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FOREWORD

The three sections of this volume are the following:

JOURNAL - the minutes of the daily sessions of the Assembly. Though the Journal does not contain the documents that appear in the second section (Appendix) it does contain the recommendations made in those documents; those recommendations appear in the Journal at the point where they were considered. For ease of reference and cross-reference the Journal is divided into articles, denoted by the symbol §. In the Index that symbol, in bold-face type, indicates reference to articles in the Journal; page numbers refer to the Appendix and the Yearbook.

APPENDIX - the documents submitted to the Assembly by presbyteries, committees of the Church, and by other bodies, for the Assembly's consideration. With the exception of Overtures, Communications, and Complaints, the several documents appear in the Appendix in the order in which they were presented to the Assembly. All references to documents in the Appendix are by page number, in both the Journal and the Index.

YEARBOOK - general information about the denomination. References to items in this section are by page number.

The Clerk welcomes suggestions for the improvement of these annual volumes.
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Wednesday Evening, June 9, 1993

1. OPENING WORSHIP. The Sixtieth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was called to order at 8:01 p.m. by the Rev. Stephen L. Phillips, Moderator of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly. Mr. Phillips constituted the meeting with a worship service and delivered a sermon on the subject, "After the Supper," based on Luke 22:14-30.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered by Mr. Phillips, assisted by Ruling Elders David S. Burkett, John L. Gerwig, P. Lee House, Lars Johnson, Jack Julien, and Louis C. LaBrriola.

The offering, which was designated for Worldwide Outreach, amounted to $667.

2. RECESS. The Assembly recessed following the singing of May the Grace of Christ Our Savior at 9:05 p.m.

Thursday Morning, June 10

3. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 8:03 a.m. and the Moderator read Matthew 6:33. John R. White, Ph.D., President of Geneva College, welcomed the Assembly on behalf of Geneva College and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America.

4. COMMISSIONERS ROLL. The roll of Commissioners, which includes those enrolled at this and all later points in the Assembly, follows [Nos. (x/x) are (number listed/number apportioned), (Churches) are churches which ruling elders attend]:
Sixtieth General Assembly

Presbytery of the Dakotas (DK)


Ruling Elders (3/3) - Robert L. Ayres (Caney), Louis C. LaBriola (Providence, Denver), Ronald E. VandenBurg (Carson)

Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic (MA)

Ministers (6/8) - Douglas A. Felch, George W. Hall, Jr., Stuart R. Jones, Thomas A. Martin, Ph.D., Albert J. Tricarico, Jr., Thomas E. Tyson

Ruling Elders (2/6) - Newman deHaas (Silver Spring), Leonard E. Miller, Ph.D. (Silver Spring)

Presbytery of the Midwest (MW)

Ministers (8/9) - Timothy L. Bero, James L. Bosgraf, Leslie A. Dunn, Stephen A. Pribble, Jude J. Reardon, Kenneth A. Smith, Lendall H. Smith, Donald F. Stanton

Ruling Elders (6/9) - Terry M. Gray, Ph.D. (Grand Rapids), Lars Johnson (Hanover Park), Dean Ter Haar (Grand Rapids), Ray Steele (Wheaton), James Van’t Voort (St. Thomas), Earl E. Zetterholm (Spencer Mills)

Presbytery of New Jersey (NJ)

Ministers (7/10) - Kenneth J. Campbell, Leonard F. Chanoux, Howard Currie, Ross W. Graham, Alan D. Strange, Stanford M. Sutton, Jr., Douglas A. Watson

Ruling Elders (5/7) - Richard A. Barker (Westfield), Charles T. DeBoer (Calvary, Phillipsburg), Jesse J. Denton, Jr. (Ringoes), Gordon H. Singer (Stratford), R. Arthur Thompson (Westfield)

Presbytery of New York and New England (NY)


Ruling Elders (6/6) - Arthur L. Comstock (Schenectady), Russell W. Copeland, Jr. (Ipswich), F. Kingsley Elder, Jr., Ph.D. (Covenant, Rochester), Stephen A. MacDonald, Ph.D. (Portland), Herbert R. Muether, Ph.D. (Franklin Square), Joseph Yankura (Franklin Square)

Presbytery of Northern California (NC)

Ministers (4/4) - Charles A. McIlhenny, Richard C. Miller, Brian H. Nicholson, John Vroegindewey

Ruling Elders (3/3) - Donald G. Jamieson (San Jose), Jack Julien (Sonora), Levon Melkonian (S. San Francisco)

Presbytery of Northwest (NW)

Ministers (5/5) - Randall A. Bergquist, Larry D. Conard, Daniel J. Dillard, John W. Mahaffy, Donald M. Poundstone

Ruling Elders (0/3)
Presbytery of Ohio (OH)
Ministers (5/5) - Charles G. Dennison, Everett C. DeVelde, Jr., R. Daniel Knox, Daniel G. Osborne, Larry E. Wilson
Ruling Elders (4/4) - T. Andrew Demana (Dayton), John L. Gerwig (Columbus), James S. Gidley, Ph.D. (Sewickley), William C. Redington, Jr. (Dayton)

Presbytery of Philadelphia (PH)
Ruling Elders (6/8) - Mark T. Bube (Glenside), Luke E. Brown, Jr. (Hatboro), David S. Burkett (Glenside), John O. Kinnaird (Oxford), Robert M. Meeker (Glenside), Howard A. Porter (Glenside)

Presbytery of the South (SO)
Ministers (4/6) - Robert D. Haehl, Larry G. Mininger, Jon D. Smith, Arthur J. Steltzer
Ruling Elders (3/4) - Robert A. Kramm (Hialeah), John R. Muether (Orlando), Lewis Peacock (Pineville)

Presbytery of Southern California (SC)
Ministers (9/9) - L. Anthony Curto, Michael D. Dengerink, Rollin P. Keller, Chong Y. Lee, Kenneth J. Meilahn, George C. Miladin, Robert B. Needham, Mark A. Schroeder, William E. Warren
Ruling Elders (4/5) - P. Lee House (San Diego), Douglas M. Jones (Santa Ana), Archibald M. Laurie (Goleta), Ellery C. Stowell, Ph.D. (Covenant Community)

Presbytery of the Southwest (SW)
Ministers (5/5) - John R. Hunt, Jr., Roger L. Gibbons, Glenn D. Jerrell, Jack J. Peterson, Richard A. Shaw
Ruling Elders (0/2)

Ex Officio
Ministers - Donald J. Duff (PH), Stephen L. Phillips (NY)

Grand Totals: Commissioners 125
                            Apportioned 152

Corresponding Members
Committee Representatives - Thomas E. Tyson (Christian Education), J. Donald Phillips (Coordination), Mark T. Bube (Foreign Missions), Garret A. Hoogerhyde (Pensions), Ross W. Graham (Home Missions)
Fraternal Delegates - The Rev. Norman Shepherd, Christian Reformed Church; the Rev. John E. Grauley, Presbyterian Church in America; the Rev. Dennis E. Roe, Reformed Church in the U.S.; the Rev. David R. Johnston, Associate
Reformed Presbyterian Church; Dr. H. H. Gootjes and the Rev. P.G. Feenstra, Canadian Reformed Churches; the Rev. John Tweed and John R. White, Ph.D., Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America.

5. FRATERNAL DELEGATE INTRODUCTION. Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, introduced the Rev. Dennis E. Roe, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Church in the U.S. On motion Mr. Roe was seated and enrolled as a corresponding member.

6. APPORTIONMENT AND ENROLLMENT OF COMMISSIONERS. The apportionment of commissioners to the Sixtieth General Assembly, in accordance with Chapter I of the Standing Rules of the General Assembly, and enrollment are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Ruling Elders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apport’d</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakotas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York and New England</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator, 59th G.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk, 60th G.A., Ex Officio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT. The Rev. Lawrence Semel reported for the Committee on Arrangements at this and at other points during the Assembly.

8. MODERATOR ELECTED. The floor was declared open for nominations to the office of Moderator. The following were nominated: Messrs. Dennison and Poundstone. On motion, Mr. Dennison’s request to have his name removed from nomination was granted. Mr. Poundstone was declared elected.

Mr. Phillips welcomed Mr. Poundstone to the chair and led in prayer on behalf of the moderatorship of Mr. Poundstone.

9. DATE, PLACE, AND TRAVEL. Mr. Watson reported for the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel.
10. **OVERTURES, COMMUNICATIONS, AND COMPLAINTS.** The Stated Clerk presented overtures, communications, and complaints addressed to the Assembly.

See:  
OVERTURES, pp. 79ff.  
COMMUNICATIONS, pp. 89ff.  
COMPLAINTS, pp. 110ff.

11. **DOCKET ADOPTED.** The docket up to this point was as follows:

1. Assembly convene 8:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 9, 1993
2. Worship service conducted by the Rev. Stephen L. Phillips, Moderator of the 59th General Assembly
3. Assembly recess at conclusion of worship service, to reconvene at 8:00 a.m., Thursday, June 10
4. Roll call
5. Seating of corresponding members
6. Report of the Committee on Arrangements
7. Election of Moderator
8. Report of the Standing Committee on Date, Place, and Travel
9. Presentation of overtures, communications, complaints, and appeals

On amended motion the remainder of the docket presented by the Clerk was adopted as follows, including a special order of the day that consideration of Complaint 4 be interposed at any place in the docket at the convenience of the Assembly, after Advisory Committee 8 has notified the Stated Clerk that their report on Complaint 4 is ready.

10. **Set times for convening, recessing, and reconvening**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Evening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convene</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>1:15 p.m.</td>
<td>6:20 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>10:00-10:20 a.m.</td>
<td>3:15-3:35 p.m.</td>
<td>9:05 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess (Meals)</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exceptions:**

a. Recess Thursday 6/10, after item 13 to permit Advisory Committees to begin work
b. Reconvene Friday 6/11, 11:55 a.m. or at the call of the Moderator
c. No session Saturday evening.

All sessions of the Assembly open with the singing of a hymn and prayer

A daily devotional service: 11:55 a.m. to 12:15 p.m., Thursday through Tuesday.

**LEADERS:** Thursday, Strange (NJ); Friday, Eckardt (NYNE); Saturday, Nicholson (NC); Monday, Bergquist (NW); Tuesday, DeVelde (OH)

11. **Adoption of docket**
Assignment of items of business to Advisory Committees

Election of Advisory and Temporary Committees
a. Advisory Committees in accordance with Standing Rule Chapter IX, Sec. 5.b.
b. Temporary Committee on Date, Place, and Travel, three members
c. Temporary Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records, 12 members
d. Temporary Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records, eight members (none to be a member of any Standing Committee)

Report of Stated Clerk

Report of the Trustees of the General Assembly

Appointment of Assistant Clerk

Action on Revisions to the Standing Rules and Instruments proposed by the previous Assembly.


Election of Statistician

Greetings and addresses by Fraternal Delegates from other bodies to be at times agreeable to them and the Moderator

Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions

Report of the Committee on Christian Education

Report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension

Report of the Committee on Coordination

Report of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries

Report of the Committee on Pensions

Report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations

Report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints

Consideration of all Overtures not already acted upon, 8:00 a.m., Monday

Consideration of proposed amendment to BD V,2.b (cf. §243 page 70 of Minutes of the 59th GA) following item 29

Report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Worship

Report of the Historian

Report of the Committee for the Historian

Report of the Chaplains Commission

Report of the Committee to Study the Method of Admission to the Lord’s Supper

Report of the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church

Temporary Committees other than Presbyterial Records, Standing Committee Records, and those already completed in connection with earlier reports

Report of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records, 8:00 a.m. Tuesday

Report of the Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records, following item 38

Reports of the Temporary Committee on Date, Place, and Travel as appropriate during the Assembly

Set Budgets for General Assembly purposes

Resolution of thanks

Unfinished Advisory Committee Business

Miscellaneous business
45. Reading and approval of Minutes (Note: Minutes are presented for approval following the lunch recess beginning on Saturday, June 12)
46. Dissolution of the Assembly (projected terminus: Noon, Wednesday, June 16)

12. TEMPORARY COMMITTEES ERECTED. On motion it was determined that the following Temporary Committees be erected, that reports, overtures, communications, and complaints be referred to them as indicated, and that the commissioners named below be appointed to these committees, the first-named being conveners.

Advisory Committee 1
Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions
Members: Messrs. Brown (PH), Dunn (MW), Ter Haar (MW), DeBoer (NJ), Bergquist (NW), Folta (NY), Stowell (SC), O'Leary (PH)

Advisory Committee 2
Report of the Committee on Christian Education
Communication 9
Members: Messrs. Cottenden (PH), LaBriola (DK), K. A. Smith (MW), Stanton (MW), Gorrell (NY), Dennison (OH), Gaffin (PH), Jones (SC),

Advisory Committee 3
Report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension
Members: Messrs. Shishko (NY), Coppes (DK), Johnson (MW), Singer (NJ), Melkonian (NC), Ramsey (NY), Georgian (PH), Peacock (SO), Hunt (SW)

Advisory Committee 4
Report of the Committee on Coordination
General Assembly Budget
Members: Messrs. D. G. Barker (NY), VandenBurg (DK), Steele (MW), Jamieson (NC), Denton (NJ), H. R. Muether (NY), Knox (OH), Laverty (PH), Curto (SC), Meilahn (SC)

Advisory Committee 5
Report of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries
Report of the Committee on Pensions
Report of the Chaplains Commission
Members: Messrs. R. A. Barker (NJ), Felch (MA), Bero (MW), Chanoux (NJ), Yankura (NY), Burkett (PH), House (SC), Lee (SC)

Advisory Committee 6
Report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations
Report of the Historian
Overture 2
Communications 1, 2, 3, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20
Members: Messrs. Mahaffy (NW), Male (DK), Gray (MW), Vroegindewey (NC), Graham (NJ), Phillips (NY), Osborne (OH), Stonehouse (PH), Laurie (SC), Haehl (SO)

Advisory Committee 7  
All pending amendments to the Standing Rules 
Report of the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church 
Communications 5, 7, 16, 19 
Members: Messrs. Hilbelink (NY), L. E. Miller (MA), Pribble (MW), McIlhenny (NC), Elder (NY), DeVelde (OH), Knudsen (PH), Schroeder (SC), Steltzer (SO)

Advisory Committee 8  
Report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship 
Report of the Committee to Study the Method of Admission to the Lord’s Supper 
Complaint 4 
Members: Messrs. Peterson (SW), Williamson (DK), Tricarico (MA), Van’t Voort (MW), Currie (NJ), Copeland (NY), Redington (OH), S. F. Miller (PH), Needham (SC), Kramm (SO)

Advisory Committee 9  
Report of the Stated Clerk 
Report of the Statistician 
Report of the Trustees of the General Assembly 
Overtures 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 
Communication 6 
Members: Messrs. Eckardt (NY), Ayres (DK), deHaas (MA), Reardon (MW), Thompson (NJ), Demana (OH), Meeker (PH), Miladin (SC), J. D. Smith (SO)

Advisory Committee 10A  
Report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints (particularly Part I) 
Communications 4, 11, 13, 14 
Complaints 3, 5 
Members: Messrs. Van Meerbeke (NY), Taylor (DK), Bosgraf (MW), Strange (NJ), MacDonald (NY), Gidley (OH), Kuschke (PH), Mininger (SO), Shaw (SW)

Advisory Committee 10B  
Report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints 
Communication 8 
Complaints 1, 2 
Members: Messrs. Tanzie (NY), Tyson (MA), Julien (NC), Campbell (NJ), Cook (NY), Foh (PH), Kinnaird (PH), Warren (SC)

Committee on Date, Place, and Travel  
Members: Messrs. Watson (NJ), Porter (PH)

Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records  
Communication 10
Overture 8

Members: Messrs. L. H. Smith (MW), Eppinger (DK), Jones (MA), Sutton (NJ), Comstock (NY), R. C. Miller (NC), Dillard (NW), Wilson (OH), Minnig (PH), Keller (SC), J. Muether (SO), Gibbons (SW)

Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records
Total- 8

Members: Messrs. Hall (MA), Martin (MA), Zetterholm (MW), Nicholson (NC), Conard (NW), Mallin (NY), Gerwig (OH), Dengerink (SC)

Total Commissioners 125
Total Commissioners on Advisory Committees 120
Not Available for Advisory Committees 5

Not Assigned: Messrs. Duff (EX), Poundstone (NW), Bube (PH), Galbraith (PH), Jerrell (SW)

13. SURVEY OF COMMISSIONERS LENGTH OF SERVICE. A survey of commissioners and corresponding members present yielded the following information as to their dates of ordination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of Ordination</th>
<th>No. of Presbyters Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since Jan. 1, 1990</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1980 to Dec. 31, 1989</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1970 to Dec. 31, 1979</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1960 to Dec. 31, 1969</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1950 to Dec. 31, 1959</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1940 to Dec. 31, 1949</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Jan. 1, 1940</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those attending the General Assembly for the first time 18

14. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 9:45 a.m. and reconvened at 11:55 a.m. with the singing of I Need Thee, Precious Jesus.

15. DEVOTIONAL. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Strange spoke on the topic, “Solomon’s Prayer for Wisdom,” based on I Kings 3:4-14. The Assembly recessed at 12:15 p.m. following prayer by led Mr. Strange.

Friday Morning, June 11, 1993

16. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 11:55 a.m. with the singing of I Love Thy Kingdom Lord.

17. DEVOTIONAL. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Eckardt led in
prayer, read I Timothy 4, and spoke on the topic, "Perseverance in Life and Doctrine," based on I Timothy 4:16. Following announcements, the Assembly recessed at 12:19 p.m. following prayer led by Mr. Eckardt.

Friday Afternoon, June 11, 1993

18. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 1:18 p.m. and sang All People That on Earth Do Dwell, and the Moderator led in prayer. The Moderator announced that Mr. Curto would be leaving the Assembly due to the illness of his mother.

19. STANDING RULE SUSPENDED. On motion Standing Rule Chapter V, Section 8 was suspended and the Report of the Stated Clerk was ordered included in the minutes without being read to the Assembly.

20. STATED CLERK'S REPORT. Mr. Duff presented his Report as Stated Clerk (see p. 137) with the following:

RECOMMENDATION:
That the 60th General Assembly approve the amendments to the Standing Rules as proposed to the Assembly by the 59th General Assembly. (The proposed amendments are found in III.C. numbers 1, 2, and 3 of this report.)

1. That the following be added to SR III.B.5.e.(1)(a): "The Clerk may propose measures for the early resolution of questions affecting the docket or Advisory Committee assignments raised by conflicting matters of business being brought to the Assembly."

2. That the following be added to SR IV.6:; "it shall include orders of the day to insure that all overtures and pending amendments to the standing rules are taken up before the projected terminus of the Assembly."

3. That the following amendments be made to the SR:
   III.B.4.f: Change "General Assembly purposes" to "the General Assembly Operation Fund."
   III.B.5.j: Change "Assembly's funds" to "Assembly Operation Fund"
   III.B.5.j.(1): Change "operating expenses of the General Assembly to "General Assembly Operation Fund."
   III.B.5.j.(4): Delete (already covered in III.B.4.f)
   V.10: Change "Budget" to "Operation"
   V.11: Change "Budget" to "Operation"
   X.4.: Change "Budget" to "Operation" (two places)
   X.4.a: Change "Budget" to "Operation"
   X.5.b(1): Change "General Assembly purposes" to "the General Assembly Operation Fund."

21. ADVISORY COMMITTEES 7 & 9 (Stated Clerk). Messrs. Hilbelink and Eckardt reported that Advisory Committees 7 and 9 were silent regarding the report of the Stated Clerk.
22. **RECOMMENDATION ACTION (Standing Rules Adopted).** The recommendation of the Stated Clerk was adopted.

23. **AMENDMENTS ADOPTED (Form of Government).** The Moderator declared, in accordance with the Form of Government XXXII.2, that the amendment to the Form of Government, Chapter XVI, 7 in regards to a congregation withdrawing from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was approved and is to go into effect on January 1, 1995, and that the amendments to the Book of Discipline II.B.3.d and V.2.a were approved and are to go into effect on January 1, 1995 (cf. Minutes of the 59th General Assembly, §101, §167, §168).

24. **TRUSTEES REPORT.** Mr. S. F. Miller reported for the Trustees of the General Assembly (see p. 141).

    **RECOMMENDATIONS:**
    1. That the following listed remuneration package for the Stated Clerk for 1993-94 be adopted:
       
       Salary: $42,000.00  
       F.I.C.A. Reimbursement (1/2): 3,213.00  
       Pension (6% of Salary): 2,520.00  
       Hospitalization, Surgical,  
       Major Medical Insurance: 5,040.00 (Est.)  
       Disability Insurance: 378.00  
       Worker's Compensation Insurance: 200.00 (Est.)  
       Total: $53,351.00

    2. That the General Assembly substitute the following language for that referred to the Trustees (see Item IV., p. 141):
       a. Insert the following language after the words “general assembly” in FG XXXII,3 on line 5, page 157: “shall determine whether a suggested change is worthy of consideration. If so determined, it”
       b. Delete the words “proposed amendment” on line 6 and insert the words “suggested change”

       The text then will read as follows: “The general assembly shall determine whether a suggested change is worthy of consideration. If so determined, it shall appoint a committee to consider any suggested change and to report to the next regular assembly, etc.”

       **Grounds:**
       (1) This language will enable the General Assembly to discharge its duty to decide the worthiness of any suggested change before being required to erect a committee for a more thorough consideration of the suggested change.
       (2) The words “suggested” and “change” are substituted for the words “proposed” and “amendment” (see line 6, section 3, page 157) to eliminate confusion with the technical use of “proposed” and “amendment” in sections 2 and 3, whereby a general assembly initiates the process of amending the Constitution by “proposing” an “amendment” to the presbyteries, by which act a suggested change becomes a “proposed amendment.”
25. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Trustees). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 regarding the Report of the Trustees of the General Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION 1:
Advisory Committee 9 concurs with Recommendation 1 of the Trustees with the addition of “with four weeks vacation each year.”
Grounds: Trustees present at the Assembly recommended the addition.

Mr. Eckardt reported further for Advisory Committee 9 as follows:

RECOMMENDATION 2:
a. Advisory Committee 9 concurs with recommendation 2 of the Trustees. The Committee further recommends the adoption of the following: In accordance with FG XXXII.5 and 3, the General Assembly proposes to the presbyteries the following: In FG XXXII.3 for “the general assembly shall appoint a committee to consider any proposed amendment” substitute “The general assembly shall determine whether a suggested change is worthy of consideration. If so determined, it shall appoint a committee to consider any suggested change.”
b. The Committee further recommends that the grounds set forth in recommendation 2 in the Report of Trustees be those sent to the presbyteries.

26. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS (Trustees): Recommendations 1, as amended, and 2 of the Report of the Trustees of the General Assembly were adopted.

27. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 2.a and 2.b of Advisory Committee 9 were adopted.

28. ASSISTANT CLERK APPOINTED. The Stated Clerk announced that, in accordance with Standing Rule, Chapter III, Section B.2.a., he had asked Mr. Jerrell to serve as Assistant Clerk.

29. TRUSTEES ELECTIONS. The floor was declared open for nominations for the Trustees of the General Assembly for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: Ministers: S. F. Miller; Ruling Elder: Willard E. Neel (West Collingswood). There being no further nominations, the Moderator declared Mr. S. F. Miller and Mr. Neel elected.

30. STANDING RULES AMENDED. Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of the Stated Clerk were adopted (see p. 138).

31. STATISTICIANS REPORT. Mr. Brown presented his report as Statistician (see p. 144).

32. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Statistician). Advisory Committee 9 was silent regarding the Report of the Statistician.
33. **STATISTICIAN ELECTED.** The floor was declared open for nominations to the office of Statistician. Mr. Brown was nominated. There being no further nominations, the Moderator declared Mr. Brown elected. Mr. Eckardt led in prayer for the Stated Clerk and the Statistician.

34. **DATE, PLACE, AND TRAVEL.** Mr. Watson reported for the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel as follows:

1. That the deadline for submission of valid travel vouchers be set for the conclusion of the morning recess (10:20 a.m.) on Saturday, June 12.
2. That for the purposes of full travel compensation, attendance be required until 12:00 noon, Wednesday, June 16, or the dissolution of the Assembly, whichever comes first.
3. That the 61st General Assembly convene at the Harvey Cedars Bible Conference Grounds, Harvey Cedars, NJ beginning 8:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 8, 1994 with the projected terminus of noon, Wednesday, June 15, 1994.
5. That the Committee on Arrangements be authorized to arrange morning and evening worship services on Sunday, June 12.

Financial Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at the end of the 59th GA</td>
<td>$11,525.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions through May 31, 1993</td>
<td>51,768.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>102.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total available to the 60th GA</td>
<td>63,396.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid airfares for the 60th GA</td>
<td>-3,456.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available to the 60th GA</td>
<td>$59,939.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. **RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS.** Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel were adopted. Recommendation 3 of the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel was moved. On motion the question was divided. Recommendation 3.a. was adopted. On motion Recommendation 3.b. was recommitted to the Committee. At a later time, Recommendations 3.b., 4, and 5 were adopted.

36. **FRATERNAL DELEGATE INTRODUCTION.** Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, introduced the Rev. John Tweed, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. On motion Mr. Tweed was seated and enrolled as a corresponding member.

37. **FOREIGN MISSIONS.** Mr. Gaffin, President of the Committee on Foreign Missions, presented its report (see p. 154).

38. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 1 (Foreign Missions).** Mr. O'Leary presented the report of Advisory Committee 1 as follows:
The Committee met with the Committee on Foreign Missions representatives Richard B. Gaffin and George R. Cottenden, and Controller David E. Haney. General Secretary Mark T. Bube was prevented from meeting with the Committee due to his wife's surgery earlier this week. We solicit the prayers of members of the Assembly on her behalf for healing and recovery.

The Committee notes that the church benefits from the General Secretary's creative recruiting of O.P. ministers for short-term theological and pastoral ministry in several countries. The Committee reviewed with Messrs. Gaffin and Cottenden the work on each mission field and the opportunities for new fields. We also reviewed with Mr. Haney the financial report of the Committee on Foreign Missions. We note with joy the many advances in the work of foreign missionaries on each field. We thank the Lord for exciting new opportunities for the work of foreign missions, including the reopening of the work in Eritrea and the commitment by the Committee on Foreign Missions to supply missionary pastors and teachers in Ethiopia, Kenya, Bulgaria and Mongolia.

The representatives of the Committee on Foreign Missions reported on the great encouragement among our missionaries stemming from the extensive personal contact they have had with the General Secretary on their respective fields. The representatives also noted the way in which the highly capable work of Miss Linda Posthuma as Administrative Assistant has enabled the General Secretary to devote his time and energy in such large measure to field oversight.

Advisory Committee 1 is silent on the remainder of the report, and there are no recommendations in the report of the Committee on Foreign Missions.

39. FOREIGN MISSIONS ELECTIONS. The Assembly was informed of the resignation of the Rev. Hailu Mekonnen. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Foreign Missions for the Class of 1996 and one for the Class of 1994. The following were nominated: Ministers: Curto, Theodore Hard, L. H. Smith, Gaffin, William B. Kessler, Tricarico, Bosgraf; Ruling Elders: Kinnaird, Melkonian, Edward Hardesty. By common consent the order of the day was extended to complete speeches and to cast ballots.

At a later time, the Moderator announced the election of Messrs. Bosgraf, Gaffin, L. H. Smith, Kinnaird, and Edward Hardesty to the Class of 1996. On the third ballot and at a later time, the Moderator announced the election of Mr. Hard to the Class of 1994. Mr. O'Leary led in prayer for the Committee on Foreign Missions.

40. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 3:24 p.m. and reconvened at 3:46 p.m. with the singing of the hymn, Zion, Founded on the Mountains.

41. PHILLIPS ASSUMED CHAIR. At the request of the Moderator, Mr. Phillips assumed the chair.

42. CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Mr. Donald M. Poundstone, the President of the Committee on Christian Education, presented its report (see p. 178). Mr. Tyson, General Secretary of the Committee on Christian Education, addressed the Assembly.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the 60th General Assembly authorize the publication of the January 1993 edition of the Modern English Study Version, in parallel columns with the Confession of Faith of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church

2. That if the 60th General Assembly approves publication of the MESV the following statement be included on each page: **This Modern English Study Version does not have any official authority**

43. MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Mr. Galbraith reported for the Minority of the Committee on Christian Education (see p. 191).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Assembly determine that before considering “approval of the January 1993 version of the proposed OPC Modern English Study Version (OPC/MESV) for publication” as recommended by the Committee on Christian Education, it seek the counsel of other churches that hold to the Westminster Standards, including the churches with which the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship (the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Korean American Presbyterian Church, the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in America, the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America), the churches to which an invitation to such a relationship has been given (the Presbyterian Church in Korea [Kosin], and the Reformed Church in Japan), other churches with which the OPC has an active correspondence (the Reformed Churches of New Zealand) and of individual theologians outside the OPC (to be chosen by the Stated Clerk) asking (1) for their advice concerning the advisability of publishing such an “unofficial” wording and interpretation of our “official” Confession of Faith, (2) for their evaluation of the text of the document and, (3) to give us the favor of their advice by December 31, 1995.

**Grounds:**

(1) It may be surprising for some to know that prior to January 18, 1993, the full Committee had never, at any meeting, discussed or studied together any draft of the text of the (then) MEV that it had submitted to the Church for study.

(2) The Committee has not had before it the substance of the suggestions and criticisms received by the subcommittee. Additionally, when changes were made in the text of the previous draft neither the Church nor the Committee had any indication of where to find the textual changes. All that anyone had (sometimes) was a two-column draft that required difficult and complicated comparisons of the respective columns. Such deficiencies regarding a document of such far-reaching importance do not inspire confidence in the final product, however diligent the efforts of the small subcommittee may have been.

(3) The January 18, 1993 meeting has been the only meeting at which a full text of either the MEV or the MESV was discussed, and that was only by a telephone conference call. Such a meeting offers, at best, less-than-ideal conditions for any discussion, let alone for a subject of such great moment as the basic statement of our Church’s faith. Of significance also is the fact that the meeting was held from
7:00 p.m. EST, until after one o’clock in the morning for a majority of the Committee, a time when fatigue has subtle effects on judgment.

This method for this supremely important matter was especially deficient in view of it being the only opportunity to discuss a text that must be an accurate rendering/interpretation of our most basic doctrinal standard.

(4) The Committee, wishing the MESV text to be published right away and as is, compounds the deficiency of inadequate consideration of the text by—with minimal discussion in the Committee, without organized discussion by Church or General Assembly, and without seeking counsel from any other churches—asking the Assembly for its “approval of the January 1993 version” of its basic confession of its faith for use in the Church and presumably elsewhere.

(5) So we observe that the Committee is not asking only for permission to publish the MESV regardless of its merits or demerits. It is, rightly, asking for approval first of the content: “approval of the January 1993 version” so that it may be published. The first must precede the second. It is expected that one, least of all a church of Jesus Christ, would not want to publish a witness—which is what a Confession of Faith is—that it has not approved. Surely no Orthodox Presbyterian General Assembly would do other than require approval of a text of such import before giving permission to publish it. Nor, surely, would it approve the document before being able to evaluate it through hearing discussion of its strengths and weaknesses. We should not neglect the opportunity and obligation to edify one another provided by the Presbyterian system which we profess.

It should be noted here that the undersigned is not recommending that the Assembly approve or disapprove the text of the MESV at this time, with all the debate on the floor of the Assembly that would be involved. Rather, he is saying that we should humbly acknowledge that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is a very small segment of the Presbyterian Reformed church and that all wisdom does not reside in us. Therefore, before we make such a momentous decision we need the advice and evaluation of other churches that are close to us. And we should be aware that undoubtedly most of those churches would be gratified to be asked for their counsel on such a matter.

(6) In the judgment of the undersigned the Committee did not do as much as it could have to comply with the directive of the 58th (1991) General Assembly: it was instructed to prepare any new draft of an MEV “in a format that shows all deletions, substitutions, and additions relative to the Church’s Confession” (Minutes, §52 [d]). The purpose, obviously, was to provide the clearest and easiest way for the reader to see and evaluate the new text as to its faithfulness to the original.

a. The method used by the Committee—separating the proposed changes from the original text by putting them into separate columns—makes it very difficult to compare the two texts precisely because it requires the reader to jump back and forth from one text to another in order to try to determine for himself what and where the proposed changes actually are; although the new wordings are all there in this method the change is less evident and more difficult to see. The difficulty becomes especially acute, and the change obscure, when entire phrases or clauses are deleted from one place and reinserted in another location, sometimes
even into a different sentence. The problem is aggravated when one must compare one text/column with the other.

b. There is a widely-accepted way that was readily available to the Committee, but which the Committee declined to use. The MESV in that format is available to the Assembly. It puts all proposed textual changes, both deletions and additions, in juxtaposition with the original text so that the reader can read either text consecutively and make, in one place, a precise comparison of the proposed changes. Use of that method would have carefully and fully complied with the purpose of the instruction for presentation of another draft of the MEV and would have enabled the reader to have a clear rendering of the proposed changes before him in one text.

c. Greater endeavor by the Committee to fulfill the Assembly’s desired purpose would have enabled the Church to be more certain concerning the faithfulness of the MESV to the Confession.

(7) The MEV has now been renamed MESV—Modern English Study Version. The insertion of the word “Study” in the title is significant. It indicates that the MESV presents the way in which its authors believe that the official Confession is to be understood, i.e., to be interpreted. Although at the Committee’s most recent meeting, March 24-25, 1993, the use of the word “interpretation” to describe one facet of the MESV was resisted, that is precisely what it is: study is for the purpose of learning the meaning of supposedly obscure words and phrases, of interpreting them for the reader. In fact, interpretation cannot be avoided when words are changed, when words and phrases and clauses are deleted or added. The undersigned believes that when the OPC thinks about advising its people and others about the meaning of its Confession of Faith it, from its little corner in the larger Reformed church, needs as much advice as it can get before it approves or distributes such a document to them.

(8) Considering the claim that spurred this endeavor, that much of the existing Confession cannot be understood by this generation of Americans, the normal tendency in instruction would be to avoid confusing the student with understandable language and to teach directly from the text of the MESV. The document than becomes not a “study aid” but itself, not the Church’s Confession, the object of the study. The real Confession inevitably would be largely disregarded. It would thereby become the Church’s de facto Confession without having gone through the constitutional process of amending it.

(9) The Orthodox Presbyterian Church has gone to great lengths to build bridges with other churches of like faith, to be able to seek their counsel and to encourage them to seek ours, going so far as to enter into agreements with them to do just that. In short, we have committed ourselves to the doctrine and practice of the unity of the church. We have talked about unity but when it comes down to the practice of it we shall show them that our words are hollow if we do not seek their counsel on this statement of our basic doctrines before we publish it. To seek advice after the fact would be seen as, if not hypocritical, at least empty. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate the integrity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, by seeking counsel before we make our decision.

(10) We should not go our own way, disregarding the other Presbyterian Reformed churches as though they are meaningless. Such an attitude moves us in
the direction of sectarianism, the tendency to disregard what others might think. We must not allow ourselves to develop such an attitude nor to give occasion to others to think that of us.

2. That the General Assembly direct the Committee to abandon immediately the application of its current Bylaws IV.2 and V.2 as respects the service of unreelected members and to amend its Bylaws at its next meeting so as to provide that no former members of the Committee not reelected by the General Assembly shall serve in any way as members or officers of the Committee nor as members of the Board of Trustees of Great Commission Publications after the General Assembly has elected their successors to the Committee.

Grounds:

1. The present Bylaws violate the legal requirements of the Committee’s Certificate of Incorporation.

The Certificate of Incorporation (Art. FOURTH, Par. (b) provides that the members of the Board shall “serve for three years and until their successors are elected”, at which time their “terms as members of this corporation shall cease and terminate unless reelected” (emphasis ours).

2. The present Bylaws void the decision of the General Assembly when by election it has determined to replace one member of the Committee with another.

a. Concerning membership on the Committee and on the Board of Trustees of Great Commission Publications, Bylaw IV.2 provides that even if members’ terms have expired at the General Assembly elections in May or June and they were not reelected, “A term of office shall normally expire at the beginning of the regular September meeting of the Board. Nevertheless members not reelected and who are members of the Board of Trustees of Great Commission Publications shall serve on the latter Board until the end of its regular meeting in September” (emphasis ours).

b. Concerning officers of the Committee Bylaw V.2 provides that they are “to hold office for one year or until their successors are elected and qualified. The term of office for these officers shall expire at the end of the regular September meeting of the Board” (emphasis ours).

c. The extension of terms beyond those specified are illegal with regard to the legally-approved Certificate of Incorporation and could jeopardize the legality of decisions of the Board if discovered. It is, further, unethical to contravene the legal provisions.

d. The current Bylaws effectively increase the membership of the Committee to more than are allowed by both the Certificate of Incorporation and General Assembly rules: those with new terms and those with expired terms are all serving for months after the election. This is not only illegal but also introduces confusion as to who are the surplus members and who are the voting members and who may be elected as officers and as members of the Board of Great Commission Publications.

e. If it is claimed that continuity requires such provisions, the other committees of the Church, which have similar problems, have had no problem operating under General Assembly rules. In any case a Committee, as a servant of the General Assembly, must operate as the General Assembly determines.
(3) The required changes will bring the Bylaws into accord with the Committee's legal base in the Certificate of Incorporation and with the operation of the General Assembly in this regard.

44. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2. Mr. Gaffin reported for Advisory Committee 2 as follows: Advisory Committee 2 met with Messrs. John Galbraith, F. Kingsley Elder, Thomas R. Patete, James Gidley, Thomas Tyson and G. I. Williamson.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the 60th General Assembly not authorize the publication of the recommendations concerning the Modern English Study Version (MESV) for the following reasons:
   a. The MESV is clearly intended for study purposes only, with the express disclaimer that it "does not have any official authority." Nevertheless, we believe that for the Church to authorize its publication will almost inevitably have the effect, however unintended, of introducing into the life of the church what will function, in some respects at least, as an implicit, de facto revision of the Confession.
   b. We believe that if the Church undertakes producing a modern language version of the Confession (and/or Catechisms), it ought to face the issue of confessional revision directly. As a committee, however, we are sharply divided over the need and propriety of such a revision, and so, with inadequate time at our disposal for addressing the issue, have no recommendation to make in this regard.
   
   Note: the Committee believes that this action makes action on recommendation 1 of the minority report and communication 9 unnecessary.

2. That the General Assembly direct the Committee on Christian Education to revise Bylaws V.2 to make it clear that officers of the Committee not reelected by the Assembly to service on the Committee do not serve beyond the election and qualification of their successors.
   
   Ground: Ambiguity in the present wording has led to the concern expressed in the minority report.

3. That the General Assembly direct the Committee on Christian Education either:
   a. to revise Bylaws IV.2 to make it clear that members of the Committee serving as trustees of Great Commission Publications who are not reelected by the Assembly to service on the Committee may not serve as trustees beyond the election and qualification of their successors, or
   b. to propose to the 61st GA an orderly way to continue the practice presently allowed in that Bylaw.
   
   Ground: It appears that the present Bylaw and its application are in conflict with the Committee's Certificate of Incorporation, which specifies that members terms last only until their successors are elected.

45. RECOMMENDATION MOVED. Recommendation 1 of the Committee on Christian Education was moved.

46. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:00 p.m. after Mr. Male led in prayer.
Friday Evening, June 11, 1993

47. **RECONVENE.** The Assembly reconvened at 6:21 p.m. with the singing of *Shine Thou upon Us, Lord.* Mr. D. G. Barker led in prayer.

48. **ORDER OF DAY.** By common consent the order of the day for the evening recess was extended 18 minutes so that the commissioners might see portions of the Historian’s video entitled, *The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.*

49. **RECOMMENDATION 1 (cont.).** The Assembly resumed consideration of Recommendation 1 of the Committee on Christian Education.

50. **HISTORIAN'S VIDEO.** The order of the day having arrived, the Historian presented a preview of the video entitled, *The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.*

51. **RECESS.** The Assembly recessed at 9:34 p.m. after Mr. DeBoer led in prayer.

Saturday Morning, June 12, 1993

52. **RECONVENE.** The Assembly reconvened at 8:00 a.m. and sang *For All the Saints.* The Moderator read Matthew 18:3. Mr. Dunn led in prayer.

53. **RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS.** Recommendation 1 of the Committee on Christian Education was adopted. Mr. Galbraith informed the Assembly of his intent to submit a protest. Recommendation 2 of the Committee on Christian Education was adopted in amended form as follows: “that if the 60th General Assembly approves publication of the MESV the following statement be included on each page: ‘This 1993 draft of the Modern English Study Version does not have any constitutional authority.’” Recommendations 2 and 3 of Advisory Committee 2 (see §44) were adopted.

54. **MINISTERIAL TRAINING ELECTIONS.** The floor was declared open for nominations to the Subcommittee on Ministerial Training for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: *Ministers:* Galbraith, Poundstone, Allen D. Curry.

The Moderator later announced the election of Messrs. Galbraith and Poundstone.

55. **CHRISTIAN EDUCATION ELECTIONS.** The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Christian Education for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: *Ministers:* A. D. Curry; *Ruling Elders:* Elder, Paul S. MacDonald.
There being no further nominations, the Moderator declared the election of Messrs. Curry, Elder, and MacDonald to the Class of 1996. Mr. Stanton, Chairman of Advisory Committee 2, led in prayer for the Committee on Christian Education.

56. **POUNDSTONE RESUMED CHAIR.** Mr. Poundstone resumed the chair.

57. **HOME MISSIONS.** Mr. Hilbelink, President of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, presented its report (see p. 197). At a later time, Mr. Bergquist and Mr. Graham addressed the Assembly.

58. **RECESS.** The Assembly recessed at 9:59 a.m., reconvened at 10:21 a.m., and sang *Give Thanks unto the Lord, Jehovah*.

59. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 3.** Mr. Shishko reported that Advisory Committee 3 was silent regarding the Report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension.

60. **HOME MISSIONS ELECTIONS.** The Assembly was notified that Mr. Lyman M. Smith had resigned from the Committee. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension for the Class of 1996 and one to the Class of 1994. The following were nominated:

- **Ministers:** Glenn T. Black, O'Leary, Taylor, Stanton, Van Meerbeke, Shishko, Richard R. Gerber, Hunt;
- **Ruling Elders:** Ayres, Julien, Richard L. Hake.

The Moderator announced the election of Messrs. Black, Gerber, Hake, Julien, and O'Leary to the Class of 1996 and Mr. Shishko to the Class of 1994. Mr. Shishko led in prayer for the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension.

61. **CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.** The Moderator informed the Assembly, according to Standing Rule 1.3.9, that Mr. J. Donald Phillips, representative of the Committee on Coordination, and Mr. Garret A. Hoogerhyde, representative of the Committee on Pensions, were seated as corresponding members.

62. **COORDINATION REPORT.** Mr. J. D. Phillips reported for the Committee on Coordination (see p. 211).

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. That the General Assembly approve the following Worldwide Outreach program for 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>$157,016</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>554,173</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions</td>
<td>461,811</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>$1,173,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>New Horizons</em></td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coordination</em></td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 1993 Worldwide Outreach</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,450,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. That the following words in Instrument E.4.i.(1) be suspended for 1994: "in the proportion which each program committee's budget bears to the total budget;" and replaced with "in the following proportion: Christian Education 16%, Foreign Missions 42% and Home Missions & Church Extension 42%.”

63. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 4. Mr. D. G. Barker reported silence for Advisory Committee 4 regarding the Report of the Committee on Coordination.

64. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Committee on Coordination were adopted.

65. COORDINATION ELECTIONS. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Coordination for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: Minister: Male; Ruling Elder: Singer. The Moderator declared Messrs. Male and Singer elected. Mr. D. G. Barker led in prayer for the Committee on Coordination.

66. DIACONAL REPORT (see §99). Mr. Coppes, Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries, presented its report (see p. 229).

67. DEVOTIONAL. The order of the day having arrived at 11:58 a.m., Mr. Nicholson led the devotional service. The Assembly sang Come, Sing unto the Lord. Mr. Nicholson read Mark 12:18-37 and delivered message entitled, “The Power of the Resurrection.” He led in prayer and the Assembly recessed at 12:17 p.m. following the benediction.

Saturday Afternoon, June 12, 1993

68. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 1:17 p.m. with the singing of O Thou Who the Shepherd of Israel Art. Mr. J. Muether led in prayer.

69. STANDING RULE SUSPENDED. On motion Standing Rule Chapter V, Section 8 was suspended and the Report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints was ordered included in the minutes without being read to the Assembly.


71. COMPLAINT 4 (Advisory Committee 8). Mr. Tricarico presented the Report of Advisory Committee 8 regarding Complaint 4 as follows:

Advisory Committee 8 concurs with the recommendations of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints as amended.

22
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly determine that, insofar as the Complaint seeks to amend the Book of Church Order (Amends B), it is out of order and not properly before the Assembly.

   *Grounds:*
   
   (1) The Complaint complains against an action of a session which, by the complainants' own admission, is not necessarily out of accord with the Directory for Worship.

   (2) A complaint is neither the proper vehicle for amendment to the Directory for Worship nor can its disciplinary functions effect such amendment; in other words, the GA cannot amend the constitution of the OPC through a decision on a complaint.

2. That the General Assembly not decide the issues of this case, but refer the issues raised in the documents of this case to the GA's Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Worship for consideration and request it to report to the 61st General Assembly in 1994.

   *Grounds:*
   
   (1) The debate has been a serious one and requires serious consideration by the Church. The two sides have centered attention not only on specific worship practices, but on how certain underlying principles (such as the regulative principle, and the relevance of O.T. music examples to the practice of the N.T. Church) should be interpreted, in order to resolve the questions about the specific practices. But the underlying principles themselves need to be clarified. It is right to clarify the principles, in order to settle the specifics. But is this General Assembly prepared to do so?

   (2) There is a further problem. This debate has not brought all the basic principles into consideration. There are other underlying Scriptural principles as to the nature of worship itself, which would have much bearing on the specific worship practices. They would affect not only our attitude toward worship, but also the manner of the worship that we give to God.

   (3) With this Complaint and its accompanying documents, we enter the area of worship where the guidelines are disputed and not all the determinants are grasped. It is a critical area for the Church.

3. That the addendum to Complaint 4, as printed in the Agenda, not be printed in the permanent records of the 60th General Assembly on the ground that it was not part of the appeal to presbytery.

72. PRIVILEGE OF FLOOR. By general consent E. Benjamin Manring, Ph.D., one of the complainants, was granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of Complaint 4.

73. RECOMMENDATION 2 (Advisory Committee 8). Recommendation 1 of Advisory Committee 8 regarding Complaint 4 was moved. The Moderator ruled that Recommendation 1 was in order and affects Complaint 4 as a whole. It was moved to amend Recommendation 1 by deleting "insofar as the Complaint seeks to amend the Book of Church Order (Amends B), it" and inserting "the Complaint." The Moderator ruled that what was currently on the floor was in order.
The ruling was appealed. The Moderator's ruling was sustained. The amendment to Recommendation 1 was carried. Consideration of Recommendation 1 was postponed until after consideration of Recommendation 2.

Recommendation 2 of Advisory Committee 8 was moved. On motion Dr. Manring was granted 20 minutes to address the Assembly. On motion Mr. Manring was granted an additional five minutes to address the Assembly. Recommendation 2 was adopted in the following amended form: (2) refer the issues regarding worship raised in the documents of this case to the General Assembly's Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship for consideration and request it to report to the 61st General Assembly in 1994.

74. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 3:16 p.m., and reconvened at 3:36 p.m., and sang Not All the Blood of Beasts.

75. MINUTES. By general consent consideration of the Minutes that had been posted and handed out was postponed until Monday.

76. COMPLAINT 4 OUT OF ORDER. Recommendation 1 as amended was taken up at this time. A substitute motion that Complaint 4 be found in order and properly before the Assembly was defeated. At their requests the following affirmative votes were recorded: Messrs. Comstock, Gidley, Knox, Laurie, Pribble. Recommendation 1 as amended was adopted. At their request the following negative votes were recorded: Messrs. Campbell, Comstock, Demana, Felch, Gidley, Hall, Knox, Laurie, Mallin, McIlhenny, L. E. Miller, Pribble, Shishko, Ter Haar, VandenBurg, Williamson, Yankura, Zetterholm. At a later time, Mr. Pribble announced his intention to file a protest against the Assembly's finding Complaint 4 out of order.

77. COMPLAINT 4 (Recommendation 3). At a later time, Recommendation 3 was adopted in the following amended form: the addendum to Complaint 4, with the exception of sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11, not be printed in the permanent records of the 60th General Assembly on the ground that it was not part of the appeal to presbytery.

78. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:01 p.m. after Mr. Foh led in prayer.

Monday Morning, June 14, 1993

79. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 8:01 a.m. with the singing of Tell Out, My Soul, the Greatness of the Lord. Mr. Johnson led in prayer.

80. DATE, PLACE, AND TRAVEL. Mr. Watson reported further for the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel as follows:
6. That commissioners who submitted valid travel vouchers by 10:20 a.m., Saturday, June 12, be reimbursed according to the following schedule for one round trip from their homes to Geneva College:
   a. Those traveling by public conveyance to be reimbursed the full cost of their fare as reported to the nearest dollar.
   b. Those traveling by private conveyance as operators be reimbursed to the nearest dollar at the rate of $0.20 per mile, plus $0.03 per mile for each passenger who is eligible to receive travel compensation with the exception that the driver shall not receive an amount greater than the combined cost of economy air fares for himself and his passenger(s), or for himself if traveling alone, unless the committee approves the reason for the use of the car in travel.
   c. Those traveling by private conveyance as passengers be reimbursed at the rate of $0.05 per mile to the nearest dollar.
   d. Mr. S. F. Miller be reimbursed for actual costs sustained in renting the vehicle used to transport himself and other passengers and that he and his passengers receive $10.00 each for incidental expenses.

7. That commissioners who applied for it be reimbursed for their expenses incurred in conjunction with attendance at the Assembly, namely, for registration fee, room and meal expenses (up to $205).

8. That the Assembly request the churches to contribute to the GA Travel Fund for 1994 at the rate of $8.00 per communicant member.

9. That the Committee on Date, Place and Travel be authorized to make arrangements for reduced air fares to the 61st GA for commissioners and other representatives. In order to facilitate this responsibility, presbyteries and committees authorized to send commissioners or corresponding members are requested to elect such persons by January 31, 1994, and to communicate immediately thereafter their selectees' names and addresses to the Committee on Date, Place and Travel, the Stated Clerk, and the Committee on Arrangements.

10. That the following be excused as indicated without loss of travel compensation:
   a. Mr. Curto beginning Friday afternoon, June 11, in order to return home to be with his mother who is near death.
   b. Mr. Julien on Wednesday, June 16, to make a scheduled train connection.
   c. Mr. McLlhenney on Tuesday evening, June 15, for a scheduled TV and radio program appearance.
   d. Mr. D. Jones on Wednesday, June 16, to make his scheduled flight home.

81. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel were adopted.

82. ORDER OF DAY. The order of the day having arrived, the Assembly began consideration of Overtures.

83. OVERTURE 1 (Advisory Committee 9). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 regarding Overture 1 as follows:
RECOMMENDATION: that Overture 1 not be adopted.

Ground: There are more appropriate actions that the presbytery can take to deal with the concerns in the grounds of this overture; namely, informal and formal discipline (e.g., BD III.5).

84. OVERTURE 1 NOT ADOPTED. The Assembly voted in the negative on the question, “Shall Overture 1 be adopted?”

85. OVERTURE 3 (Advisory Committee 9). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 regarding Overture 3 as follows:

RECOMMENDATION: That the committee sees no hindrance to the Assembly adopting Overture 3.

Ground: The second ministerial member mentioned in ground 2 has indeed subsequently moved into the area.

86. OVERTURE 3 REFERRED. On motion Overture 3 was amended by the addition of the words “from the Presbytery of the Midwest” between “northwest Iowa” and “to the Presbytery of the Dakotas.” On motion Overture 3 was referred to the Presbytery of the Midwest for its advice and with the request to report to the 61st General Assembly.

87. OVERTURE 4 (Advisory Committee 9). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 regarding Overture 4 as follows: Advisory Committee 9 considers this Overture incomplete in its present form.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That this Overture be returned to the presbytery.

   Ground: The overture lacks stated, clear, succinct grounds. “No amendments shall be proposed to the presbyteries without written grounds for the proposed amendments” (FG XXXII.2).

2. That the paper, “The Adopting Act and Subscription,” (printed in the Agenda) not be included in the Minutes.

   Ground: The Committee does not consider the article to be an essential part of the overture, but rather a reference document.

88. OVERTURE 4 RETURNED. Recommendations 1 and 2 of Advisory Committee 9 were adopted. On motion the attached paper, “Discussion of the Proposed Amendment,” (printed in the Agenda) was not to be included in the Minutes.

89. OVERTURE 5 (Advisory Committee 9). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 regarding Overture 5 as follows:

Advisory Committee 9 concurs with Overture 5 (see p. 83) and recommends that it be adopted with the following changes:
The 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church humbly petitions the President of the United States of America, as Commander in Chief of all the armed services, not to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military. We support this petition with the following:

1) Based on the Word of God . . .
2) For good order and discipline . . .
3) Your own Christian profession . . .
4) Your lifting the ban on homosexuality will effectively discriminate . . .

Therefore, for the honor of Christ and His Church, and the welfare of our nation, we exhort you . . .

Very respectfully submitted
The General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, June 1993

90. OVERTURE 5 AMENDMENT (see §199). On motion Overture 5, paragraph 4), first line was amended by changing “homosexuality” to “homosexuals in the military.” It was moved to amend the overture by deleting the portion of the first sentence following “America” and inserting in its place “to cease his support of homosexuals.” On motion consideration of Overture 5 and the proposed amendment were postponed until consideration of the Report of the Chaplains Commission.

91. OVERTURE 6 (Advisory Committee 9). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 regarding Overture 6 as follows: Advisory Committee 9 concurs with Overture 6 (see p. 84).

92. OVERTURE 6, PROPOSED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE AMENDMENTS.

On motion the Assembly determined to propose to the presbyteries the amendments to the Book of Discipline in Overture 6, parts 1 and 3. A motion to propose to the presbyteries the amendments to the Book of Discipline in Overture 6, parts 2 and 4 was defeated.

Parts 1 and 3 are as follows:

1. That in Chapter VII, Section 7 (page 202), the words “neither the appellant, nor any” be substituted for the word “no”, and the words “propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning” be substituted for the words “take any part in the decision of” so as to read: When the judgment of a lower judicatory is before an appellate judicatory, neither the appellant, nor any member of the judicatory from whose judgment appeal is taken shall propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning the case.

Ground: This procedure will regularize what has been the practice of the highest judicatory (the Assembly) so that it, or lower judicatories, will not become engrossed in repetitive debate over what “take any part in the decision of” means. It also specifies that the appellant is included in this prohibition (the appellant might not be a member of the judicatory from whose judgment appeal is taken). Note also the following quotation from J. Aspinwall Hodge’s What is Presbyterian Law as defined by The Church Courts?: Who may vote? All the members of the court, except that
"members of judicatories appealed from cannot be allowed to vote in the superior judicatory on any question connected with the appeal." So also in case of complaint. No Minister or Elder who was a member of the judicatory when the vote appealed from took place can vote on the appeal. Such was the decision of 1792. In 1836 the Assembly decided that an Elder of the lower court could not vote, even though he was not a member of that court when the case was tried. . . . The Moderator of the judicatory, if a member of the court appealed from, must retire from the chair while the appeal is being tried. Other members who may be personally interested in the result of the appeal may voluntarily retire or be challenged (p. 193).

3. That in Chapter IX, Section 4, last sentence (page 209), the words "propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning" be substituted for the words "take part in the decision of" so as to read: Neither the complainant nor any member of the judicatory whose alleged delinquency or error is complained of shall propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning the matter.

Ground: [same as 1. above, minus the second sentence, namely: It also specifies that the appellant is included in this prohibition (the appellant might not be a member of the judicatory from whose judgment appeal is taken).]

93. OVERTURE 7 (Advisory Committee 9) Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 as follows: Advisory Committee 9 concurs with Overture 7 (see p. 85).

94. OVERTURE 7 (Recommendation Actions). Recommendation 1 (Section 1) of Overture 7 was defeated. On motion Recommendation 2 (Section 2) of Overture 7, as amended by deleting the words "without debate" in the first sentence and by deleting the second sentence, was returned to the Presbytery of New York and New England without prejudice.

95. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 10:01 a.m., reconvened at 10:20 a.m, and sang Now Israel May Say, and That in Truth.

96. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Tweed, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, addressed the Assembly.

97. DOCKET AMENDMENT. On motion consideration of docket item "30. Consideration of proposed amendment to BD V.2.b" was postponed until after item "36. Report of the Committee to visit Park Hill Church" in the docket.

98. FRATERNAL DELEGATE INTRODUCTION. Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, introduced the Rev. Norman Shepherd, fraternal delegate of the Christian Reformed Church of North America. On motion Mr. Shepherd was seated as a corresponding member.

99. DIACONAL REPORT. Mr. Coppes, Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries, presented their report (see p. 229). The following recommendations were included:
RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the General Assembly request the congregations to give at least half of their contributions by the end of May.
2. That the General Assembly remind the presbyteries not to approve a call containing "free from worldly care" if they consider the call under consideration to be inadequate to provide for the minister's livelihood, and to make certain that the call includes a provision for the payment of hospitalization, surgical, and major medical insurance.
3. That the General Assembly approve a 1994 budget of $163,800 for the General Fund and $91,000 for the Aged and Infirm Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund, for a total budget of $254,800.
4. That for the year 1994 the General Assembly request the churches of the OPC to support the work of this Committee at the suggested per capita rate of $19.00 per communicant member for the General Fund and $7.00 for the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund.

100. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5. Mr. R. A. Barker reported the silence of Advisory Committee 5 concerning the recommendations of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries.

101. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 1 through 4 of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries were adopted.

102. DIACONAL ELECTIONS: The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Diaconal Ministries for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: Minister: King; Ruling Elder: Porter.

There being no further nominations, the Moderator declared Messrs. King and Porter elected to the Class of 1996. Mr. R. A. Barker led in prayer for the Committee on Diaconal Ministries.

103. DOCKET AMENDMENT. On motion consideration of Complaint 3 was postponed until after docket item "26. Report of the Committee on Pensions."

104. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Shepherd, fraternal delegate of the Christian Reformed Church of North America, addressed the Assembly.

105. DEVOTIONAL. The order of the day having arrived at 11:56 a.m., Mr. Bergquist led the devotional service. He read Hebrews 12:18-24 and delivered a message entitled, "Home Is Where Your Heart Is." The Assembly recessed at 12:15 p.m. after Mr. Bergquist led in prayer.

Monday Afternoon, June 14, 1993

106. RECONVENED. The Assembly reconvened at 1:17 p.m. with the singing of The Sands of Time Are Sinking. Mr. J. D. Smith led in prayer.
107. FRATERNAL DELEGATE INTRODUCTION. Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, introduced the Rev. Johnston, fraternal delegate of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. On motion Mr. Johnston was enrolled as a corresponding member.

108. STANDING RULE SUSPENDED. On motion Standing Rule Chapter V, Section 8 was suspended and the Report of the Committee on Pensions was ordered included in the minutes without being read to the Assembly.

109. PENSIONS REPORT. Mr. Hoogerhyde reported for the Committee on Pensions (see p. 238).

110. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5. Mr. R. A. Barker reported for Advisory Committee 5 as follows: The committee met with Mr. Garret A. Hoogerhyde, Chairman-Treasurer of the Committee on Pensions (COP). The committee commends to the General Assembly the work of the Committee on Pensions. The committee is otherwise silent as to the Report of the Committee on Pensions.

111. RECOMMENDATION ACTION (Pensions). The recommendation of the Pensions Committee was adopted as follows: that the 60th General Assembly request a contribution of $7.00 per communicant member from the churches in 1994 to partially offset the heavy drain on hospitalization funds that has been incurred over the past several years.

112. OVERTURE 7 FROM 59TH GA. On motion the recommendation of the Committee on Pensions was adopted that no action be taken in response to Overture 7 submitted to the 59th General Assembly by the Presbytery of New York and New England regarding a proposal allowing participants to elect the option to receive Pension benefits at age 59 1/2.

113. PENSIONS ELECTIONS. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Pensions for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: Minister: Galbraith; Ruling Elders: Hoogerhyde, Meeker. There being no further nominations, the Moderator declared the election of Messrs. Galbraith, Hoogerhyde, and Meeker to the Class of 1996. Mr. R. A. Barker led in prayer for the work of the Committee on Pensions.

114. COMPLAINT 3 (Appeals and Complaints). Mr. Kuschke reported for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints regarding Complaint 3.

115. COMPLAINT 3 (Advisory Committee 10A). Mr. Gidley reported for Advisory Committee 10A regarding Complaint 3 and Communications 11 and 14. The report is as follows:

Witnesses: Messrs. George C. Scipione, Curto, Douglas Jones, Laurie, and Duff
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly find Complaint 3 in order and properly before the Assembly.

2. That the General Assembly sustain the complaint, for the reason that, although the session of the Covenant Community Church of Orange County (CCOC) was not in violation of the two-year limit in BD III.2, they did fail to lodge charges in a timely manner; they did not act swiftly enough, given the seriousness and public nature of Mr. Arnold’s sin (Eccl. 8:11; Isa. 26:10; I Cor. 5:1,2,12,13). While the Assembly sustains the complaint, the Assembly commends the session for its active seeking after the repentance and restoration of Mr. Arnold.

3. That the General Assembly grant no amends.

   Ground: The session of the Covenant Community Church of Orange County has already acknowledged to the congregation and to Mr. Bahnsen its untimely delay in lodging charges against Mr. Arnold.

   Note: It is the opinion of Advisory Committee 10A that, although the session of the Covenant Community Church of Orange County was delinquent in unduly delaying the lodging of charges against Mr. Arnold, the session did not violate BD II.B.3.d.(2).

116. PRIVILEGE OF FLOOR. On motion the Rev. George C. Scipione, representative for Mr. David Bahnsen, was granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of Complaint 3.

117. COMPLAINT 3 IN ORDER AND NOT SUSTAINED. Recommendation 1 of Advisory Committee 10A was adopted.

   Recommendation 2 of Advisory Committee 10A was moved. At a later time and on amended motion, the Assembly denied the complaint for the reason that the session of the CCCOC was not in violation of the 2 year limit in BD III.2. The Assembly notes, however, the acknowledgment by the session of CCCOC that it did fail to bring charges in a timely manner. The Assembly judges that the session did not act swiftly enough, given the seriousness and public nature of Mr. Arnold’s sin (Ecc. 8:11; Isa. 26:10; I Cor. 5:1,2,12,13). The Assembly therefore urges the session of CCCOC to seek reconciliation with Mr. David Bahnsen. At their requests the following negative votes were recorded: Messrs. Campbell, Currie, Folta, LaBriola, Mallin, Shaw, Strange, Taylor, Van Meerbeke, Vroegindewey, Zetterholm.

118. PROTEST 1 (see §117). Mr. Knox entered a protest as follows: “the undersigned enters a protest concerning the previous action on the ground that it elevates the subordinate standards above the Word of God.”

119. FRATERNAL DELEGATE INTRODUCTION. Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, introduced the Rev. H. H. Gootjes, Th.D. and the Rev. P. G. Feenstra, fraternal delegates from the Canadian Reformed Churches. On motion Messrs. Gootjes and Feenstra were enrolled as corresponding members.
120. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 3:15 p.m., reconvened at 3:36 p.m., and sang *Come, O Come, Thou Quickening Spirit*.

121. FRATERNAL DELEGATE ADDRESS. Mr. Roe, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Church in the U.S., addressed the Assembly.

122. MINUTES. The Moderator called for the reading of the minutes of the sessions of Wednesday, June 9, through Saturday, June 12. The minutes were approved as corrected.

123. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:01 p.m., and Mr. Demana led in prayer.

**Monday Evening, June 14, 1993**

124. RECONVENED. The Assembly reconvened at 6:21 p.m. with the singing of *There Is a Green Hill Far Away*. Mr. Hunt led in prayer.

125. ECUMENICITY REPORT. Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, reported for the Committee (see p. 255).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The following recommendation is the Committee’s response to the directive of the 58th (1991) General Assembly that the Committee “either (sic) . . . report to the 59th General Assembly that it has agreed not to pursue efforts at J & R or present justification why it should continue to proceed with J & R.” The Committee had been unable to carry out that directive for report to the 59th (1992) Assembly because the letter of the 58th (1991) Assembly to the 19th (1991) Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America did not reach that Assembly and the Committee then had to defer its report until after the action of the 20th (1992) PCA Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly inform the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) as follows:

1. The General Assembly deeply regrets the decision of the 20th (1992) General Assembly declining to consider any method of uniting our two churches other than by a “joining and receiving” (J & R) method that precludes prior resolution of our concerns.

2. The General Assembly observes that hopes that were sincerely held out to us by the Ad Interim Committee and the Eighth (1980) General Assembly before the 1981 OPC General Assembly approved the three-way joining and receiving—that certain practices or conditions in the PCA that appeared to many in all three churches to be questionable would be at least alleviated—have not materialized, such as a moderation of involvement with parachurch organizations in foreign missions, and adoption of a much smaller, deliberative, General Assembly.
3. The PCA General Assembly's decision not to consider with us any avenue to union other than by its J & R method effectively cuts us off from further efforts toward union of our churches at the present time. Although the PCA Interchurch Relations Committee invited the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to present "Stipulations" (reservations) relating to union of the two churches, and responded to them, the PCA 20th GA ignored such matters and said simply that the only method of union had to be by its J & R method.

The General Assembly makes the following observations in hopes that the PCA may yet agree to consider with us the possibility of an avenue other than its J & R method:

a. This J & R method, as stated by the PCA General Assembly, to inform “the OPC that the best way that the PCA can understand the desire of the OPC for union is for the OPC to take their necessary constitutional steps requesting to be received into the PCA, and that the Interchurch Relations Committee continue to be available to the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process” restricts, if not eliminates, the possibility of “speaking the truth in love” (Ephesians 4:15). “Speaking the truth in love” is in a passage that deals with the unity of the church in truth and love. The simple applying for membership in the PCA eliminates the possibility of addressing the issues that divide us.

b. This J & R method ignores the need for reconciliation before union. In reconciliation the two parties must discuss that which needs to be reconciled so that reconciliation can take place. Without speaking the truth in love to one another, without mutual admonition with the resultant reconciliation, without substantial discussion on issues that divide, there comes no unity which must be the basis of union.

c. The 12-year history of following this method has proved to be divisive and less and less productive of attaining the goal of union.

4. That the following communication be sent to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of North America:

Our dear brothers,

We greet you in the high and precious name of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of his body the church.

We write to you as members of the body feeling with you the joys and infirmities of all those who seek to live in him, and to share our love and care for you. And we write because we are brothers who are joined to you in the ties of many years of mutual concerns and endeavors as well as by the ties of official fellowship.

In the interest of continuing those ties into the future we look back over the past year to share some thoughts with you as brother to brother. For one thing, we want to give thanks. We thank God that your 1992 Synod heeded the plea of your brothers in the churches of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council not to approve the ordination of women to the offices of teaching and ruling elder. This was of great concern to us, and we rejoice. Nevertheless our joy is tempered by
concern about the meaning of the further decision that women may “expound” in the Church, and we have apprehensions about how it may come to be practiced in days ahead.

We are thankful also for your decision to urge that churches that had previously begun practices that are contrary to your Church Order in those matters to bring them into agreement with your decisions. We are aware that since that decision was made some congregations have newly controverted that decision by electing and ordaining women to the office of ruling elder. We pray and hope, however, that the discipline of the Church will quickly restore order in this matter. Responsible members of the Christian Reformed Church have freely acknowledged that the exercise of biblical discipline has declined in the Christian Reformed Church. We have great sympathy for you in this for we ourselves know the difficulty of seeking to maintain it, and the ease with which all of us can follow the path of least resistance. Especially because we know this from experience we pray that God will strengthen your hand to your task not only in these matters but in all the life of your Church. In all candor, your handling of this matter may affect our relationship with you in the future.

We should speak to you also of a matter that has disturbed some in your Church: the attitude that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church should have toward persons or groups who have left or are considering leaving the Christian Reformed Church. In our dealing with such persons we should behave as circumspectly as we would expect you to act were our roles reversed. We believe that we should not solicit or initiate contact with such people to induce them to leave the CRC. But rather we believe that people who come to us for information about our church should be given that information. We further believe that neither in giving such information nor in receiving such people into the Orthodox Presbyterian Church should we be charged with causing or fostering the sin of schism (those who leave a church are not necessarily those who are schismatic).

Further, we wish to clarify our attitude toward the Alliance of Reformed Churches. First, we wish you to know that up to this point we, in deference to the CRC and in order not to encourage schism, have not sent any representatives to any meetings relative to that body. The Assembly wishes you to know also that it does not approve the ARC decision: “It has now become evident that withdrawal from the CRC should occur.” Furthermore, our church does not regard as schismatic all those who have left the CRC or are contemplating doing so, and being mindful of the dangers that this disruption in the lives of Christ’s sheep may cause, reserves the right to seek to minister to them. The Assembly therefore believes it proper that representatives may participate in some aspects of the work of the ARC.

We should be remiss if we were to close this letter without expressing to you our empathy in the turmoil that your Church is now experiencing. We also empathize with the many of your members, and those who have left you, whose hearts are burdened over these troubles. We encourage you to help them, and us, with renewed faithfulness in interpreting, preaching, and practicing God’s Word and to uphold that mark of the true church, a faithful and just exercise of discipline.

May God’s Spirit be with you.
Sincerely yours in Christ’s service.
3. That the committee be authorized to appoint two official observers to be sent to the next meeting of the Alliance of Reformed Churches.

   Grounds:
   (1) The members of the Alliance are our brothers and sisters in Christ.
   (2) The churches that make up the Alliance are seeking greater unity on a Reformed basis.
   (3) There is great respect for the OPC among these churches.
   (4) These churches are struggling to find a new form of organizational unity and need the help that we can give them.

4. That the General Assembly express to the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) its disappointment with the action at its meeting October 29, 1992, by which it postponed reception of the Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS) into membership of NAPARC, and express the hope that NAPARC will receive them without further delay, at its next meeting, November 10, 1993.

   Ground: The Reformed Church in the United States fulfills, in both its statement of faith and its endeavor to practice that faith diligently and faithfully, the requirements of NAPARC for membership in the body.

5. That Overture 1 to the 59th General Assembly, from the Presbytery of the Midwest (to expand the boundaries of the presbytery into a part of Ontario, Canada), in the absence of any information as to why the overture was referred to this Committee, be adopted.

6. That the General Assembly grant the budget request of NAPARC for $180. as the assessment of the OPC for the year.

7. That the General Assembly authorize that $500 from its general funds be sent to NAPARC for the planned 350th anniversary celebration of the Westminster Assembly.

126. MINORITY REPORT OF ECUMENICITY. Mr. Williamson reported for the Minority of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations as follows:

   The undersigned agrees with the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to the effect that the 60th General Assembly should not sever fraternal relations with the Christian Reformed Church at the present time.

   RECOMMENDATIONS:
   1. That if the Christian Reformed Church fails to initiate disciplinary proceedings against those who have ordained women as ruling elders by the time of our 61st (1994) General Assembly, consideration of termination of the fraternal relationship with the CRC be placed on its docket;

   2. That the CRC be informed of this action.
Grounds:

(1) According to widely published reports the following churches have women elders, and some have had women elders for several years.

   Detroit, Mich. - First CRC
   Fort Collins, Colo. - Immanuel
   Grand Rapids, Mich.
      Church of the Servant
      Eastern Avenue
      Grace
   Madison Square
   Kalamazoo, Mich. - Immanuel
   Oak Forest, Ill. - Hope
   Toronto, Ont., Canada - First
   Washington, D.C.

(2) The ordination of women to ruling and teaching office is clearly forbidden in Scripture. (I Timothy 2:11,12 “Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence.”)

(3) It is also contrary to the clear teaching of the Belgic Confession. (Art. XXX: “everything will be carried on in the Church with good order and decency, when faithful men are chosen according to the rule prescribed by St. Paul in his Epistle to Timothy.”)

(4) The undersigned is deeply concerned about what he sees as a pervasive and increasing lack of faithfulness to the Scriptures on the part of the Christian Reformed Church. Prominent among my concerns is the number of CR churches which have ignored or are in the process of ignoring Synod’s recent decision (1992) not to open the ruling and teaching office to women. While the 1992 decision is ambiguous at best it is still clear that the ordination of women to the office of elder has not been approved. It will be extremely significant, therefore, to note the way in which the 1993 Synod of the Christian Reformed Church deals with this matter. If there is not decisive discipline in these cases, such failure would constitute clear evidence that we should consider severing fraternal relationship.

   (Signer: G. I. Williamson)

127. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 6 (Ecumenicity). Mr. Mahaffy reported for Advisory Committee 6 as follows:

Re: Overture 2, Communications 1, 2, 3, 15, 17, 18, 20

The Committee met with Messrs. R. A. Barker, Duff, Felch, Gaffin, Galbraith, Hilbelink, Jerrell, Knox, Peterson, Roe, Shepherd, Tyson, and Williamson.

Procedural Recommendation: that Communication 2 be referred to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly adopt Recommendation 1, amended as follows:

   a. 4.b (see §125) be deleted on the following grounds:
(1) It is redundant with respect to the last sentence of 4.a., and
(2) The use of the word "reconciliation" has the potential of being misunderstood.

b. A new 5. be added as follows: "5. Be assured that we reaffirm our desire for the day when we may be one in witness to the grace of our Sovereign Head."

2. That the General Assembly with regards to Recommendation 2:
   a. Adopt Recommendation 2, amended as follows:
      That paragraph 6, following the quotation of the Alliance of Reformed Churches, read: "However, our church does not regard as necessarily schismatic all those who have left the CRC or are contemplating doing so, and being mindful of the dangers that this disruption in the lives of Christ's sheep may cause, reserves the right to seek to minister to those who come to us."

b. Should the Assembly adopt Recommendation 2 as amended, that this action be deemed the Assembly's answer to Overture 2, and Communications 12 and 15.

3. That since the Committee does not concur with this recommendation, it urges its defeat for the following reasons:
   a. The Alliance of Reformed Churches contains churches and individuals which are members of the CRC, and to send observers is inconsistent with our present ecclesiastical relationship with the CRC.
   b. Even though sending observers might be, in itself, neutral, it may well not be perceived that way either by the CRC or by the Alliance of Reformed Churches (which has already misrepresented in its Minutes the presence of an Orthodox Presbyterian minister at a previous gathering).
   c. The Alliance of Reformed Churches has declared, "It has now become evident that withdrawal from the CRC should occur." To send observers to such a group is inconsistent with our present ecclesiastical relationship with the CRC.

Re. Recommendation 4 - (silent)
Re. Recommendation 5 - (silent)
Re. Recommendation 6 - (silent)
Re. Recommendation 7 - (silent)

Further, the Committee calls the attention of the Assembly to the following action of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations:

A Tribute Of Thanks

The Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, meeting in Horsham, Pennsylvania, this 4th day of February 1993, pay tribute to and give thanks to God for the service of you, John P. Galbraith. You have served the Committee since 1971, as Chairman since 1980. You have led the Orthodox Presbyterian Church into a worldwide ecumenical vision. You have taught us by word and example how to work with the people of God in his church. You have
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And now you have retired as Chairman of the Committee. On this occasion we pause to thank our Lord, and you, for using your gifts in the service of the Lord and his church. Although you have retired as chairman, we look forward to your continuing service on the Committee.

128. COMMUNICATION 2 REFERRED. The following procedural recommendation of Advisory Committee 6 was adopted as follows: that Communication 2 be referred to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations.

129. RECOMMENDATION 1 (Ecumenicity). Recommendation 1 of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations was adopted in the following amended form:

RECOMMENDATION:
That the General Assembly inform the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) as follows:

1. The General Assembly deeply regrets the decision of the 20th (1992) General Assembly declining to consider any method of uniting our two churches other than by a "joining and receiving" (J & R) method that precludes prior resolution of our concerns.

2. The General Assembly observes that hopes that were sincerely held out to us by the Ad Interim Committee and the Eighth (1980) General Assembly before the 1981 Orthodox Presbyterian Church General Assembly approved the three-way joining and receiving—that certain practices or conditions in the PCA that appeared to many in all three churches to be questionable would be at least alleviated—have not materialized, such as a moderation of involvement with parachurch organizations in foreign missions, and adoption of a much smaller, deliberative, General Assembly.

3. The PCA General Assembly's decision not to consider with us any avenue to union other than by its J & R method effectively cuts us off from further efforts toward union of our churches at the present time. Although the PCA Interchurch Relations Committee invited the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to present "Stipulations" (reservations) relating to union of the two churches, and responded to them, the PCA 20th General Assembly ignored such matters and said simply that the only method of union had to be by its J & R method.

4. The General Assembly makes the following observations in hopes that the PCA may yet agree to consider with us the possibility of an avenue other than its J & R method:

a. This J & R method, as stated by the PCA General Assembly, to inform "the Orthodox Presbyterian Church that the best way that the PCA can understand the desire of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church for union is for the Orthodox
Presbyterian Church to take their necessary constitutional steps requesting to be received into the PCA, and that the Interchurch Relations Committee continue to be available to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process” restricts, if not eliminates, the possibility of “speaking the truth in love” (Ephesians 4:15). “Speaking the truth in love” is in a passage that deals with the unity of the church in truth and love. The simple applying for membership in the PCA eliminates the possibility of addressing the issues that divide us.

b. The 12-year history of following this method has proved to be divisive and less and less productive of attaining the goal of union.

5. Be assured that we reaffirm our desire for the day when we may be one witness to the grace of our Sovereign Head.

130. RECOMMENDATION 2 (Ecumenicity): Recommendation 2 of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations was moved.

131. DOCKET AMENDED. On motion Complaints 1 and 2 were made the order of the day, Tuesday morning, immediately following the Report of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records and the Report of the Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records.

132. ORDER OF DAY. On motion the order of the day was extended in order to complete the Report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations or until 9:30 p.m., whichever comes first.

133. POSTPONED RECOMMENDATION 2 (Ecumenicity, see §171). On motion it was determined to postpone consideration of Recommendation 2 of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations along with the amendment as proposed by Advisory Committee 6 until after consideration of Recommendation 3 of that Committee.

134. RECOMMENDATION 3 (Ecumenicity, see §168): Recommendation 3 of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations was moved.

135. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 9:30 p.m. and Mr. Yankura led in prayer.

Tuesday Morning, June 15, 1993

136. RECONVENED. The Assembly reconvened at 8:00 a.m. with the singing of Come, My Soul, Thou Must Be Waking. Mr. Conard led in prayer.

137. PRESBYTERIAL RECORDS (New Jersey). Mr. Keller reported for the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records as follows:
Re: Presbytery of New Jersey Rationale
Re: Overture 8

The Presbytery of New Jersey must be commended for its courage and boldness in declaring Senate No 3758 to be wicked and ungodly legislation. As an assembly we need to record our unity in declaring allegiance to the seventh commandment in all of its Scriptural implications.

Since this lawsuit has already been entered, we do not want to weaken the case of the Presbytery of New Jersey, even a little, by failing to approve their minutes at this point in time. To find an exception in the case of this lawsuit, at this point, would open the door for more harm than good.

Our confessional standards admit to the propriety of addressing the civil authorities—as a court of Jesus Christ—“by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary” (Westminster Confession of Faith XXXI.IV). Therefore this Committee anticipated a rationale that would demonstrate that this lawsuit is a humble petition, and that this case is indeed extraordinary.

The “Rationale” sometimes resorts to unfortunate rhetoric rather than calm, clear reasoning.

The “Rationale” does show that the Presbytery of New Jersey was convinced that entering court as plaintiff may be construed as “humble petition.” It fell short of proving this to every member of the Committee, however. We anticipate its failure to satisfy many of the commissioners.

The “Rationale” also shows that the Presbytery of New Jersey was convinced of the extraordinary nature of this case. Again it fell short of proving this point to every member of the committee, and, we suppose it fails to convince many commissioners of the assembly as well.

Therefore, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the 60th General Assembly take no action with respect to the “Rationale” offered by the Presbytery of New Jersey.
2. That the 60th General Assembly find no exception to the minutes of the Presbytery of New Jersey concerning its lawsuit against the state of New Jersey.
3. That the 60th General Assembly declares its full agreement with the Presbytery of New Jersey in its characterization of Senate 3758 as ungodly and contrary to Scripture.

138. RECOMMENDATION ACTION. Recommendation 1 of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records was adopted.

Recommendation 2 was adopted. The following requested that their negative votes be recorded: Campbell, Copeland, Dennison, Duff, Foh, Knox, Hilbelink, Jerrell, Kuschke, Laurie, Meeker, S. F. Miller, Peterson, Shaw, Van Meerbeke, Zetterholm (see §185).

On motion the previous question to close debate was carried during consideration of recommendation 2 (see §185).

Recommendation 3 of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records was postponed indefinitely.
139. PRESBYTERIAL RECORDS. Mr. Keller reported further for the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Concerning the Minutes of the Presbytery of the Dakotas that their response to the exceptions taken to their Minutes by the 59th General Assembly be deemed sufficient, and that their Minutes be approved with the notations listed by the Committee and the following exception: There is no record of prayer being offered at the opening of presbytery on page 92-6 (rule 10).

2. Concerning the Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic that their response to the exception to their Minutes taken by the 59th General Assembly be deemed sufficient, and that their Minutes be approved with the single notation listed by the Committee and with the following exception: Selection of the Clerk pro tem is not indicated in the Minutes on page 230 (rule 6).

3. Concerning the Presbytery of the Midwest that their Minutes be approved with the notations listed by the Committee and the following exceptions:
   a. There is no indication of the church represented by elder Voskuil on page 14-3 (rule 7b).
   b. The identity of the Moderator is not apparent on page 15-1 & 3 (rule 5).
   c. It is not clear what kind of exam is being given on page 20-19 (rule 12a).
   d. The minutes are not signed at page 31-11 (rule 18).

4. Concerning the Minutes of the Presbytery of New Jersey that their response to the exception to their Minutes taken by the 59th General Assembly be deemed sufficient, and that their Minutes be approved without exception and without notation.

5. Concerning the Presbytery of New York and New England that their Minutes be approved without exception and without notation.

6. Concerning the Minutes of the Presbytery of Northern California that their Minutes be approved without exception and without notation.

7. Concerning the Presbytery of the Northwest that their Minutes be approved with the notations listed by the Committee and without exception.

8. Concerning the Presbytery of Ohio the Committee recommends:
   a. That their response to the exceptions to their Minutes taken by the 59th General Assembly be deemed sufficient.
   b. That due to unclear and insufficient information in the Minutes of the Presbytery of Ohio with regard to disciplinary actions taken by the presbytery toward Mr. David Kiester, the Moderator of the 60th GA appoint a Special Committee of Two to review said actions with a view to the spiritual restoration of and reconciliation with Mr. Kiester and report to the 61st General Assembly.
   c. That approval of the Minutes of the Presbytery of Ohio be deferred until after the report of the Special Committee to the 61st General Assembly.

9. Concerning the Presbytery of Philadelphia that their Minutes be approved without notation and with the following exception: Minutes were not presented to the Assembly until Saturday (rule 19).
10. Concerning the Presbytery of the South that their Minutes be approved with the notations listed by the Committee and with the following exceptions:
   a. No terms are given for the call, nor is there any indication of health coverage on page 194, paragraph 18-23.
   b. No terms are given for the call, nor is there any indication of health coverage on page 196, paragraph 48 (rule 12b and c).

11. Concerning the Minutes of the Presbytery of Southern California that their Minutes be approved with the notations listed by the Committee and the following exceptions:
   a. There is no record of opening prayer for the meeting of 10-6-92 on page 147 (rule 10).
   b. There is no record of opening prayer for the meeting of 2-5&6-93 on page 157 (rule 10).

12. Concerning the Presbytery of the Southwest that their response to the exception to their Minutes taken by the 59th General Assembly be deemed sufficient, and that their Minutes be approved with the notations listed by the Committee and with the following exception: The Minutes are not signed on pages 17, 34, 54 and 81 (rule 18).

140. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.a, 9, 10, 11, and 12 were adopted. Recommendation 8.b. was moved. It was amended by inserting the words “be requested to” after “Moderator of the 60th General Assembly” and before “appoint a Special Committee.” It was moved to amend 8.b. by inserting the word “ultimate” after the words “a view to the” and before the words “spiritual restoration.” On motion Recommendation 8. b. and c. and the proposed amendments were recommitted to the Committee on Presbyterial Records (see §211).

141. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 9:59 a.m., and reconvened at 10:21 a.m. with the singing of My Song Is Love Unknown.

142. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Johnston, fraternal delegate of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian church, addressed the Assembly.

143. STANDING COMMITTEE RECORDS. Mr. Hall reported for the Committee on Standing Committee Records as follows:

The Committee on Standing Committee Records reviewed the minute books of the 10 Standing Committees and makes the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the Minutes of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints be approved with the notations listed and with the following exceptions:
   b. Pages 17-18 - Minutes of January 14, 1992, are missing (violation Rule #1).
c. Page 24, Art. #7 - The date of the next meeting was set for June 1, 1993, but the next meeting was held on June 2, 1993, without explanation in the Minutes (violation Rule #4).

2. That the Minutes of the Committee on Christian Education be approved without exception and without notation.

3. That the Minutes of the Committee on Coordination be approved without exception and without notation.

4. That the Minutes of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries be approved without exception and without notation.

5. That the Minutes of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations be approved with the notations listed and with the following exception:
   Page 194, art. #22 - Failed to record the name of the person who lead in prayer at the reconvening on the morning of Wednesday, March 11, 1992 (violation Rule #10).

6. That the Minutes of the Committee on Foreign Missions be approved with the single notation listed and without exception.

7. That the Minutes of the Committee on General Assembly Date, Place and Travel be approved without exception and without notation.

8. That the Minutes of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension be approved with the notations listed and without exception.

9. That the Minutes of the Committee on Pensions be approved with the notations listed and without exception.

10. That the Minutes of the Trustees of the General Assembly be approved with the notations listed and without exception, and that the disposition of the exception to their Minutes taken by the 58th General Assembly be deemed sufficient.

This committee has made the observation that some of the errors might have been caught earlier if the approved Minutes in the official book had been proof read before presentation to the Assembly by someone other than the Secretary or Clerk who inscribed them.

Please notice that, unless you had an up to date version of the Rules for Keeping Standing Committee Records in your Minute Book, this committee has supplied you with such. Please attach it properly in your book.

We thank those committees who thoughtfully supplied us with an extra copy of their Minutes thus expediting the speed of our work.

144. RECOMMENDATION ACTION. On motion the Recommendations of the Committee on Standing Committee Records as a whole were adopted.

145. COMPLAINT 1 (Appeals and Complaints). The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Tyson reported for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints regarding Complaint 1 (see p. 110).

146. COMPLAINT 1 (Advisory Committee 10B). Mr. Tanzie reported for Advisory Committee 10B regarding Complaint 1 as follows:

   Committee 10B met with Commissioners Williamson, LaBriola, VandenBurg,
Coppes, Male, Taylor, Ayres, and Messrs. J. K. Unangst, G. R. Nightengale. Advisory Committee 10B concurs with the recommendation of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints relative to Complaint #1.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly find the Complaint of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton against the decision of the Presbytery of the Dakotas to be in order and properly before the Assembly.

2. That the General Assembly sustain Complaint #1, brought by the session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, against the decision of the Presbytery of the Dakotas in the matter of the formation of the Committee of Six.

   **Ground:** FG XIII.7,9 states “The session . . . shall receive, dismiss and exercise discipline over the members of the church and “the names of members shall be placed upon or removed from the rolls of the church only by order of the session, and according to the provisions of the Book of Discipline.”

3. That the General Assembly grant the following amend: that the General Assembly direct the Presbytery of the Dakotas to dissolve the Committee of Six and to affirm the right of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, to designate Park Hill Church a mission work of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, and to affirm the right of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, to admit individuals from Park Hill Church to membership in Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, following due process as set forth in the Form of Government.

4. That if the Assembly does not sustain Complaint #1, then Advisory Committee 10B recommends that the Assembly respectfully request the Presbytery of the Dakotas to dissolve the Committee of Six and to affirm the right of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, to designate Park Hill Church a mission work of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, and to affirm the right of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, to admit individuals from Park Hill Church to membership in Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, following due process as set forth in the Form of Government.

   **Ground:** The Committee of Six was erected on September 24, 1992. On March 24, 1993, in response to the Complaint, Presbytery declared that Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, is neither obligated to use the Committee of Six, nor is Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, obligated to heed the Committee’s advice. Now, in as much as the very existence of this Committee is a source of contention for Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, it would be a significant act of reconciliation for the presbytery to dissolve this Committee.

147. COMPLAINT 1 (Minority of Advisory Committee 10B). Mr. Campbell reported for the Minority of Advisory Committee 10B as follows:

   **RECOMMENDATION:**

   The minority of the Advisory Committee recommends that the General Assembly deny Complaint #1 brought by the session of Immanuel, Thornton against
the decision of the Presbytery of the Dakotas (POD hereafter) in the matter of the formation of the Committee of Six.

Grounds:

(1) POD's action in erecting a Committee to examine prospective members does not violate FG XIII.7.9, as examination of prospective members is not the exclusive prerogative of sessions in all circumstances. FG XXIX.A.2 and XXIX.B.2.b indicate that there are circumstances in which presbyteries may erect committees to examine prospective members.

The minutes of the POD, September 24, 1992, do not specify the specific circumstances in which the erected committee was to exercise its mandate. This omission and lack of adequate specification allowed for various assumptions as to the specific purpose and circumstance of the work of this committee. It was only the assumption of the complainants (the session Immanuel, Thornton) that this committee was erected to deprive them of sessional rights. This lack of clarification as to purpose and circumstance of the committee was corrected as indicated in the minutes of the POD, March 2-4, 1993, p. 93-12, item 84, where the following explanatory definition was adopted: “because that while there is a moral obligation for the Thornton session to work with the Committee of Six, this mandate (92-50-89) neither requires the Thornton session to send applicants through the committee nor requires them to heed the advice of that committee.”

This definition specifying the limits of the committee’s purpose and circumstance is confirmed by the minutes of the POD, March 2-4, 1993, pp. 93-12, 93-13, items 86-89 which indicate the rejection by the POD of attempts to define the purpose and circumstance in a way which would have resulted in the violation of the rights of the sessions of Immanuel, Thornton and the other churches in the Denver area as set forth in FG XIII.7, 9.

(2) POD’s action in erecting the Committee of Six does not violate FG XIII.10. With respect to the session of Immanuel, Thornton, the Committee could only exercise itself at the invitation of the session. The committee was not and never was intended to be an augmentation of the session.

(3) POD’s action in erecting the Committee of Six does not violate FG XXIX.A.1. The mandate of the committee with its defined purpose and circumstance does not prohibit the session of Immanuel, Thornton from designating the Park Hill congregation a mission work. (It is recognized that the POD in a separate action unrelated to the erection of the Committee of Six did request the session of Immanuel to withdraw its designation of Park Hill congregation as a mission work.)

148. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR. On motion the Rev. Jack K. Unangst and Mr. Gregorio R. Nightengale were granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of Complaints 1 and 2.

149. COMPLAINT 1 IN ORDER. On motion the General Assembly found Complaint 1 to be in order and properly before the Assembly.

150. COMPLAINT 1 SUSTAINED. Complaint 1, brought by the Session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, against the decision of the Presbytery of the Dakotas in the matter of the formation of the Committee of Six
was sustained. The following requested that their negative votes be recorded: Campbell, DeVelde, Hunt, Knox, Shishko, Wilson, Vroegindewey, Yankura, Zetterholm. Mr. Williamson informed the Assembly that he intended to file a protest.

151. RECOMMENDATION ACTION. Recommendation 3 of Advisory Committee 10B was adopted.

152. DEVOTIONAL. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. DeVelde led the devotional service. The Assembly sang *The Heavens Declare Thy Glory, Lord.* He led in prayer, read Psalm 19:1-6, and delivered a message entitled "Declaring the Glory of God." He led in prayer and the Assembly was recessed at 12:15 p.m.

Tuesday Afternoon, June 15, 1993

153. RECONVENED. The Assembly reconvened at 1:16 p.m. with the singing of *I Sing the Almighty Power of God.* Mr. Peacock led in prayer.

154. FRATERNAL DELEGATE. Mr. Feenstra, a fraternal delegate from the Canadian Reformed Churches, addressed the Assembly.

155. COMPLAINT 2 (Appeals and Complaints). Mr. Tyson reported for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints regarding Complaint 2 (see p. 113).

156. COMPLAINT 2 (Advisory Committee 10B). Mr. Tanzie reported for Advisory Committee 10B regarding Complaint 2 as follows:

Committee 10B met with Commissioners Williamson, LaBriola, VandenBurg, Coppes, Male, Taylor, Ayres, and Messrs. J. K. Unangst, G. R. Nightengale. Advisory Committee 10B concurs with the recommendation of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints relative to Complaint #2.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the General Assembly find the Complaint of Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Denver, brought on appeal by Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, in order and properly before the Assembly.
2. That the General Assembly sustain the Complaint of Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Denver, as brought on appeal by Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, pertaining to charges against three former elders of Park Hill Church.

Grounds:
(1) While a case might be made that the charges were filed one day beyond the two year deadline, (Book of Discipline, III.2) we believe this is too slim a technicality to justify ruling out of order a serious charge. Further, it isn't clear to all that the charge was filed one day late and not on the last available date.
There are questions of clarity which bear upon Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton’s statement that they could not “detect even a trace of an accusation of sin committed by the accused on December 16, 1990” (see page 117):

a. Should the charge be “schism” or “aiding and abetting the schism of others”?

b. Does specification four support the charge?

c. What specifically did the elder(s) do on 16 December 1990 that would, if proven, constitute the performance of the offense charged?

3. That the General Assembly grant the amends sought by Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Denver, namely the reinstatement of charges (middle of page 115) subject to the clarification of the same.

157. COMPLAINT 2 IN ORDER. On motion the General Assembly found Complaint 2 to be in order and properly before the Assembly.

158. COMPLAINT 2 SUSTAINED. The Assembly sustained the Complaint (Complaint 2) of Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Denver, as brought on appeal by Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, pertaining to charges against three former elders of Park Hill Church.

159. RECOMMENDATION ACTION. Recommendation 3 of Advisory Committee 10B was adopted in the following form: that the General Assembly grant the amends sought by Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Denver, namely the reinstatement of charges brought by Messrs. Van Zweden, Bridgeman, and Lewis.

160. FRATERNAL DELEGATE INTRODUCTION. Mr. Galbraith, Chairman of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, introduced Mr. Grauley, fraternal delegate of the Presbyterian Church in America. On motion Mr. Grauley was seated and enrolled as a corresponding member.

161. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 3:16 p.m., reconvened at 3:35 p.m. with the singing of Great Is Thy Faithfulness.

162. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Grauley, fraternal delegate of the Presbyterian Church in America, addressed the Assembly.

163. DATE, PLACE, AND TRAVEL. Mr. Watson reported further for the Committee on Date, Place, and Travel. On motion Standing Rule 12 was suspended and Messrs. Lee, Haehl, and Peacock were excused from the morning sessions of Wednesday, June 16, in order to make their scheduled flights by taking the van leaving at 8:00 a.m. and that this be without loss of travel compensation.

164. ENROLLMENT. Mr. Mark Bube was enrolled in the Assembly at this time. On motion Standing Rule 12 was suspended so that Mr. Bube might be reimbursed for his travel expenses.
165. **DATE, PLACE, AND TRAVEL ELECTIONS.** The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Date, Place and Travel to the Class of 1996. Mr. Porter was nominated.

There being no further nominations, the Moderator declared Mr. Porter elected to the Class of 1996.

166. **PROTEST 2 (see §76).** The following protest was entered:

The undersigned respectfully protest the action of the Assembly in finding the complaint of Mr. and Mrs. Manring out of order and not properly before the Assembly. In spending much time dealing with the technicality of whether the complaint was properly before the Assembly, and in granting twenty-five minutes to address the Assembly to only one of the parties in what was later judged to be no complaint, the Assembly denied itself the opportunity to hear arguments on the substance of the issue which may have afforded the opportunity to adjudicate the matter and bring peace, encouragement and comfort to a local congregation of Christ’s church.

The complainants raise an important issue: Is special music commanded by the Word of God? They deserve a clear answer from Scripture. This will briefly be attempted.

The worship of God is of paramount importance. Worship is to be offered only as He Himself has commanded in His Word. This is the regulative principle of worship, which is an application of the second commandment defined by our Standards as follows:

- The second commandment requireth the receiving, observing, and keeping pure and entire, all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath appointed in his word (SC 50).
- The second commandment forbiddeth the worshipping of God by images, or any other way not appointed in his word (SC 51).
- The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture (WCF 21.1).

The Confession of Faith lists the proper elements of worship: prayer, the reading of the Scriptures, the preaching of the Word, the singing of psalms, the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ; also religious oaths, vows, solemn fastings and thanksgivings upon special occasions (21:4-5). To these the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Directory for Worship properly adds “the bringing of offerings into God’s house” (III.7, cf. I Cor. 16:1-2). No elements beyond those prescribed in Holy Scripture may be added, and no parts of “the ordinary religious worship of God” may be omitted (WCF21:5). The regulative principle requires a positive scriptural command, either by explicit directive or approved example, for every element used in worship.

**Biblical Justification For Special Music**

That singing praise to God is an element of worship is beyond dispute. It is
found in every age of the church. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church Directory for
Worship specifies two types of singing: congregational singing and special music.
With regard to congregational singing the Directory specifies: “Let every member
of the church take part in this act of worship.” With regard to special music it says,
“No person shall take a special part in the musical service unless he is a professing
Christian and adorns his profession with a godly walk” (III:6).

The Bible supplies an approved example of special music in worship which
functions as a positive command. It is recorded in II Chronicles 29:28, “And all the
congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded: and
all this continued until the burnt offering was finished.” The use in the Hebrew of
three parallel symmetrical participial phrases, each introduced by the word “and,”
implies that the worship by the congregation and the special vocal and instrumental
music all happened simultaneously. The NIV brings this out in paraphrase: “The
whole assembly bowed in worship, while the singers sang and the trumpeters
played.” It is particularly noteworthy that the entire congregation did not sing but
only the singers. If singing by a part of the congregation was a legitimate part of
public worship under the Old Covenant, and is never forbidden by later revelation,
then it remains a legitimate part of public worship. (This is the historic understand-
ing of covenant theology and the hermeneutic underlying our confessional stan-
dards; in opposition to this, dispensationalists assert that men are not obligated to
observe commandments that are not repeated in the N.T.)

As noted above, no elements of worship beyond those prescribed in Holy
Scripture may be added, and no parts of the ordinary religious worship of God may
be omitted. However, there is a degree of liberty regarding the particular manner
of performing the elements of worship. For example, the reading of the Scriptures
is an element of worship, but it is evident that there is some variety in the manner
in which Scripture is read: by the entire congregation (Neh. 9:1-3, Acts 4:24-26), by
responsive reading (Deut. 27:14-26, Ps. 118:1-4, Acts 4:24-26), by a single
speaker (Josh. 8:34; Neh. 8:2-3, Lk. 4:16-20). As an element of worship the reading
of Scripture may not be omitted, but no worship service must of necessity include
every manner of reading.

Prayer is an element of worship. It may be offered by the whole congregation
(Acts 4:24), by a number of individuals (Acts 1:14) or a single individual (II Chron.
6:4). As an element of worship prayer may not be omitted, but no worship service
must of necessity include every manner of praying.

Likewise, singing is an element of worship. It may be performed by the whole
congregation (Ps. 34:3, 67:3), by a part of the congregation (II Chron. 29:28), by a duet
(Jdg. 5:1) or by a soloist (Deut. 31:30; Ps. 35:18, 111:1). As an element of worship
singing may not be omitted, but no worship service must of necessity include every
manner of singing.

It has been argued that the singing of the Levites in II Chronicles 29:28 does not
constitute an approved example of special music since their musical performance
was an integral part of the ceremonial law. It can be demonstrated that this is not
the case. Our Standards hold the position that the ceremonial law was fulfilled in
Christ and is no longer binding upon the church today. The Confession of Faith
states,
God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ; His graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated, under the new testament (19:3).

The purpose of the ceremonial law has been summarized as follows:

The Levitical ordinances were patterned after a heavenly model (Heb. 8:4-5; 9:23) and thereby typologically foreshadowed the Messiah and His atoning work (Heb. 10:1). These ceremonial laws are organically connected with Christ and His work in salvation history. The truth depicted in these ritual commands is embodied in Christ and is valid yet today. Only the pre-incarnation use of these ceremonial procedures is removed for the Christian in the New Covenant—because they were observed once for all by and in the person and work of Christ [Greg L. Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1984), p. 49].

Basically, the Old Testament ceremonial law dealt with the priesthood, ceremonial atonements, sacrifice, circumcision, ritual feasts, and ritual places (ibid., p. 211).

The mere proximity of the Levites' singing with ceremonial worship does not establish that it is an integral part of the ceremonial law. In fact, there are compelling reasons that refute this:

1. **The time factor.** Some 500 years elapsed between the giving of the law through the prophet Moses at the constitution of Israel as a nation and the time of King David.

2. **The change of personalities.** The law was given by Moses the lawgiver (Jn. 1:17); David was the sweet psalmist of Israel (II Sam. 23:1). The Mosaic legislation is fundamental; the later prophets did not add new legislation but prosecuted the people for failing to adhere to the laws already revealed. David did not add to the ceremonial law; rather, because of changed circumstances arising from the establishment of a permanent place of worship and the consequent elimination of the need for the Levites to carry the tabernacle and its furnishings from place to place any longer (I Chron. 23:26), David with God's guidance reassigned the Levites' duties (I Chron. 28:19, II Chron. 8:14, 29:25). A further reassignment of the Levites was carried out later under King Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 19:11, 20:21).

3. **The literary difference.** The reassignment of the Levites is recorded in the Chronicles (I Chron. 6:31, 15:1-24; II Chron. 8:14, 19:11, 20:21), the very last book of the Hebrew Old Testament, belonging to the third division known as the writings (cf. Lk. 24:44). This section, comprising the Psalms, Job, Ruth, Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra/Nehemiah and the Chronicles, is historical/poetical in nature and does not carry the same weight or force of law to the Hebrew mind as the Torah, the legislation given by Moses, which is regarded as primary. The later prophets did not add new legal requirements but made further application of the Mosaic law. The placement of these narratives not in the Torah but in the writings argues against regarding the singing by the Levites as an integral part of the ceremonial law.
4. **Biblical confirmation.** The distinction between the ceremonial legislation enacted by Moses and the levitical duties ordered by David is explicitly stated in II Chronicles 23:18: "Also Jehoiada appointed the offices of the house of the LORD by the hand of the priests the Levites, whom David had distributed in the house of the LORD, to offer the burnt offerings of the LORD, as it is written in the law of Moses, with rejoicing and with singing, as it was ordained by David" (Hebrew: "... by the hands of David"). A distinction is made between the written law of Moses and the administrative activity of David.

5. **Theological problems.** A number of important theological questions are left unanswered by the complainants' position; for instance: (1) In what way is the singing of the Levites (the act of singing not the content of their song) organically connected with Christ and His work in salvation history? (2) How is the singing of the Levites fulfilled by Christ? (3) How did the singing of the Levites typologically foreshadow the Messiah and His atoning work? (4) How is the truth depicted in the singing of the Levites embodied in Christ? If the singing of the Levites is an integral part of the ceremonial law, then these questions need to be answered. But the Bible is silent on these matters.

Thus, the singing of a part of the congregation during the worship of God is not a matter of (to use the words of Calvin) "aping the ceremonies"; the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in no way advocates a special priesthood, priestly vestments, the "sacrifice" of the mass, candles, bells, holy water, incense, etc. Singing praise to God is not ceremonial but a moral duty obliging God's people in every age. Let it be remembered that there are clear examples of singing by a part of the congregation in the Word of God.

Additionally, there are a number of Scriptures that describe the action of a single individual giving praise or thanks in the midst of the assembled congregation in testimony of his response to the Word of God proclaimed:

I will give thee thanks in [be-] the great congregation: I will praise thee among [be-] much people (Ps. 35:18).

I will praise the LORD with my whole heart, in [be-] the assembly of the upright, and [in] the congregation (Ps. 111:1).

In these verses the first person singular pronoun is used with a singular verb, the congregation is not described as taking part, and the Hebrew preposition is not one which would necessarily include the congregation in the action; the first person singular pronoun and verb are equally appropriate for either a man or a woman.

The New Testament usage is similar. Hebrews 2:12 (quoting Ps. 22:22) has, "... I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." The Greek for "in the midst" is en meso, "in the middle"; not syn, "together with." The one singing praise unto God is the same as the one declaring God's name to the brethren. No mention is made of any other individual being involved in either the preaching or the singing.

Therefore, since singing praise is commanded by God it is a proper element of worship which may not be omitted. Various modes of singing are observable in Scripture which establish the parameters for the church's practice. Singing may be performed by a soloist, ensemble or the congregation.
Involvement Of Women In The Special Musical Service

The binding nature of the apostle's authoritative directive must be recognized: "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (I Tim. 2:12). In the dialogue of worship Christ speaks to His church through His ordained ministers. This speech is authoritative; therefore, the office of elder is restricted to men. Only men may teach as the official representatives of Christ in His church. There is a sense, however, in which all the members of the church of Jesus Christ are involved in teaching. This is established in Paul's letter to the Colossian Christians: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord" (Col. 3:16). The content of this teaching is restricted to the church's hymnody approved by her elders. In the dialogue of worship between Christ and His church, a woman is not permitted to teach through spoken speech as a representative of Christ in the authoritative teaching of an ordained elder (proclamation), but according to the Directory for Worship (III.6) is permitted to teach through song as a representative of the congregation offering praise to God (response). It is noteworthy that in Heb. 2:12, preaching—declaring the name of Christ—is directed to the church; singing praise is directed to God: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." The primary audience of the church's worship is God Himself. Though singing is offered directly to God it has an indirect effect in teaching and admonishing the congregation. Women are properly involved in teaching in this limited way.

When a professing Christian woman who adorns her profession with a godly walk takes a special part in the musical service, singing words which have been approved as theologically sound and edifying for the church by the elders, her worship is offered on behalf of the congregation as part of the church's response to God, not as the authoritative proclamation of Christ speaking to His church through the preached Word. The church is edified and admonished indirectly, while the primary audience is God. She gives thanks to God in the great congregation, praising Him among the people, praising the Lord with her whole heart in the assembly of the upright (Ps. 35:18, 111:1). It is appropriate for the woman to offer her song only, and not to give any spoken remarks either before or after.

In the Bible, though men predominate in worship, it is evident that women play a part as well. The roles of Miriam (Ex. 15:20-21), Deborah (Jdg. 5:1), Hannah (I Sam. 2:1) and Mary (Lk. 1:46-55) are notable. In Psalm 68:24-25 it is noted that "damsels playing with timbrels" accompanied a processional of singers and instrumentalists during sanctuary worship. Under the direction of the prophet Jeremiah "singing women" took part in the funeral service for King Josiah (II Chron. 35:25; cf. Ezra 2:65, Neh. 7:67). The daughter of Zion is specifically exhorted to sing: "Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem" (Zeph. 3:14; cf. Zech. 2:10). In II Chronicles 25:5-6 it is recorded,

And God gave to Heman fourteen sons and three daughters. All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the LORD, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God, according to the king's order to Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman.
The words “All these” immediately follow the mention of the “three daughters” (in the Hebrew as well as English), strongly implying that Heman’s daughters were involved in the musical service along with their brothers.

Thus, though a woman may not teach the church as the minister of Christ delivering the preached Word, it is proper for a woman to take part in singing praise as a soloist, ensemble member, congregational singer or instrumentalist.

In summary, (1) singing by a part of the congregation during worship (“special music”) is a proper manner of praising God, and (2) a woman may take a special part in the musical service as a representative of the congregation offering praise to God. In view of these considerations the Assembly should have found the complaint in order and gone on to deny the complaint on the ground that the singing at Grace Community Church is being conducted in conformity with the Directory for Worship and the Word of God.

(Signers) Stephen A. Pribble, Richard A. Barker, Douglas A. Felch, Terry M. Gray, Kenneth A. Smith, Dean Ter Haar

167. PROTEST 3 (see §150). The following protest was entered:

We respectfully protest the decision of the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to sustain the complaint of the Thornton Orthodox Presbyterian Church against the Presbytery of the Dakotas dated December 5, 1992.

The effect of this decision is to affirm the rights of a session (FG XIII.7 and 9) in such a way as to effectually deny the right of the presbytery (FG XXXIX.A.5 and B.2.a. through e.) to exercise original jurisdiction over the Park Hill group which was already organized as a church. The tragedy is that this also has the effect that the presbytery sought to avoid, namely, the aggravation of the division among the churches of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in Denver area.

(Signers) G. I. Williamson, Everett C. DeVelde, Jr., Edward A. Eppinger, James S. Gidley, William J. Gorrell, John R. Hunt, R. Daniel Knox, Louis C. LaBriola, Levon Melkonian, Larry E. Wilson, Earl E. Zetterholm

168. RECOMMENDATION 3 (Ecumenicity, see §134). Mr. Galbraith reported further for the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations. Recommendation 3 was adopted in the following form: that the Assembly, although it does not endorse the Alliance of Reformed Churches statement that, “It has now become evident that withdrawal from the CRC should occur”, instruct the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to continue to stay abreast of the ongoing policies and activities of the Alliance of Reformed Churches without sending official observers with a view to the Committee exercising its duty to pursue the unity of the church in the truth.

169. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:00 p.m. and Mr. Osborne led in prayer.
5170. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 6:21 p.m. with the singing of God Is Our Strength and Refuge. Mr. Jamieson led in prayer.

5171. RECOMMENDATION 2 (Ecumenicity, see §125, §133). Recommendation 2 of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations was adopted in the following amended form:

2. That the following communication be sent to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of North America:

Our dear brothers,

We greet you in the high and precious name of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of his body the church.

We write to you as members of the body feeling with you the joys and infirmities of all those who seek to live in him, and to share our love and care for you. And we write because we are brothers who are joined to you in the ties of many years of mutual concerns and endeavors as well as by the ties of official fellowship.

In the interest of continuing those ties into the future we look back over the past year to share some thoughts with you as brother to brother. For one thing, we want to give thanks. We thank God that your 1992 Synod heeded the plea of your brothers in the churches of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council not to approve the ordination of women to the offices of teaching and ruling elder. This was of great concern to us, and we rejoice. Nevertheless our joy is tempered by concern about the meaning of the further decision that women may “expound” in the Church, and we have apprehensions about how it may come to be practiced in days ahead.

We are thankful also for your decision to urge that churches that had previously begun practices that are contrary to your Church Order in those matters to bring them into agreement with your decisions. We are aware that since that decision was made some congregations have newly controverted that decision by electing and ordaining women to the office of ruling elder. We pray and hope, however, that the discipline of the Church will quickly restore order in this matter. Responsible members of the Christian Reformed Church have freely acknowledged that the exercise of biblical discipline has declined in the Christian Reformed Church. We have great sympathy for you in this for we ourselves know the difficulty of seeking to maintain it, and the ease with which all of us can follow the path of least resistance. Especially because we know this from experience we pray that God will strengthen your hand to your task not only in these matters but in all the life of your Church. In all candor, your handling of this matter may affect our relationship with you in the future.

We should speak to you also of a matter that has disturbed some in your Church: the attitude that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church should have toward persons or groups who have left or are considering leaving the Christian Reformed
Church. In our dealing with such persons we should behave as circumspectly as we
would expect you to act were our roles reversed. We believe that we should not
solicit or initiate contact with such people to induce them to leave the CRC. But
rather we believe that people who come to us for information about our church
should be given that information. We further believe that neither in giving such
information nor in receiving such people into the Orthodox Presbyterian Church
should we be charged with causing or fostering the sin of schism (those who leave
a church are not necessarily those who are schismatic).

Further, we wish to clarify our attitude toward the Alliance of Reformed
Churches. First, we want you to know that up to this point we, in deference to the
CRC and in order not to encourage schism, have not sent any representatives to any
meetings relative to that body. The Assembly wishes you to know also that it does
not approve the Alliance of Reformed Churches decision: “It has now become
evident that withdrawal from the CRC should occur.” However, our church does
not regard as necessarily schismatic all those who have left the CRC or are
contemplating doing so, and being mindful of the dangers that this disruption in the
lives of Christ’s sheep may cause, reserves the right to seek to minister to those who
come to us.

We should be remiss if we were to close this letter without expressing to you
our empathy in the turmoil that your Church is now experiencing. We also
empathize with the many of your members, and those who have left you, whose
hearts are burdened over these troubles. We encourage you to help them, and us,
with renewed faithfulness in interpreting, preaching, and practicing God’s Word
and to uphold that mark of the true church, a faithful and just exercise of discipline.

May God’s Spirit be with you.
Sincerely yours in Christ’s service.

172. PREVIOUS QUESTION. On motion the previous question to close debate
was carried during consideration of the previous question. At his request, Mr.
Duff’s negative vote was recorded.

173. SUSPEND STANDING RULES. On motion Chapter 7, Section 1 of the
Standing Rules was suspended and it was determined to limit the two
speeches per motion with the first speech up to 6 minutes and the second speech up
to 3 minutes.

174. ORDER OF THE DAY. On motion the Chaplains Report and Overture 5
were made the order of the day Wednesday after the morning recess.

175. ANSWER TO OVERTURE 2, COMMUNICATIONS 12 AND 15. On
motion Recommendation 2, part b, of Advisory Committee 6 (see §127), was
adopted in the following amended form: that this action (see §171) be deemed the
Assembly’s answer to Overture 2, Communications 12 and 15, and the Minority of
the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations (see §126).
176. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS (Ecumenicity). Recommendations 4, 6, and 7 (see §125) of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations were adopted.

177. MINORITY OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE 6. Mr. Phillips reported for the Minority of Advisory Committee 6 as follows:

Re: Recommendation 5 (see §125) in the Report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations

RECOMMENDATION:
That Overture 1 from the Presbytery of the Midwest, presented to the 59th General Assembly, and referred to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations (cf. Minutes, 59th G.A., p. 41, §142) be returned to the presbytery without prejudice, and that the presbytery, if it so desires, resubmit its Overture only after it is prepared to present and does present/clarify/resolve matters such as:

1. Resolution of the conflict between the bounds of presbytery extending into a foreign country and the stated purpose of our General Assembly's Committee on Foreign Missions to erect an indigenous church in foreign countries (cf. FM Manual, §2.2.1.3).

2. Official documentation or ruling as to:
   a. how an Orthodox Presbyterian Church congregation in Canada can claim not-for-profit status while being a member of a denomination chartered solely in the U.S.A.
   b. whether funds from Canadian individuals contributed directly to entities of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. qualify as tax deductible contributions under Canadian tax law
   c. whether funds from a church in Canada contributed directly to entities of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in any way endanger a church's Canadian incorporation or not-for-profit status
   d. what rights or benefits, if any, does a church incorporated in Canada have by virtue of being a member of a corporation of the U.S.A.
   e. whether a member of a church in Canada may bring civil suit in Canadian court against the Presbytery of the Midwest (and against the denomination), of which he/she is a constituent member, and whether the Presbytery of the Midwest may bring a civil suit in Canadian court against a member of one of its regional churches in Canada
   f. what regulations govern a citizen of the U.S.A., whose ministerial credentials are held by (a) presbytery, who may be called as pastor of a church in Canada that is part of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
   g. whether, upon dissolution, any assets of a church in Canada may be used to pay off indebtedness to an entity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Grounds:
(1) Canada, in spite of being largely English-speaking and having such international relations with the U.S.A. that allow citizens of either country to cross the border without need of passport or visa, is still a foreign country.
The presbytery has neither suggested nor argued that not to adopt the Overture would produce a hardship in any way.

The Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations did not pursue any of the possible difficulties presented in the body of this motion (see its Report, V.A. p. ; also testimony before the Advisory Committee by a number of its members).

To adopt the Overture and then run into unforeseen legalities might prove both costly and embarrassing to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as a whole.

The Assembly should not override the express policy statement of one of its own standing committees without having input from that committee in some official form.

178. RECOMMENDATION 5 (Ecumenicity). The substitute recommendation of the Minority of Advisory Committee 6 for Recommendation 5 of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations was adopted.

179. ECUMENICITY ELECTIONS. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: Bube, Galbraith, Peterson, Jerrell, Needham, Phillips.

At a later point the Moderator declared Messrs. Galbraith, Needham, and Peterson elected to the Class of 1996.

180. EXTEND ORDER OF DAY. On motion the order of the day was extended to take one ballot for the Ecumenicity elections.

181. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 9:21 p.m. after Mr. Mahaffy led in prayer for the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations.

Wednesday Morning, June 16, 1993

182. RECONVENED. The Assembly reconvened at 8:02 a.m. with the singing of Blessing and Honor and Glory and Power. Mr. Minnig led in prayer.

183. PROTEST 4 (see §53). The following protest was entered:

The undersigned respectfully protest the action of the 60th General Assembly, namely, to “authorize the publication of the January 1993 edition of the Modern English Study Version (MESV) in parallel columns with the Confession of Faith of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church” for the following reasons:

A. The undersigned hold that

1. The General Assembly’s authorization to publish (and distribute in the Church, of course) the MESV is a tacit approbation of the contents, the text, of the MESV. (It must be assumed that the Assembly would not authorize publication of
a document of which it disapproves, and those who receive it must therefore conclude that the Assembly approved of the MESV, at least in some measure.)

2. The use of the MESV, as a document distributed in the Church by authorization of the General Assembly, will inevitably come to be regarded by some who use it regularly as the authorized interpretation of the Confession of Faith. It is a short step from that to dependence upon it rather than upon the Confession itself. As that happens, the MESV gradually becomes a de facto revision of the Confession.

3. Only one discussion of the full text of the MESV by the Committee on Christian Education in all the time that this project was before it, and that in the less-than-ideal means of a telephone conference call, is inadequate warrant for distributing to the Church a document of such immense import for use in studying and interpreting the Church’s Confession of Faith.

4. Use of the MESV, published for the purpose of study of the Confession of Faith of the Church, must result in the use of statements and formulations that are different in meaning from the Church’s Confession; it is thus an instrument of teaching ideas that differ from the Confession.

Examples from just early chapters of the document:

II.1, line 3 - “passive properties” is a confusing substitute for “passions”

III.4, line 2 - the change from “designed” (in re angels) to “designated” completely alters the meaning of one clause while at the same time duplicating the thrust of the succeeding clause

IV.2, line 1 - Substitution of “mankind” (the human race) for “man” (Adam) obscures the doctrine of the federal headship of Adam.

VII.4, line 1 - “sometimes” contradicts the original “frequently”

VIII.2, line 2 - “truly”, substituted for “very”, is one of numerous substitutions of adverbs for adjectives, which serve to change meaning or emphasis.

5. No document that contains statements that are not in accord with the standards of the Church, most especially a document presuming to represent the Church’s most basic statement of its faith, should be authorized for distribution in the Church.

6. The small majority by which the Assembly passed this important motion (less than 58%) and the deep feelings evidenced in the discussion of the question indicate clearly that this matter has created division in the Church. That division will foster other division as some in the Church use the MESV and others do not. Nor does the disclaimer adopted by the Assembly solve the problem: in spite of the disclaimer the Church can perceive clearly that the Assembly has nonetheless made the MESV available for their use. In our judgment the Committee on Christian Education and the General Assembly should be more concerned with unity on such an issue than with haste.

B. The undersigned humbly seek the following amends:

That the General Assembly rescind its action and instruct the Committee on Christian Education, if it wishes to pursue development of a version of the Confession of Faith in modern English, to seek from other churches and qualified individuals their advice as to (1) the advisability of circulating in the Church a supplementary version of the Confession of Faith, and, (2) the wording of the
modem English version, and, if publication is desired, report with recommendations to the 62nd (1995) General Assembly.


184. ANSWER TO PROTEST 4: The motion that the Moderator appoint a Committee to Answer Protest 4 was defeated. The following requested that their affirmative votes be recorded: Messrs. Galbraith, Peterson, and Zetterholm.

185. PROTEST 5 (see §138). The following protest was entered:

The undersigned protest the cutting off of debate by the assembly on Recommendation 2 from the Committee on Presbyterial Records, regarding Overture 8. Not only did this action counter the generally followed OP practice of not cutting off debate, it ended debate on a matter that some judge has the potential for changing the direction and character of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Historically, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has been committed to an indirect approach in its relationship to the state. Not that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church on occasion has failed to address the state by way of “humble petition.” However, the recent lawsuit pursued by the Presbytery of New Jersey of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, in that it has involved the whole of the church and could very well serve as a bellwether in the church’s future, reflects the influence of lines within presbyterianism at variance to our own historic position. These lines can be identified with the dissenting tradition of the Covenanters and the political activism of both New School presbyterianism and fundamentalism. Characteristic of these diverse lines is their common commitment to a direct and even aggressive approach to the state. Neither Machen nor the large majority of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church’s founders had sympathy for such a perspective and judged it out of accord with the proper emphases of biblical Christianity.

Pressures for our church to move contrary to the commitment of our founders will only increase. Society exerts greater and greater influence on us and creates in us and for us the very opposite of what we imagine; i.e., we become politicized and sociologized. Specifically, we are cast in the role of a minority concerned to insist upon our rights, thus, diverting us from our true task and confusing us in our true calling.

(Signers) Charles G. Dennison, Randall A. Berquist, Everett C. DeVelde, Donald J. Duff, William J. Gorrell, John R. Hilbelink, Glenn D. Jerrell, R. Daniel Knox, A. M. Laurie, Richard A. Shaw, Steven F. Miller, Jack J. Peterson, Earl E. Zetterholm

186. PROTEST 6 (see §76). The following protest was entered:

The undersigned respectfully protest(s) the action of the 60th General Assembly in which it found Complaint 4 (of Ben and Sandra Manring against the Session of Spencer Mills Church, Gowen, Michigan,) to be out of order and not properly before the Assembly.
The Assembly found neither that the complaint violated the definition of a complaint (Form of Government IX.1) nor that the process by which it came to the Assembly violated any of the provisions of Book of Discipline IX. Moreover, the Assembly adopted no grounds for its action.

It is particularly distressing that the recommendation to find the complaint out of order came from the Committee on Appeals and Complaints, which is prohibited by Standing Rule X.2.b from recommending the disposition of Complaints and Appeals. Since the Committee cited grounds arising out of the contents of the complaint rather than the provisions of Book of Discipline IX, its recommendation came close to a de facto recommendation of disposition. While the undersigned has confidence in the integrity of the members of the Committee, such a recommendation sets a poor precedent.

(Signers) James S. Gidley, Everett C. DeVelde, George W. Hall, R. Daniel Knox, Jr., Louis C. LaBriola, A. M. Laurie, John W. Mallin, Charles M. McIlhenny, Stephen Pribble, K. A. Smith, G. I. Williamson

187. BUBE. At the request of the Moderator, Mr. Bube addressed the Assembly offering his thankfulness to the Lord for the many mercies shown him and his wife during her recent surgery.

188. COMPLAINT 5 (Appeals and Complaints). Mr. Kuschke reported for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints regarding Complaint 5 (see p. )

189. COMPLAINT 5 (Advisory Committee 10A). Mr. Gidley reported for Advisory Committee 10A as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the Assembly find Complaint 5 in order and properly before the Assembly.
2. That the Assembly deny Complaint 5 for the reason that the complainant has failed to show that the action of the session of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church was unconstitutional (Book of Discipline II.B.3.d.(1), II.B.2.c, Form of Government 12.1, 13.9).

190. COMPLAINT 5 NOT SUSTAINED. Recommendation 1 of Advisory Committee 10A was adopted. Complaint 5 was not sustained. The following requested that their affirmative votes be recorded: Messrs. Shishko, R. Miller, Minnig, and Yankura.

191. COMPLAINT PROCEDURES (Appeals and Complaints) Mr. Kuschke reported for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints with the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That this General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following amendment to the Book of Discipline, in Chapter IX to renumber the present Section 6 as 7 and to insert a new Section 6 as follows:
"6. A complaint, carried by appeal to a higher judicatory, may be sustained; or, denied; or, remanded, with grounds, to the next lower judicatory. A decision to remand shall state whether jurisdiction in the matter is being returned to the lower judicatory, or retained by the higher judicatory."

**Grounds:**

1. In stating these options open to an appellate judicatory, this amendment recognizes the option to remand a complaint, or to send a complaint back to a lower judicatory for further consideration (cf. Book of Discipline VII.6 for a similar provision in a judicial case.)
2. If jurisdiction has been transferred to a lower court, the decision of the court may be appealed, with jurisdiction then returning to the higher court.
3. The question when to remand a complaint, rather than to sustain it, or deny it, should be considered carefully by the appellate judicatory. A decision to remand a complaint should be accompanied by the grounds for doing so.
4. A complaint should be sustained when it proves that an action or delinquency of the judicatory complained against is in violation of the Constitution of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. If a complaint does not prove such a violation, it should be denied. A complaint that is unnecessary or trifling should also be denied. A complaint should be found out of order, and therefore not properly before the appellate court, if the procedures followed by the complainant are contrary to the procedures required in the Book of Discipline.
5. A complaint that alleges serious delinquency or error, but with an essential element of its factual background still in dispute, may be remanded for further inquiry into the facts.
6. There may be other circumstances under which an appellate court may choose to remand a complaint.
7. A complaint that is remanded to a lower judicatory may, after further inquiry by that judicatory, be sustained or denied; or it may be withdrawn by mutual consent, in such a way that the problem on which the complaint centers is settled in the lower judicatory.
8. The lower judicatory should notify the higher judicatory, or the next following General Assembly, of the action it has taken. If jurisdiction had been returned to the lower judicatory, and no appeal is entered, the case is concluded.

2. That this General Assembly advise the presbyteries and sessions that in their general pastoral oversight they have power to exercise administrative discipline, and to inquire into, and to settle, administrative problems that might lead to a complaint, without waiting for a complaint to be filed.

**Grounds:**

1. A judicatory's responsibility of pastoral oversight includes looking into all problems brought to its attention.
2. Many a problem can be solved at the outset by recognizing it as a problem that needs to be considered; and many an action can be reconsidered if cogent reasons are advanced for doing so.
3. A complaint should not be necessary to initiate an inquiry, and a complaint is not necessarily a good thing in itself. A complaint is a last resort. A complaint means that a judicatory, and a complainant, have not succeeded in
resolving a difficulty by ordinary means but have to submit to a process of litigation that could extend to an appellate court or courts. In this sense a complaint is a confession of failure on the part of the judicatory and/or the complainant.

(4) If there has to be a formal complaint, a judicatory is much better prepared to deal with it if a preliminary inquiry has already been undertaken.

(5) Frequent reliance upon complaints is litigious.

3. That this General Assembly amend the suggested form for a complaint (Book of Church Order, p. 268) as follows: on the seventh line place a period instead of a comma after the words “of which complaint is made),” and drop the rest of the sentence on present lines 7 and 8, for re-statement at a later point. Insert two new paragraphs:

In bringing this complaint I affirm that I believe that the session (or presbytery) has erred (or has been delinquent) and that this error (or delinquency) is serious; that I have tried to understand the session’s (presbytery’s) point of view; and that I have made a serious effort to correct the error (or delinquency) short of entering a complaint.

In support of this complaint I set forth the following grounds: (here set forth concisely in numbered paragraphs the grounds of fact, circumstance, and law in support of the complaint)

Date: __________________________  Complainant

Grounds:

(1) A complainant should understand that in bringing a complaint he bears a responsibility to avoid frivolous or personal objectives and to show that the problem he presents is serious; and that he has already done everything he can to clear up the problem by way of a protest, reconsideration, personal conferences, and/or attempt to rescind, before engaging a session or presbytery, or ultimately the whole church, in a legal battle.

(2) A complainant should also realize that it is up to him to present a cogent argument, based on the facts and the law, in support of his complaint.

(3) This amendment may serve as a deterrent to those who might think of a complaint as the initial way, or as the only appropriate way, to deal with a problem posed by a judicatory’s actions.

4. That this General Assembly advise the presbyteries and sessions that when a complaint is presented to a judicatory it is the responsibility of that judicatory to ascertain, and to verify, all the facts. The judicatory should institute a preliminary investigation of the facts. This task belongs to the judicatory of original jurisdiction and should not be referred, by default, to an appellate judicatory or judicatories.

Grounds:

(1) The words “after considering a complaint” in Book of Discipline IX.3 ought to be understood to refer to a necessary step in handling complaints, similar to the “preliminary investigation” before a judicial case (III.7).

(2) In a judicatory’s consideration of a complaint against its own action,
the judicatory ought to take stock of the whole situation to see whether, after all, its action was in error in the light of the facts, so that the complaint should be sustained and the error corrected. If so, the Book of Discipline is justified in providing for complaints, and for their consideration, first, by judicatories complained against.

(3) Upon objective consideration of the facts a judicatory may come to the realization that the problem underlying the complaint should have been dealt with in a different way, rather than by the action complained against. The judicatory can then go back, correct the actions, and resolve the problem in mutual agreement. Again the Book of Discipline is justified.

(4) To verify the facts is the duty of the judicatory of original jurisdiction, that is, the judicatory complained against; but appellate judicatories may correct the record. At times the CAC or the Advisory Committee, from a study of the documents of a case, may discover facts not previously noted but which are found by the General Assembly to determine the case.

5. That this General Assembly advise the presbyteries that a presbytery, to which a complaint against a session has been carried by appeal, should not ordinarily content itself with the facts as brought to it by the session, but should itself institute a further inquiry into both the facts and the law in the case.

Grounds:
(1) At one remove from the session, a presbytery may be able to reach a more objective evaluation or to correct a chronology.
(2) If the presbytery itself, or a committee of the presbytery, has already become involved with matters related to the complaint, that involvement itself brings in additional facts or actions which the presbytery has to evaluate prior to its decision.
(3) The great aim of the presbytery's inquiry should be to bring cases to resolution in such a way that appeal to the General Assembly will not be necessary.

6. That this General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following amendments to the Book of Discipline: in Chapter III, Section 7.b, at the end of the first paragraph; and in Section 8.b, at the end of the first paragraph, to add the sentence: "It shall also prepare a statement of the facts of the case, arranged by date in the form of a chronology."

In Chapter VII, Section 5, after the words "the entire record of the case," to insert the words: "including the chronology" so that Section 5 will read:

"5. The clerk of the judicatory from whose judgment the appeal is taken shall submit the entire record of the case, including the chronology, to the clerk of the appellate judicatory."

Grounds:
(1) A chronology exhibits the facts of a case and shows that there has been a serious effort to ascertain those facts. It is most desirable that a chronology be agreed upon, if possible, by both parties.
(2) A chronology, as a statement of facts, lists the events which have occurred, including the documents of the case. It shows how and when the problem
arose, and what has been done to try to rectify it, and by whom; it shows the
temporal relationship of events; and it shows whether the provisions of the Book of
Discipline have been followed.

(3) Actions that take place during a controversy may be actions of the
moment, without consideration of their relationship to past or prospective actions
in the case. An objective chronology of all the facts can remind a judicatory of what
all the parties, including the judicatory itself, have done or allowed, and can lead to
a more accurate perspective.

(4) If there is an appeal to the General Assembly, the chronology should
be reviewed by the presbytery and brought up to date, and sent to the Stated Clerk
of the General Assembly with the other documents of the case. As an exhibition of
the facts it can be indispensable, in complicated cases, in assisting the Committee on
Appeals and Complaints, the General Assembly's Advisory Committee, and the full
Assembly, in the determination of the case.

(5) A chronology may be imperfect; it may not include all the pertinent
facts as evidenced by the other documents. In such an event the facts are to be
determined by the other documents and the chronology corrected.

7. That this General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following
amendment to the Book of Discipline: in Chapter IX, Section 4, first sentence, after
the words “the relevant papers, including” to insert the words
a statement of the facts of the case arranged by date in the form of a
chronology, and

**Grounds:** see the Grounds for Recommendation #6. Recommendation #6
provides for a chronology in judicial cases. Recommendation #7 provides for a
chronology in complaints.

192. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 10A. Advisory Committee 10A was silent
regarding the further report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints.

193. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the
Committee on Appeals and Complaints were adopted. The Moderator ruled
that the passage of Recommendation 3 does not require the Clerk to republish the
Book of Discipline any sooner than is provided by Form of Government XXXII.2.
Recommendation 3 was adopted with the insertion after “point of view” the words
“that I have seriously examined, in prayer before the Lord, my willingness to be in
subjection to my brothers in Christ;”. At a later time, Recommendations 6 and 7 were
adopted.

194. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 10:00 a.m., reconvened at 10:21 a.m.
with the singing of We Have Not Known Thee As We Ought.

195. CHAPLAINS COMMISSION. Mr. Needham reported for the Chaplains
Commission as follows (see p. 286):
RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the General Assembly concur with the following statement of the Joint Commission, and so inform the Commission:
   The Bible, which is our infallible rule of faith and practice, commands us to express redemptive love and compassion to all persons. It further commands us to condemn homosexual behavior as sinful and dangerous.
   Our chaplains will provide compassionate and caring ministry to all service members and their families regardless of sexual orientation and behavior or the diseases with which they may be afflicted. At the same time we will never condone the destructive behavior of homosexuals.
   Therefore, chaplains endorsed by this Commission will continue to preach the whole counsel of God, are not permitted to conduct divine worship with homosexual chaplains, are not permitted to have homosexual ministry assistants, and are not permitted to perform same sex marriages.

2. That the General Assembly adopt the following statement to be forwarded to the Commission in overseeing Orthodox Presbyterian Church chaplains:
   1) Whereas, the Bible is our infallible rule of faith and practice, and
   2) Whereas the Bible establishes that by creation ordinance the heterosexual, monogamous, and faithful marriage relationship is both God’s ordained basis for an orderly society and God’s chosen vehicle to teach about His relationship with his people, and
   3) Whereas human sexuality has both procreation and mutual love and affection between husband and wife as its true expressions, and
   4) Whereas the Bible condemns the inappropriate use of human sexuality including adultery, fornication, bestiality, pedophilia, incest, homosexuality and any other perversion of God’s gift of sexuality, and
   5) Whereas, it is conceivable that chaplains endorsed by the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel could well be asked in the future to compromise their convictions in these matters in carrying out their ministries,
   6) Therefore, the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church makes the following declaration:

   7) The Bible, which is our infallible rule of faith and practice, commands us to express redemptive love and compassion to all persons. It further commands us to condemn sexual behavior which deviates from God’s revealed standard as sinful and destructive. The Bible calls all who engage in these behaviors to repentance by turning to God and proving their repentance by their deeds. The chaplains of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church are committed to providing a compassionate, redemptive, and caring ministry to military service members, their families, and other groups among whom they are called to minister, regardless of sexual behavior or the diseases with which their constituents may be afflicted. Therefore, Orthodox Presbyterian Church chaplains endorsed by the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel will continue
to preach and minister in light of the whole counsel of God on these matters. (Gen. 1:27, 28, 2:18-25, 19:1-29; Lev. 18:6-24, 20:13; Prov. 18:22; Matt. 19:4-6; Jn. 2:1-11; Acts 26:20; Rom. 1:24-27; 1 Cor. 6:9-11, 7:2-4; Eph. 5:22-33; Rev. 19:6-9.)

3. That the General Assembly add to Paragraph G of the Instruments of the General Assembly as Appendix A the following:

Appendix A: The following are policy guidelines which apply to the ministry of chaplains of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church serving with the military. They are not changes to the Constitution of the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel but serve to explain and codify specific issues considered necessary by this denomination.

1) Since the Orthodox Presbyterian Church holds that the office of minister, or teaching elder, is given only to biblically qualified men, it is impermissible for any minister of this Church serving as a military chaplain to share in the conduct of any service of public worship where those not meeting biblical qualifications take part in the leading of that worship service. This principle does not prohibit such a chaplain from working with chaplains from other denominations in biblically appropriate areas of cooperative ministry.

2) Our chaplains will provide compassionate and caring ministry to all service members and their families regardless of sexual orientation and behavior or the diseases with which they may be afflicted. At the same time we will never condone the sinful and destructive behavior of homosexuals. Those OPC chaplains endorsed by the Commission will continue to preach the whole counsel of God, but are not permitted to conduct divine worship with homosexual chaplains, are not permitted to have homosexual ministry assistants, and are not permitted to perform same-sex marriages.

4. That the General Assembly concur with this new paragraph to be added to Article IV of the Joint Commission By-laws:

The Joint Commission is not a division of any one denomination but because of the organizational and administrative support provided by the PCA, the Executive Director normally will be a teaching elder of the PCA with military chaplain experience and he also will represent MNA as appropriate and feasible.

196. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5. Advisory Committee 5 was silent regarding the report of the Chaplains Commission.

197. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of the Chaplains Commission were adopted without dissent. Recommendation 3 was adopted with the following amendment: section 2. of Recommendation 3 was amended by inserting “sinful and” between “condone the” and “destructive behavior.” On motion the Assembly recommended to the Joint Commission the insertion of the words in Recommendation 1, paragraph 2, “sinful and” between “condone the” and “destructive.”
198. CHAPLAINS ELECTIONS. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Chaplains Commission for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: House, Christopher H. Wisdom, Stonehouse.

The Moderator announced the election of Mr. House to the Class of 1996.

199. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (see §90). Mr. Eckardt reported for Advisory Committee 9 as follows:

RECOMMENDATION:
That the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church humbly petitions the President of the United States of America to stand against the sin of homosexual activity. We support this petition with the following considerations.

Based on the Word of God and his creation law, homosexuality (including bisexuality and lesbianism) violates God's non-negotiable moral standard and therefore is sin. According to the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments, it is an abomination and contrary to nature as God intended for man and woman (Leviticus 18:22, Romans 1:26,27).

The practice of homosexuality is a reproach to any nation. It undermines the family, and poses a substantial threat to the general health, safety and welfare of our citizens. Your own Christian upbringing ought to demonstrate to you the practical benefits of upholding the biblical stand against homosexuality especially in the light of the current epidemic of AIDS and other diseases spread through homosexual conduct (Exodus 15:26, Psalm 33:12).

And, specifically, we urge you as Commander-in-Chief of all the armed services not to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military. Lifting the ban would effectively discriminate against chaplains who hold to biblical ethics by forbidding them to preach God's law against this sin. Such a prohibition compromises the Free Exercise of Religion clause as well as the gospel message which delivers homosexuals from this destructive practice. (I Corinthians 6:9-11). Moreover, any such preaching subsequent to lifting the ban might be considered a hate crime.

Therefore, for the honor of Christ and his Church, and the welfare of our nation, we exhort you to remember the words of the wisest magistrate, "Righteousness exalts a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14:34). Our prayers go with you, your family and your administration and we commend to you the salvation that comes only through Jesus Christ our Lord (I Timothy 2:1,2).

Very respectfully submitted,
The General Assembly, June, 1993

200. RECOMMENDATION ACTION. On motion pending amendments to Overture 5 were laid on table (§90). Recommendation of Advisory Committee 9 was adopted with the following amendments:

1. In paragraph 3 delete the Scripture citations: (Ex 15:26; Ps 33:12);
2. In paragraph 3 substitute "background" for "upbringing";
3. That the Scripture references be written out in the NIV with the Scripture citations following.
201. DPW REPORT POSTPONED. On motion consideration of the Report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship and consideration of docket item, "Consideration of proposed amendment to Book of Discipline V.2.b" were postponed until the next Assembly.

202. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 12:16 p.m. after Mr. Melkonian led in prayer.

Wednesday Afternoon, June 16, 1993

203. RECONVENCED. The Assembly reconvened at 1:16 p.m. with the singing of A Mighty God the Lord. Mr. Vroegindewey led in prayer.

204. APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS ELECTIONS. The floor was declared open for nominations to the Committee on Appeals and Complaints for the Class of 1996. The following were nominated: S. R. Jones, Mallin, Samuel T. Logan, Jr.

The Moderator later announced the election of Mr. Jones to the Class of 1996. Mr. Tyson led in prayer for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints.

205. SUSPEND STANDING RULES. On motion Standing Rule Chapter V, Section 8 was suspended and the Report of the Historian was ordered included in the minutes without being read to the Assembly.

206. HISTORIAN REPORT. Mr. Dennison reported as the Historian (see p. 282).

207. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 6. Advisory Committee 6 was silent on the Report of the Historian.

208. COMMITTEE FOR THE HISTORIAN REPORT. Mr. Dennison, Historian, reported for the Committee for the Historian (see p. 283). The recommendations of the Committee are as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That Mr. Charles G. Dennison be appointed as the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church for another three-year term.
2. That the Historian be paid an honorarium of $5,000.00 per year for 1993-94 (same as for last year).
3. That Messrs. James F. Alexander and David K. Thompson be reelected to the Committee for the Historian for a three-year term. The Committee submits the name of Brian O'Leary to replace Dr. John S. Deliyannides.
4. That the proposed budget of the Committee for the Historian, itemized in section IV (see p. 284), be adopted.
209. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 6. Advisory Committee 6 was silent on the Report of the Committee for the Historian.

210. RECOMMENDATION ACTION. Recommendations 1 and 3 of the Committee for the Historian were adopted. On motion Recommendations 2 and 4 were referred to Advisory Committee 4.

211. PRESBYTERIAL RECORDS (Ohio). Mr. Keller reported for the Committee on Presbyterial Records regarding the Minutes of the Presbytery of Ohio and presented the following recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION:
That the Minutes of the Presbytery of Ohio be returned to that presbytery for review of matters indicated in the report form prepared by the Committee for submission to the 61st General Assembly for review.

212. RECOMMENDATION ACTION (Ohio). The recommendation regarding the Minutes of the Ohio Presbytery was adopted in the following amended form: that Instrument B.6 &7 be suspended and that the General Assembly take exception to the Minutes of the Presbytery of Ohio in respect to the uncertainty that the Minutes are complete (Rule 12.a), and that the Minutes be returned to that presbytery for review and that they be resubmitted to the 61st General Assembly for its review.

213. APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS (Budget). On motion the request of the Committee Appeals and Complaints to be given $750 from the General Assembly Operation Fund was referred to Advisory Committee 4.

214. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 4 (Budget). Mr. D. G. Barker reported for Advisory Committee 4 with the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the following be proposed to the 61st General Assembly: Standing Rules X be amended with the addition: "7. All recommendations coming from committees that involve budgetary requests for the following year shall be committed to the advisory committee responsible for reviewing the General Assembly Operation Fund."

2. That the following be proposed to the 61st General Assembly: Standing Rules III.B.5.j. be amended:
   a. with a new (3): "To include in his report to the general Assembly a financial accounting for every committee with an approved budget of $2,000 and over which must be current through April of that year and which shall be updated for the Assembly at the time his report is given."
   b. changing current (3) to (4) and current (4) to (5).

3. That the General Assembly adopt the following budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund:
Sixtieth General Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$109,038</td>
<td>$73,869</td>
<td>$124,136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Ad.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of Minutes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts</td>
<td>116,288</td>
<td>79,404</td>
<td>131,086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$94,685</td>
<td>$53,351</td>
<td>$131,586</td>
<td>$128,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk</td>
<td>44,238</td>
<td>39,303</td>
<td>53,351</td>
<td>53,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Clerk</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Support</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>11,470</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>6,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>6,812</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip/Post/Suppl</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly Meetings</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,056</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Print/Dist.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Print/Dist.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. on Arr.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat. Delegates</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPARC</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jt. Chaplains Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals &amp; Complaints</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains Comm.</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. for Historian</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ec. &amp; Inter. Rel.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>11,470</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision to BD/Dir. of Worship</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of the GA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill Vis Comm.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admis. to LS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$116,288</td>
<td>$94,685</td>
<td>$131,586</td>
<td>$128,991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. That the General Assembly request the churches to contribute $13.00 for each communicant member and that each minister be requested to contribute $13.00 to meet the 1993-1994 GA Operation Fund budget.
5. That the General Assembly encourage those churches who find themselves unable to give the full amount requested not to fail to make at least some contribution toward this GA Operation Fund.

6. That the General Assembly request to the Editor of New Horizons to bring to the attention of the congregations the services of our full-time Stated Clerk as well as the committees and ministries supported in this GA budget and promote the churches' giving to it.

215. BUDGET ADOPTED. Recommendations 1, 5, and 6 of Advisory Committee 4 was adopted. Recommendation 2 was referred to the Stated Clerk for his review and to report to the 61st General Assembly. Recommendation 4 of Advisory Committee 4 was adopted with the amendment changing $13 to $14 in both places.

Recommendation 3 of the Committee as amended was adopted as follows:

### General Assembly Operation Fund Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$109,038</td>
<td>$73,869</td>
<td>$124,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Ad.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of Minutes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td>116,288</td>
<td>79,404</td>
<td>131,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk</td>
<td>44,238</td>
<td>39,303</td>
<td>53,351</td>
<td>53,351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Clerk</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Support</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>6,812</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip/Post/Suppl</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Assembly Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Print/Dist.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,056</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Print/Dist.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. on Arr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat. Delegates</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPARC</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jt. Chaplains Comm.</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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215. Committee Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals &amp; Complaints</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains Comm.</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. for Historian</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ec. &amp; Inter. Rel.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision to BD/Dir. of Worship</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of the GA</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill Vis Comm.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admis. to LS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$116,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

216. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 3:15 p.m. and reconvened at 3:30 p.m.

217. ADMISSION TO LORD’S TABLE. Mr. Gaffin reported for the Committee to Study the Method of Admission to the Lord’s Supper (see p. 293). The Committee recommended that it be dissolved.

218. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 8 (Committee on Admission) Mr. Needham reported the following for Advisory Committee 8:

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That the committee not be dissolved, and
2. That it be given the mandate of suggesting ways in which sessions might interact with visitors/strangers desiring to partake of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper in such a way as to better protect the ignorant from eating and drinking judgment to themselves.

219. LORD’S SUPPER COMMITTEE DISSOLVED. The motion of the Committee to Study the Method Of Admission to the Lord’s Supper was adopted and the committee was dissolved.

220. VISIT PARK HILL CHURCH. Mr. Tyson reported for the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church (see p. 332).

RECOMMENDATION:
That the Committee be continued with the same mandate.

221. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 7 (Park Hill). Mr. Elder reported for Advisory Committee 7 as follows: Advisory Committee 7 met with Messrs. R. Barker and Peterson. Advisory Committee 7 expresses appreciation for the work of the Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Re: the recommendation of the Committee:
1. That the committee be continued with the following on-going mandate:
   That with urgency it continue to impress upon the parties involved the
   need to take all necessary steps to pursue reconciliation, calling upon each party to
demonstrate a mutual submission to the demands of God's Word and the require-
ments of the Confession of Faith, Form of Government, and Book of Discipline.
   In particular that the Committee:
   a. Encourage Messrs. C. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran to com-
      plete the work of seeking personal reconciliation with those they have offended, and
      encourage those who have been offended to respond in a biblical manner.
   b. Continue to encourage and comfort the people of Trinity Church.

   Grounds:
   (1) The mandate is needed.
   (2) Changes from the 59th General Assembly mandate reflect progress
in meeting some of the objectives of that mandate.
2. That the name of the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church be changed to
   the Committee on Reconciliation in the Presbytery of the Dakotas.
   Grounds:
   (1) The formal names of Assembly committees should properly be
determined by the Assembly.
   (2) The name "Committee on Reconciliation" was agreed upon by the
various parties involved.
   (3) The name being proposed is more specific while keeping the spirit of
the agreed-upon name.

222. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS (Reconciliation). Recommendations 1
   and 2 of Advisory Committee 7 were adopted.

223. STANDING RULE AMENDMENT. On motion Standing Rule VI.A.2 was
suspended and the Assembly proposed to the 61st General Assembly that
Standing Rules X.1 be amended by adding: "The names of committees of the General
Assembly shall be changed only by action of the Assembly."

224. EXCEPTIONS FOR LICENSURE AND ORDINATION. Dr. Elder
reported for Advisory Committee 7 as follows:
Advisory Committee 7 met with Messrs. Hunt, Poundstone and Watson.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
   1. That Communication 5 from the Presbytery of the Dakotas be received as
      information.

   Re: Communication 7 from the Presbytery of New Jersey,
   2. That the General Assembly advise the Presbytery of New Jersey with
regard to the licensure and subsequent ordination of Mr. Michael G. Evangelista as
follows:
      That the Presbytery:
      a. Proceed to complete his requirements for licensure by admin-
istering the remaining examinations, but with waiver of the Hebrew competency requirement.

b. Upon licensure, proceed toward examination for ordination, but waiving the three-year theological degree requirement, and treating the Hebrew requirement in accordance with FG XXIII.3.

*Grounds:*

1. It would appear that Mr. Evangelista has evidenced the gifts for the office of minister of the Gospel by the actual exercise of these gifts for several years at New Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Hammonton, N.J.

2. His age and family responsibilities would make it virtually impossible for him to pursue further formal education in any reasonable time.

Re: Communication 16 from the Presbytery of the Northwest:

3. That the General Assembly concur with the Presbytery of the Northwest that Mr. G. Mark Sumpter should be granted an exception to the rule requiring a three-year seminary degree (FG XXIII.3).

*Ground:*
The Committee refers to the five reasons in Communication 16 as grounds for concurring with the request to call Mr. G. Mark Sumpter.

Re: Communication 19 from the Presbytery of the Southwest:

4. That the General Assembly concur with the Presbytery of the Southwest with regard to the licensure exam of Mr. Charles K. Carroll, that the completion of the B.A. degree may be waived (FG XXI.3).

*Grounds:*

1. The Committee heard testimony given by Mr. Hunt that Mr. Charles Carroll has successfully completed a theological course at Mid-America Reformed Seminary and has received a Th.B. which is equivalent to an M.Div.

2. That Mr. Carroll has sustained his examinations before the Presbytery of the Southwest.

3. That Mr. Carroll has served two summer internships in churches located in Austin, Texas, and Volga, South Dakota; both internships receiving very favorable reports.

225. RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS. Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Advisory Committee 7 were adopted.

226. RESOLUTION OF THANKS. On motion the following resolution of thanks was adopted: that the Assembly adopt the following resolution of thanks:

The Assembly expresses its gratitude to the administration and staff of Geneva College for their kind and gracious hospitality extended to the 60th General Assembly in providing the use of their beautiful campus. The commissioners' needs for food, housing, and transportation have been met more than adequately. In particular the Assembly thanks Mr. Jeff Santarsiero and Mrs. Jan Vish for their willing service (including Mrs. Vish's washing the Moderator's shirts).
The Assembly also thanks the Committee on Arrangements, the Rev. Lawrence Semel, Mr. David R. Heise and Luis A. Orteza, for their arduous labors in preparing for the Assembly and expediting its business. It also thanks Mr. Kenley Leslie for his assistance during registration, Mr. Benaiah D. Heise for his willingness to aid the commissioners in meeting their needs, and Mr. Miladin for his assisting our worship through playing the piano.

"We . . . thank God for all of you, mentioning you in our prayers. We continually remember before our God and Father your work produced by faith, your labor prompted by love, and your endurance inspired by hope in our Lord Jesus Christ" I Thessalonians 1:2,3.

227. MINUTES. The Clerk read the minutes of Monday, June 14 through Wednesday, June 16, 1993. On motion the minutes of June 14-16 were approved as corrected.

228. MINUTES AS A WHOLE. The Clerk read the minutes. On motion the Minutes of the Assembly as a whole were approved.

229. DISSOLUTION AND NEXT ASSEMBLY. On motion it was determined that the Assembly be dissolved.

Mr. Poundstone made the following declaration: By virtue of the authority delegated to me by the church, let this General Assembly be dissolved, and I do hereby dissolve it, and require another general assembly, chosen in the same manner, to meet at Harvey Cedars Bible Conference, Harvey Cedars, New Jersey, beginning at 8:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 8, 1994, with a projected terminus of noon, Wednesday, June 15, 1994.

230. PRAYER AND BENEDICTION. The Moderator led the Assembly in prayer and pronounced the Apostolic Benediction. The 60th General Assembly closed at 6:07 p.m., Wednesday, June 16, 1993.
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Appendix

OVERTURES

Overture 1

From the Presbytery of the Dakotas

At the September 1992 stated meeting of the Presbytery of the Dakotas, the following overture was adopted.

On motion, presbytery moved to send the following overture and reasons to the 1993 General Assembly and all OPC presbyteries.

That the 60th General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following amendment to the Form of Government:

FG XXIV.2 (p. 116): "If the pastor is not willing to resign, the congregation may petition the presbytery to dissolve the pastoral relationship and may send representatives to the meeting to support the request. The presbytery may grant the request, or having given the pastor opportunity to present his reasons for not concurring, it may decide to reject the request; then it shall inform the congregation of its reasons and enter those reasons in its minutes, or it may urge the congregation to reconsider its action."

Grounds: The adoption of the amendment clarifies what appears to be implied in the original statement in the Form of Government: "The presbytery may grant the request, but only after giving the pastor opportunity to present his reasons for not concurring, or it may urge the congregation to reconsider its action" (FG XXIV.2).

(1) Is the pastor’s presentation no more than an attempt for him to vent his frustration, or is it an opportunity for him to block his removal as the pastor? It seems to us that the latter is clearly implied, for the former would be meaningless. Does the last clause, ("or it may urge the congregation to reconsider its action") mandate that the pastor’s statement be no more than a delay of granting the request for him to be removed? Is this simply a delaying of the inevitable—his dismissal? If so, this makes the entire procedure seem to place the presbytery in the position of having to violate the Scriptures. The amendment clearly allows the presbytery to reject what it may judge to be a sinful request from a congregation to remove a righteous man from their pulpit.

(2) According to the interpretation of some, the absence of this clarification makes it impossible to redress the evils in a particular congregation if the presbytery judges the congregation is in a state of rebellion against the lordship of Christ, and to be seeking to dismiss its pastor because he is preaching the gospel faithfully and calling them to faith and repentance. So, this amendment is consistent with the general principle stated in the Form of Government as follows: "The presbytery has the power...to visit particular churches for the purpose of inquiring into their state
and of taking proper measures to insure that evils which may have arisen in them shall be redressed” (FG XIV.5).

Edward A. Eppinger
Stated Clerk

Overture 2

From the Presbytery of the Dakotas March 23, 1993

The presbytery also adopted the following overture and directed the stated clerk to forward a copy to the stated clerk of the General Assembly and all the presbyteries for concurrence.

"The Presbytery of the Dakotas agrees with the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to the effect that the 60th General Assembly should not sever fraternal relations with the Christian Reformed Church at the present time. Nevertheless, the Presbytery of the Dakotas overtures the 60th General Assembly to determine: (1) that if the Christian Reformed Church fails to initiate disciplinary proceedings against those who have violated its prohibition on women in ruling and teaching office by the time of our 61st General Assembly (1994), consideration of termination of the fraternal relationship with the Christian Reformed Church be placed on its docket; (2) that the Christian Reformed Church be informed of this action."

Ground: We are deeply concerned as to the faithfulness of the Christian Reformed Church to the Scriptures, and prominent among our concerns are a number of churches which have ignored or are in the process of ignoring Synod’s prohibition of women in ruling and teaching office which is in accord with Scripture (I Timothy 2:12-13). It will be extremely significant to note the way in which the 1993 Synod of the Christian Reformed Church deals with this rebellion. If there is not decisive discipline in these cases, we would have to view such failure as clear evidence that we should consider severing fraternal relationship.

Edward A. Eppinger
Stated Clerk

Overture 3

From the Presbytery of the Dakotas March 23, 1993

The presbytery determined to overture the 60th (1993) General Assembly to transfer the jurisdiction of Lyon, Sioux, Osceola, and O'Brien counties in northwest Iowa from the Presbytery of the Midwest to the Presbytery of the Dakotas. A copy of this overture be sent to the stated clerk of the Presbytery of the Midwest and Don Stanton, chairman of the Home Missions Committee.
Grounds:

(1) These areas were formerly part of the Presbytery of the Dakotas, but were transferred to the Presbytery of the Midwest.

(2) We have a ministerial member of presbytery living in the area and teaching at Dordt College. Now a ministerial member of the presbytery will be moving to this area and seeks to be doing home missions work in this area.

(3) The presbytery Missions Committee has already been in consultation with a member of the Missions Committee of the Presbytery of the Midwest on this jurisdictional change. They will be receiving a copy of this overture.

Edward A. Eppinger
Stated Clerk

Overture 4

From the Presbytery of Northern California April 6, 1993

The Presbytery of Northern California hereby overtures the Sixtieth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to Amend the Form of Government as follows:

A. That Form of Government XXI.7.(2); XXII.13.c.(2); XXIII.8.(2); XXIII.12.a.(2); XXIII.12.b.(2); XXIII.14.(2); XXIII.17.(2), all which pertain to the vow of subscription to the standards of the Church by candidates at their licensure, by ministers at their ordination and/or installation, and by transferring ministers at their installation (Question # 2 in each instance), be amended as follows:

1. Substitute a semicolon (;) for the question mark at the end of the present question
2. Add the following after the (new) semicolon:
   and do you further promise that if, at any time, you can no longer conscientiously agree to the terms of this vow respecting any particular assertion in these standards, you will neither publicly nor privately teach, inculcate, insinuate or sanction those views either by preaching or writing, and that you will upon your own initiative, make known to your presbytery the change that has taken place in your views since taking this vow?

B. That the Form of Government XXV.6.b.(2) pertaining to the vow of subscription to the standards of the Church by ruling elders and deacons at their ordination and/or installation be amended as follows:

1. Substitute a semicolon (;) for the question mark at the end of the present question
2. Add the following after the (new) semicolon:
   and do you further promise that if, at any time, you can no longer conscientiously agree to the terms of this vow respecting any particular assertion in these standards, you will neither publicly nor privately teach, inculcate, insinuate or sanction
those views either by preaching or writing, and that you will
upon your own initiative, make known to your session the
change that has taken place in your views since taking this vow?

C. That the Form of Government, Chapter XX, be amended by the addition
of a new section 8 as follows, the present Section 8 being renumbered Section 9:

The "system of doctrine" referred to in the subscription vows for
licentiates and officers in the Church is the whole body of truth which the
Holy Scriptures teach. The Confession of Faith and Catechisms are to be
received by the licentiate and officer as a most satisfactory exposition of
this truth in an integral and indivisible whole. By receiving and adopting
the standards, he thereby affirms and agrees with nothing less than the
complete set of assertions contained in the Confession of Faith and
Catechisms.

An exception is a dissent from, an objection to, or a mental reserva-
tion about any assertion contained in the Confession of Faith or Cat-
echisms and is to be distinguished from an inconsequential objection to
a proposition or from a quibble or reservation about terminology.
However, such a distinction is to be made only by the judicatory, never
by the individual. No officer or licentiate shall presume to have the right
of making a self-evaluation regarding this distinction.

An exception to the confessional standards may be granted by a
judicatory, for the sake of conscience, only if 1) it affects a peripheral and
minor assertion in the standards, not a central and fundamental one, 2) it
does not vacate the central teaching of any chapter of the Confession or
overturn a complete answer to any question in the Catechisms, and 3) it
does not undermine the system of truth in the Confession and Cat-
echisms as a whole.

When a deacon, ruling elder, or minister declares a change in his
views affecting any assertion in the confessional standards, he shall
present to the judicatory of jurisdiction a written statement explaining
his exception. The judicatory shall investigate his views and consult with
him, to the end that he conform his views to the standards. If, after
consultation, he remains adamant, and the judicatory should find that
the exception does not warrant judicial process, it shall vote on granting
tolerance for the exception. A grant of tolerance, allowing the exception,
shall be by a two-thirds majority of members voting. If tolerance for the
exception is not granted, the judicatory shall, in the light of its decision,
take whatever action it deems necessary to bring the matter to a resolu-
tion.

Upon granting tolerance for a declared exception, the judicatory
shall enter into its minutes: 1) the written statement of exception, and 2)
a full explanation of the reasons for which tolerance was granted with a
justification of the action with reference to the standards. The toleration
extended by a judicatory, in allowing an exception, shall not be construed
as approval of the exception, nor a constituting permission to propagate
that exception.

This same procedure, as applicable, shall be followed in the case of
an exception declared by a candidate for the office of ruling elder or deacon, or a ministerial candidate for ordination, or a transferring minister.

The stricture against teaching a view at variance with the confessional standards shall not be construed in a way as to preclude an officer’s proposing, defending, or voting for an amendment to these standards in the forum of the judicatories of the Church.

The two-thirds majority rule shall be required in all appeals or complaints to the General Assembly in matters relating to exceptions.

Attached to this letter is material presented explaining and supporting the adoption of this proposal.

Richard C. Miller
Stated Clerk

Overture 5

From the Presbytery of Northern California April 6, 1993

The Presbytery of Northern California on March 20, 1993, determined to overture the Sixtieth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as follows:

On motion, in response to communication number 14, the overture having been sent to the sessions at least three weeks before this meeting, presbytery unanimously voted to consider the overture to the 60th General Assembly proposed in this communication. On motion, presbytery overtured the 60th General Assembly as follows:

An Overture to the 60th General Assembly

The presbytery of Northern California overtures the 60th General Assembly to humbly petition the President of the United States of America, as Commander in Chief of all the armed services, not to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military.

1) Based on the Word of God and His creation law, homosexuality (including bisexuality and lesbianism) is contrary to God’s non-negotiable moral standard and therefore sin. According to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament it is an abomination and contrary to nature as God intended for man and woman (Leviticus 18:22, Romans 1:26, 27).

2) That for good order and discipline and morale in the armed services, you as commander in chief must by federal law maintain the utmost standard of morality in order to be a vital force in defending our country and protecting the true rights of human beings.

3) That your own Christian profession and upbringing ought to demon-
strate to you the practical benefits of upholding the traditional and biblical stand against homosexuality in the light of the current epidemic of AIDS and other diseases spread through homosexual conduct.

4) That your lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military will unofficially discriminate against chaplains who hold to biblical morality in forbidding them to preach God's law against this sin and so compromise the free exercise of religion clause as well as the gospel message that frees homosexuals from this destructive lifestyle; and that subsequently such preaching may be considered a hate crime (I Corinthians 6:9-11).

We, as Orthodox Presbyterians, for the honor of Christ and His Church and the welfare of our nation exhort you to remember the Words of the wisest magistrate, "Righteousness exalts a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14:34)

Our prayers go with you, your family and your administration and commend to you the salvation that comes only through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Very respectfully submitted,

The General Assembly, June, 1993

In His lovingkindness,
Richard C. Miller
Stated Clerk

Overture 6

From the Presbytery of New York and New England

April 21, 1993

The Presbytery of New York and New England, at its stated meeting held April 15-16, 1993, determined to overture the 60th General Assembly to propose to the presbyteries amendments to the Book of Discipline as follows:

1. That in Chapter VII, Section 7 (page 202), the words "neither the appellant, nor any" be substituted for the word "no", and the words "propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning" be substituted for the words "take any part in the decision of" so as to read: When the judgment of a lower judicatory is before an appellate judicatory, neither the appellant, nor any member of the judicatory from whose judgment the appeal is taken shall propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning the case.

Ground: This procedure will regularize what has been the practice of the highest judicatory (the Assembly) so that it, or lower judicatories, will not become engrossed in repetitive debate over what "take any part in the decision of" means. It also specifies that the appellant is included in this prohibition (the appellant might not be a member of the judicatory from whose judgment appeal is taken). Note also the following quotation from J. Aspinwall Hodge's *What is Presbyterian Law as defined by The Church Courts?*: Who may vote? All the members of the court, except that "members of judicatories appealed from cannot be allowed to vote in the superior judicatory on any question connected with the appeal." So also in case of complaint. No Minister or Elder who was a member of the judicatory when the vote appealed
from took place can vote on the appeal. Such was the decision of 1792. In 1836 the Assembly decided that an Elder of the lower court could not vote, even though he was not a member of that court when the case was tried. . . . The Moderator of the judicatory, if a member of the court appealed from, must retire from the chair while the appeal is being tried. Other members who may be personally interested in the result of the appeal may voluntarily retire or be challenged (p. 193).

2. That a new Section 8 be added to Chapter VII (p. 202) as follows: 8. The lower judicatory from whose judgment an appeal is taken shall present its case to the higher judicatory through an appointed representative(s). The appellant or his representative(s) shall present his case to the higher judicatory.

Ground: This concentrates the case of the lower judicatory for the benefit of the higher judicatory, discourages “filibustering” by the lower judicatory, and serves to foster equalization of representation between the appellant and the lower judicatory. It also makes provision so that each side actually has someone to present its case.

3. That in Chapter IX, Section 4, last sentence (page 209), the words “propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning” be substituted for the words “take part in the decision of” so as to read: Neither the complainant nor any member of the judicatory whose alleged delinquency or error is complained of shall propose or second motions, or vote in any decisions concerning the matter.

Ground: [same as 1. above, minus the second sentence, namely: It also specifies that the appellant is included in this prohibition (the appellant might not be a member of the judicatory from whose judgment appeal is taken).]

4. That a new Section 6 (the present 6 being renumbered to 7) be inserted in Chapter IX (p. 209) as follows: 6. The lower judicatory from which a complaint has been carried to a higher judicatory shall present its case to the higher judicatory through an appointed representative(s). The complainant or his representative(s) shall present his case to the higher judicatory.

Ground: This concentrates the case of the lower judicatory for the benefit of the higher judicatory, discourages “filibustering” by the lower judicatory, and serves to foster equalization of representation between the complainant and the lower judicatory. It also makes provision so that each side actually has someone to present its case.

Stephen L. Phillips
Stated Clerk

Overture 7

From the Presbytery of New York and New England April 21, 1993

The Presbytery of New York and New England, at its stated meeting held April 15-16, 1993, determined to overture the 60th General Assembly to propose to the
presbyteries amendments to the Book of Discipline as follows:

1. That in Chapter VIII, Section 2, the following be added to the last sentence after the word "and": "if it be couched in temperate language and is respectful to the court," so as to read: A protest shall be read to the judicatory and, if it be couched in temperate language and is respectful to the court, shall be recorded in the minutes.

   **Ground:** The inclusion of the amendment restores to the judicatory a right to maintain proper Christian propriety over its minutes. Presently, a protest could contain highly offensive and disrespectful language, and yet must be recorded. The 1839 PCUSA Book of Discipline (VIII.111) stated: "If a protest... be couched in decent and respectful language, and contain no offensive reflections or insinuations against the majority of the judicatory, those who offer it have a right to have it recorded on the minutes." The PCA Book of Church Order, Chapter 45-5, retains this historic concept: "If a... protest... be couched in temperate language, and be respectful to the court, it shall be recorded"

2. That the following be added at the end of Section 3 of Chapter VIII (p. 205): The answer shall be placed in the minutes without debate upon the affirmative majority vote of those not protesting. Non-protesters who substantially disagree with the answer so recorded may have their negative votes recorded.

   The protester(s) may enter a response to the answer (or seek permission to withdraw the protest), and the judicatory may reply as above, but this shall end the matter unless an answer to a protest recommends the judicatory take an action.

   **Grounds:**
   1. This procedure will regularize what has been the usual practice of the highest judicatory (the Assembly) so that it, or lower judicatories, will not become engrossed in further debate over the matter protested, itself being an action already settled by the judicatory.
   2. It will provide a way for non-protesters who do not agree with the answer to register that disagreement without unduly infringing on the time of the judicatory.
   3. Since non-protesters have no say or rights over the protest which is automatically entered into the minutes (cf. Chapter VIII, Section 2, last sentence), the protester(s) should have no say or rights over the answer of the non-protesters and its outcome.
   4. It will permit limited, continuing interchange without unduly infringing on the time of the judicatory.

   Stephen L. Phillips
   Stated Clerk

**Overture 8**

From the Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic  
April 24, 1993

The Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic respectfully overtures the 60th General
Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to find no exception to the minutes of the Presbytery of New Jersey concerning its lawsuit against the state of New Jersey (consideration of said exception being postponed for consideration by 59th General Assembly) and in support of this overture notes the following:

a) Two grounds are given for finding an exception by the minority report of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records (§212, Journal of 59th GA) which can be summarized as (1) ceding the sole rights of Christ over his church to the civil government (contra WCF XXV.6; FG I) and (2) using the coercive power of civil government to enforce the church's interests by changing the secular legal and governmental situation contrary to the true character of church power (contra WCF XXXI.4; FG III.3 & 4).

b) The representation we have concerning this suit by testimony given thus far, is that it seeks merely to prevent the state of NJ from forcing on the church as church, an avowed homosexual who might wish to take communion or enjoy some other privilege which is reserved only to true Christian people who are members in good standing of a church. In short, the challenge to New Jersey is to except the church from its wicked legislation and is not a suit against homosexuality in general.

Grounds:

1) Concerning the allegation that the suit constitutes a ceding of the sole right of Christ over his church we note that it is precisely to assert (not gain) the sole right of Christ over his church, that this suit has been brought. No presbyter from New Jersey has hinted that this right can be taken from Christ or that the decision of the civil government, however adverse, will change their conduct or recognition of this sole right of Christ. Confusion seems to arise from the fact that presbytery is possibly asserting something more, viz. that the supreme civil law of the land also affords protection of the church from civil meddling. The assertion of the latter does not contradict the assertion of the former. This simply raises the question of whether the church may lawfully assert civil liberties by a suit. It is not clear why the church should be denied due process of law simply because it is the church. It might be plausibly argued that the civil court has a different framework for supporting religious liberty than does the Christian Church. The presbytery is not encouraging retention of a secular framework by its suit, in so far as the challenge to constitutional consistency forces on the courts a decision entailing philosophical considerations tending either to absurdity or adoption of the Christian framework. This is in line with our best apologetic tradition. To put this in other terms, all law, however deformed by human rebellion, is derived from God. Perfect reformation of civil law may not be possible with a single suit, but nothing in presbytery's suit encourages deformation.

2) Though presbytery's suit can be construed, as we have, as consistent with reformation of the laws in a proper direction, the purpose of the suit is not to use the coercive power of the state to enforce its interests with respect to its particular mission. It is certainly true that the suit seeks to secure its interest in civil liberty. This is not the same thing as trying to fulfill it mission directly by changing the culture through legal means (though this may happen as a by-product of such a suit, Lord willing). As indicated in the notation above, this suit does not attempt to remove so called "civil rights" for homosexuals in all areas of life. This suit focuses
on the narrow issue of the church as church. If the suit attempted to exempt public schools (or perhaps even Christian schools) from New Jersey's legislation (desirable as such exemptions would be), then it might be plausibly argued that the church was using the sword to extend its kingdom rather than using the keys. But the case is not particularly one of the church extending the kingdom, per se. The church is securing a civil interest that parallels its spiritual interest. Like the purchase of a building for purposes of worship, or formation of a corporation related to the property interests of the church, this suit is pursuing something in this world which is a lawful help in promoting the gospel, but is not of the essence of its life.

(3) The standards of the church (WLC q/a. 144) require preserving and promoting truth, the good name of our neighbor and our own, and appearing and standing for the truth. Few things are so damaging to a good name than the label of law-breaker. If the law passed by the state of New Jersey is allowed to stand and is enforced, then all Christian people who honor the Lord will be forced to wear the label of law breaker or revolutionary. Since legal means are available to challenge this iniquitous law, failure to issue a lawful challenge could be construed as a breaking of the ninth commandment. Some have asserted that the church should wait until it is directly challenged for law-breaking. At best this is an argument over strategy rather than principle. At worst, it is a failure of principle which risks failure of responsibly maintaining the good name of Christ's church.

(4) The standards of the church (WLC q/a 141,142) forbid prodigality and enjoin "avoiding unnecessary law-suits" while making clear we are to "by all just and lawful means...procure, preserve, and further the wealth and outward estate of others, as well as our own." It is a reasonable argument that when the state seeks to steal that which belongs to Jesus, whether it be things spiritual, or places of worship purchased with the tithes dedicated to Christ, that a civil suit is just and lawful, and can be reasonably construed as a necessary law-suit.

(5) The grounds for taking exception to the suit of presbytery are inferences from the subordinate standards of the church. The suit is not a denial that the church's power is ministerial and declarative any more than the purchase of a worship facility is an assertion that church power is architectural in nature. The suit is incidental. When the standards are invoked so casually to find exception with presbytery's minutes, it should be remembered that the Assembly which framed those standards in their original form was one convoked by an English civil magistrate (parliament). To make proper inferences about what the standards teach, greater care must be given to the text and context of these standards. We provide the following observations about the intention of the standards:

(a) The parliament which convoked the Westminster Assembly tended toward Erastianism and never approved chapter XXX of the WCF.
(b) The Scottish people who adopted the Confession rejected Erastianism but favored establishment.
(c) The American version of the WCF rejects both Erastianism and an Established Christian denomination.

The common denominator of all these positions, is that the civil arm is supposed to be a protector of the church. This position is not denied by the American standards which take the civil branch farthest away from church affairs. Therefore, the constitution of the OPC encourages the civil branch to protect the church and the
suit of presbytery is simply a call to the government to do both what we believe the state ought to do, and what the state itself has said it will do in the first amendment of the United States Constitution.

(6) When the standards say the church is not to intermeddle with things belonging to the civil magistrate except by way of humble petition (WCF XXXI) they are speaking about the subject matter that is to occupy synods and councils. This section of the confession constitutes the last portion of a section on the church which begins in chapter XXV. The fact that this section follows immediately a chapter on censures, which the parliament refused to adopt, indicates a fear of Romanist type meddling and abuse of church authority. It is assumed that a synod will render influential judgments that could affect one’s standing in the church. Neither the parliament or the assembly of divines wanted ecclesiastics to make declarations on political issues. By refusing to give in to parliament on church discipline, however, the Assembly made it clear that excommunication, etc. belonged to the church and not the political-civil branch. This is the constitution we maintain. If New Jersey passes a law which intrudes on this, then chapter XXXI is not strictly applicable. In so far as the church seeks to secure its earthly property and liberty by a suit, this is action by the church’s civil corporation rather than its synod.

Stuart R. Jones
Stated Clerk

COMMUNICATIONS

Communication 1

From the Presbyterian Church in America

May the rich grace of our Lord Jesus Christ strengthen and nurture your hearts in faith and love!

We have received your communication, informing “that the 58th General Assembly (OPC) reaffirm(s) to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America our desire for closer union with the PCA and plead(s) with our brethren to reconsider their rejection of organic union by any process except J & R.”

Your clerk’s letter concludes with this hope: “May the Lord of the church deliver all of us from all thoughts and stands that cannot be substantiated from His word, as we seek to reflect more perfectly His desire for one church.”

We rejoice that your General Assembly has reaffirmed its desire for closer union with the PCA, and further rejoice that we both stand together in this desire, and have adopted the same “Guiding Principles for Ecumenical Relations.” This statement introduces Section II (Developing Procedures for Removing Barriers to Unity): “No schedule of conversations, no procedures for reception or plans for union will be pleasing to the Lord or effective in his service unless his glory is the motivation of our actions.”
We have abundant evidence that this spirit motivated the representatives of the OPC, PCA, RPCES, and RPCNA on September 14, 1979, when the idea of inviting other churches to join the PCA, originally proposed at the 6th General Assembly, came to fruition in the concept of “joining and receiving.” After nine years of discussion and various actions relating to J & R, our 1989 General Assembly reconsidered this, and determined to enter into union discussions with the OPC. This action brought six overtures from as many presbyteries, expressing great concern that such discussions would consume inordinate amounts of our limited time, energy, manpower, commitment, emotion and financial resources, are “of debatable priority” and would yield questionable results.

In response to these overtures, the 18th General Assembly (1990) directed that the OPC be informed that “the best way that the PCA can understand the desire of the OPC for union is for the OPC to take their constitutional steps, requesting to be received into the PCA, and that the Interchurch Relations Committee continue to be available to the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process.”

The representatives of our three denominations (OPC, PCA, RPCES) in 1979 saw the J & R process as a biblical, speedy, and effective way to fulfill the desire of our Lord for the unity of His church, and their judgment has been confirmed by majority votes at OPC and PCA General Assemblies. We are further convinced by events since 1982, when the RPCES entered the PCA through J & R, that it is the best route to achieve unity and practice prudent stewardship.

The late Francis Schaeffer warned that the prolonged intricacies of negotiated church union can bring a drain on our limited resources that our little flocks can ill afford.

The Presbyterian Church in America lovingly assures you that we stand ready to give sympathetic consideration to your request for reception and again offer its Interchurch Relations Committee to be available for discussion of any matters relating to the joining and receiving process that may concern you.

Brethren, pray for us!

Paul R. Gilchrist
Stated Clerk

Communication 2

From the Reformed Church in Japan

August 9, 1992

Thank you for your letter of July 28, 1992 informing us of your invitation to a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

When we look into the past, we noticed that our General Assembly adopted the principles of mission cooperation with the OPC Japan Mission in 1956, but that we had no official agreement of an ecclesiastical relationship between two churches.

We, therefore, can understand that your action taken by the 59th General Assembly would imply that we confirm our mutual relationship by the highest church court. If our understanding is correct, which we would appreciate your
confirmation, we are greatly pleased to implement the ratification our side. At this later stage, however, it is a little difficult to put a proposal into the agenda of our next General Assembly to be held in October this year. We may be able to respond to your action at the next General Assembly in 1993. In any event we are very thankful for your encouragement.

Yoshio Mitani
Stated Clerk

Communication 3

From the Reformed Church in Japan August 9, 1992

Greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have very much appreciated your help and fellowship which you have provided with us for the past nearly half a century.

It is our real pleasure and privilege to invite you to honor us with the presence of a fraternal delegate to the 47th General Assembly of the Reformed Church in Japan. The Assembly is scheduled to be held at Hotel Gimpasou in Aiti prefecture from 13th to 16th in October, 1992. The Assembly is convened by the Rev. Kitisaburou Yasuda, the Moderator, at 2:30 p.m. on the 13th.

Your delegate will have the privilege of the floor. We shall be privileged to provide his lodgings and meals as our guest during his stay with us. For the purpose of arrangement of reservation our Stated Clerk, the Rev. Mitani, looks forward to hearing directly from you or through your Japan Mission.

H. Suzuki
Secretary

Communication 4

From the Presbytery of New York and New England October 15, 1992

(Sent also to Mr. & Mrs. Gary Stevenson and the Session and Congregation of Westchester Orthodox Presbyterian Church)

The statement which follows was adopted by the Presbytery of New York and New England at its stated fall meeting, held on October 13, 1992.

In accordance with the directive of the 59th General Assembly, we, the members of the Presbytery of New York and New England:

a. ask forgiveness of the Stevensons for not sustaining their complaint. We also apologize for the long delay in responding to the urgent needs of you and the other members of Westchester Orthodox Presbyterian Church, thus exacerbating the pain of this breakdown of true Christian fellowship.
b. ask the forgiveness of the Session of Westchester Orthodox Presbyterian Church for failing to give more clear and expeditious direction to help you in healing this division.

c. encourage you, the Stevensons, to seek the forgiveness of the Session of the Westchester Orthodox Presbyterian Church for any offenses you have, inadvertently, or with intent, caused to them.

d. encourage you, the Session of Westchester Orthodox Presbyterian Church, to ask forgiveness of the Stevensons for offenses caused, inadvertently, or with intent, to them and to receive them back into fellowship as soon as possible.

e. further exhort and encourage all parties in this dispute to forgive from the heart and put these matters behind you, and determine in the future to love one another unconditionally, and to work together to rebuild Christ's kingdom at Westchester Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Stephen L. Phillips
Stated Clerk

Communication 5

From the Presbytery of the Dakotas

November 3, 1992

At the September 1992 stated meeting of the presbytery, the following action was taken:

85. It was moved to note in the minutes that the Elder Training Committee is unable to meet the mandate of the General Assembly because the men they were to retrain are no longer elders—motion adopted.

Edward A. Eppinger
Stated Clerk

Communication 6

From the Presbytery of New Jersey

March 12, 1993

The Presbytery of New Jersey on February 27, 1993, determined not to concur with the overture of the Presbytery of the Dakotas seeking revision of the Form of Government, Chapter XXIV, Section 2, because the presbytery regards giving presbyteries the right explicitly to reject a church's request to have its pastoral relationship dissolved without the pastor's concurrence as potentially more destructive to the peace and unity of the local church than the granting of such a request on questionable grounds.

Richard A. Barker
Stated Clerk
Communication 7

From the Presbytery of New Jersey  
March 12, 1993

The Presbytery of New Jersey at its stated meeting on February 27, 1993, determined, in accordance with the requirement of the Form of Government, Chapter XXI, Section 6, to seek the advice of the 60th General Assembly concerning the licensure of candidate Michael G. Evangelista, who has not “completed an adequate course of study lasting at least one year and a half in a theological seminary” (cf. Form of Government, Chapter XXI, Section 3), and further determined, in accordance with the requirement of the Form of Government, Chapter XXIII, Section 3, to seek the advice of the Assembly concerning the ordination of Mr. Evangelista, who has not completed a “course of study in a theological seminary equivalent to that required for a regular three-year theological degree,” and who “lacks competency in the Hebrew and Greek languages, or one of them” (cf. Form of Government, Chapter XXIII, Section 3).

Mr. Evangelista was received under care of this presbytery as a candidate for the gospel ministry on February 23, 1991, at which time he had already been a ruling elder for at least six years, and had been performing most pastoral functions at New Life OPC, Hammonton, N.J. for nearly five years.

It is the desire of the Hammonton church that Mr. Evangelista become their de jure as well as their de facto pastor. The presbytery has received a number of fine testimonials to the faithfulness and efficacy of Mr. Evangelista’s services.

The presbytery has appointed the Rev. Douglas A. Watson to be its primary presenter to the appropriate advisory committee and to the Assembly, if necessary, of further particulars of this matter. Mr. Watson is a commissioner of this presbytery to the Assembly.

Richard A. Barker  
Stated Clerk

Communication 8

From the Session of Immanuel OPC Thornton, CO  
March 27, 1993

We thought it would be helpful to give you an update on the progress toward reconciliation among the churches in the Denver area from our perspective since the last General Assembly. We are involved to a large extent, since Messrs. Cyril Nightengale, LeRoy Petrie and Arthur Samiran had been transferred from the regional church of the Presbytery of the Dakotas to our congregation in the spring of 1992. Also the Rev. Jonathan D. Male, who originally was given permission to work outside the bounds of presbytery to bring Park-Hill Presbyterian Church back into the OPC, has been called by the Thornton congregation and approved by the presbytery to be our Associate Pastor. He is working particularly in Park Hill to bring the Park Hill Church back into the OPC.
We greatly appreciate the work of the General Assembly Committee on Reconciliation as they have labored sacrificially and for many hours to bring about the desired oneness that Scripture commands. A meeting called for all parties in the controversy was held in a motel at the Denver airport in August of 1992. Many differences were aired, confession was made of sin, forgiveness was offered and received and other sins were covered in love. Even though Mr. C. Kenneth Sande, the attorney from Billings OPC, could not be present as originally planned, the Committee on Reconciliation followed his guidelines for Biblical reconciliation and progress was made. The Committee has given our session the few remaining areas where problems still exist, and we are seeking to work through them.

We as a session had asked Elder Arthur F. Johnson and Pastor Male to inquire if anyone attending the Park Hill Presbyterian Church would be interested in joining the Thornton congregation. Messrs. Petrie, Nightengale and Samiran have attended regularly at the Park Hill Church since it has been designated a mission work of our church. Our plan was to examine each one applying for membership as to his or her credible profession of faith in Christ and ask the four questions asked of all who join the OPC. When the examinations would be completed, those we judged to give a credible profession of faith would join our congregation as a group on reaffirmation of faith. It was hoped that later, when officers could be trained and installed, we would petition presbytery to divide our congregation. When the presbytery met at Thornton in September 1992, it forbade us to move in this direction without the approval of a special Committee of Six from the Denver area churches that would be involved in the examination of former Park Hill OPC members. Messrs. Johnson and Male have ceased examining those attending Park Hill since then.

The Presbytery of the Dakotas assigned us the task of completing the pending trial of Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran, since they were in our jurisdiction. Charges had been brought against the three men at the September stated meeting of presbytery in 1991. A difficult two day trial has been completed, and a transcript of that trial is available from our session. Following the trial, Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran sent the following letter to their accusers:

Dear ________:

We write to you out of a deep concern over the divisions existing among the Reformed congregations in Denver. We have been on opposite sides of important issues and the resulting tensions have not been good for any.

We want you to know that we understand that you believed that you acted in good faith and out of a sense of duty to God, as you perceived your duty, in filing and continuing with the charges against us. We also want you to know that we will carry no lasting offense against you and that we forgive any and all incidental offenses which may have arisen during the process.

That stated, we hope that the path toward polarization has ended and that we all can begin to travel the path back to reconciliation and unity. We offer ourselves for any meaningful and constructive endeavor toward that end.

(signed) 3 above

Messrs. Samiran, Petrie and Nightengale presented a letter to our session explaining their involvement in the withdrawal of the Park Hill Orthodox Presby-
terian Church from the OPC. We agree that there were serious problems on all sides, but we felt the weight of their arguments, and thus sent an overture to the March 2-4, 1993, Stated Meeting of presbytery requesting presbytery to rescind its previous declaration that Park Hill was guilty of the sin of schism. Presbytery rejected our overture at the March 1993 meeting. This declaration that Park Hill was guilty of the sin of schism for leaving the OPC was made in response to an overture sent by the session of Bethel OPC of Carson, ND to the September Stated Meeting of presbytery in 1991. For a text of the Bethel OPC overture, see the 1992 Minutes of the General Assembly, pages 304-306.

At the September 1992 Stated Meeting of presbytery, just before the Committee of Six mentioned above was established, presbytery asked our session to consider apologizing for disregarding its declaration that Park Hill was guilty of the sin of schism, since we were beginning to examine for membership some attending Park Hill. We sent the following overture to presbytery dated February 27, 1993:

In response to the minute of the Presbytery of the Dakotas 92-50-87, that we be urged to consider the need to apologize to the presbytery for disregarding the presbytery’s declaration concerning the sin of schism (91-44-82), we, the Session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Thornton, Colorado, do respectfully overture the Presbytery of the Dakotas to reverse its previous action declaring that the Park Hill Presbyterian congregation (formerly known as the Park Hill Orthodox Presbyterian Church) to be guilty of the sin of schism with the attached letter from Cyril T. Nightengale, Arthur Samiran and LeRoy Petrie as grounds.

Mike Morelli,
Stated Clerk

The following is the attached letter mentioned above:

To: Session, Immanuel OPC, Thornton, Colorado
Re: Withdrawal of Park Hill from the OPC
From: Cyril T. Nightengale, Arthur Samiran and LeRoy Petrie
Date: February 9, 1993

The undersigned respectfully submit the following as their explanation and defense to the session of Immanuel OPC regarding the withdrawal of Park Hill Presbyterian Church from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in December of 1990.

We wish, first of all, that it be understood by you brothers, that this withdrawal was an extremely painful decision, and that we do not relish our present status. We hope for the day when Park Hill Presbyterian Church can again enjoy the positive relationship and fellowship that it had with the Presbytery of the Dakotas in former years.

Nevertheless, we firmly believe that the withdrawal of Park Hill from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was absolutely necessary in order for the (now former) ruling elders to protect weak and defenseless members of that congregation from an approach to discipline that was fraught with abuse. Given the same
circumstances today, we would unhesitatingly do the same, however painful. Scripture requires us to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Spirit made us overseers (Acts 20:28). To acquiesce in the abuse of discipline that we observed would have been a dereliction of our duty.

We are aware that we are using very strong words in affirming to you that in Park Hill prior to December of 1990 an approach to discipline was fraught with abuse and harmful to the weak members of the congregation. We believe that we can prove this statement. We regret the necessity of raising and restating this history at this point; however, we attempted in good faith to raise this concern before. We further submit that we are not attempting in any fashion to revive any unprosecuted charges at this late date. The Presbytery of the Dakotas did not address our concerns when it summarily dismissed our charges against the Rev. Jack K. Unangst. It may ignore our concerns no longer.

It is our perception that a slim majority of those in the Presbytery of the Dakotas believe that what lies at the heart of the controversy between the presbytery and Park Hill is the issue of discipline. We reject, however, the contention that our controversy with Mr. Unangst rendered us “repeat offenders.” We hope to set before you and later to presbytery our contention that our disagreements with Mr. Unangst regarding discipline and our earlier disagreements with the Rev. Leonard J. Coppes are not of a similar nature. With respect to Mr. Coppes, we would remind you brothers and hopefully in the future the presbytery that several issues other than discipline were involved with Mr. Coppes, including charges against Mr. Coppes. Clearly he has acknowledged this as recorded in the minutes 87-35 of the Presbytery of the Dakotas. As to the matters involving Mr. Unangst, an issue of discipline was indeed an occasion and an element in our controversy. We cite this difference in the two cases in order to undergird our argument that we were on “new ground” with Mr. Unangst. We believe that we must point out this past history because of the view held by some in presbytery that our controversy with Mr. Unangst is a “repeat offense.” Such a view is not only harmful but is an oversimplification that breeds inaccuracy.

We perceive that Mr. Unangst rushed into matters of discipline without due regard to the rules for discipline of the OPC and also without sufficient effort to work patiently with people with problems. He was simply too willing to proceed to erase the names of Christians from the rolls of membership.

Our controversy with Mr. Unangst seemed to come to a head in the Michael Nunley charges. Mr. Unangst pushed to get the Nunley case underway in a manner that ignored the provisions of the Book of Discipline. We attempted to slow the process in order to bring it into conformity with the rules set forth in the Book of Discipline. For our consistent and repeated insistence that the rules be obeyed and followed, we were subsequently charged with sin by Mr. Unangst. During our trial before presbytery, we were prohibited by order of the presbytery from exercising our office as elders. We would stress that our effort in the Nunley judicial proceedings was not to insulate Mr. Nunley from calls to repentance but an effort on our part to prevent Mr. Nunley from being cast out of office without due process supported by a fair hearing. We were denied the opportunity to bring the Nunley charges to completion. When we appealed to the 1991 General Assembly, we were vindicated in our approach of “playing by the rules.” The General Assembly stated
that "each separate delay in the Nunley trial has a reasonable explanation."

The congregation of Park Hill OPC voted at a properly called meeting that the pastoral relation of Mr. Unangst with the church be dissolved. The Presbytery of the Dakotas did not act on this decision. It did not send it back for reconsideration as it could have done, nor did it dissolve the relation of Mr. Unangst with the congregation. The General Assembly vindicated our argument that Mr. Unangst was preserved in office by a wrongful delay in the vote of presbytery for the dissolution of the relationship.

Since we were ordered by presbytery not to exercise our office as elders, the presbytery appointed Mr. Mike Johnson and Mr. Louis LaBriola, both elders from the Providence OPC of Denver, to augment the Park Hill session. There was no consent by the governed as is clearly required in the Book of Discipline. The 1991 General Assembly agreed with the complaint filed in our behalf, that these men were illegally imposed on the church.

Our first "brush" with this illegally constituted session came quickly when one of our members, Mrs. Anita Hanson, gave us a letter mailed to her and her husband, Everett, by this augmented session. Both were threatened with erasure in two months unless they immediately conformed to demands regarding their attendance. This letter to the Hansons, in addition to citing no constitutional authority, and making demands greater than those made by the constitution of the OPC, was issued by men of this illegally constituted session, some of whom the Hansons had never met. This letter to the Hansons impressed us with its harshness. Clearly, at least to us, this illegally constituted session intended to side with Mr. Unangst in what we perceived and believed to be a misplaced zeal to purge the membership rolls of the Park Hill church without regard for the rules. We further submit to you, brothers, although we did not learn of this until late in 1992, that this illegally constituted session has never rendered any accountability to any regarding this attempted purge. The minutes of that session meeting which authorized this attempted purge of the rolls of membership of Park Hill do not exist and have never been reviewed by presbytery.

The Park Hill congregation had its first vote to leave the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the fall of 1990. The second and final vote was delayed until after the December 1990 meeting of presbytery in the hope that presbytery would then grant the requested dissolution of the pastoral relationship which had been voted on four months earlier by the Park Hill congregation. This would have allowed Park Hill additional time to reconsider its earlier decision to withdraw and to address the issue of the augmented session. When presbytery denied the request of Park Hill to have its relationship with Mr. Unangst dissolved, and when it continued the illegally augmented session, we were convinced that the abuse of authority and discipline would continue unabated. Therefore with heavy hearts Park Hill completed its withdrawal from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church with the second vote of the congregation on December 16, 1990.

We are acutely aware, because many have pressed it upon us, that many would prefer that we had remained in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and pressed complaints against any and all actions which we believed were illegal. We agree that in an ideal world this would be desirable, but, sadly, this is not an ideal world and there are times when even those within the church are subjected to abuses of church
power. We genuinely feared that the aforementioned acts of the augmented session plus the further illegal act of presbytery in denying the request of Park Hill to dissolve its pastoral relationship with Mr. Unangst, carried the real threat of wounding members of Park Hill, particularly those weaker members. To the many of our concerned brothers and sisters who tell us that we should have remained in the denomination and filed our complaints, and particularly those who say we would have “won” those complaints, we say: Had these complaints been sustained over a period of time, is there any assurance or guarantee that during the time it would take to pursue these complaints, that we would be able then to reassemble all the scattered pieces and damaged lives? Could we then proceed on with church life as though nothing had ever happened? We respectfully submit that we would have been utterly irresponsible before our Lord had we ignored real hurts and real dangers to the flock while “winning” victories in the church courts. We freely admit operating on the basis of fear, fear of the results of the abuse of discipline. Our consciences could not and still will not allow us to rest comfortably when we believe the sheep to be in danger.

We fervently wish that the situation could be otherwise. We believe that it could not and please understand that our hearts are broken at the necessity of Park Hill withdrawing from our beloved OPC! With hope and confidence we still look forward to the day in which a climate will be provided in which Park Hill can exist in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church without fear that Christ’s little ones will be abused.

Cyril T. Nightengale
Arthur Samiran
LeRoy Petrie

After hearing extensively from all sides and observing impartially the problems of the Denver area churches, the General Assembly Committee on Reconciliation presented a proposal to the March 2-4, 1993 stated meeting of the Presbytery of the Dakotas that we believe is a workable solution to the existing problems. A counter proposal was moved by presbytery that changed the Committee’s proposal significantly. This motion removes Park Hill as a mission work of Thornton OPC, and we will not have the exercise of discipline and government over it. The Thornton session is no longer directly involved in the process. Park Hill has been asked to deal directly with the presbytery. A copy of the presbytery’s suggested change is in the hand of its stated clerk at the time of this writing, and we have already filed a complaint over the essence of this issue. See argument #3 of our first complaint before this General Assembly. The original proposal of the General Assembly Committee on Reconciliation is as follows:

ACTION:

1. That the Presbytery of the Dakotas determine to treat Park Hill Presbyterian Church (PHPC) as a mission work of the Thornton Church, allow Mr. Male and the Thornton Session to exercise discipline and government over the Park Hill Presbyterian Church, with the ultimate goal of reconstituting the Park Hill Church as a congregation of the presbytery. When PHPC is so constituted they must confess
their part in the sin of schism in the rending of the body of Christ that resulted in the
formation of Trinity Church and the continued existence of the Park Hill Church.

2. That the Committee on Reconciliation of the General Assembly be re-
quested to call a meeting of six representatives of the presbytery, six representatives
of the Park Hill Church and Messrs. Male and Wynja for the purpose of pursuing
reconciliation.

   The representatives of presbytery shall be chosen by the presbytery and
   the representatives of the PHPC shall be appointed by the Thornton session but will
   include Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran.

   The Committee on Reconciliation shall arrange the venue, time and agenda in
   a way similar to the August 1992 meeting between the representatives of Park Hill,
   Trinity and Providence Churches.

3. That the Presbytery of the Dakotas invite the Park Hill Church to apply for
reconstitution as a congregation of the Presbytery of the Dakotas with the sole
requirement being that the Park Hill Presbyterian Church confess its part in the sin
of schism in the rending of the body of Christ that resulted in the formation of Trinity
Church and the continuing existence of the Park Hill Church.

4. That the Presbytery of the Dakotas confess its culpability in connection
with the schism.

   The Thornton session believes that the original proposal of the General
Assembly Committee on Reconciliation will best bring about the desired reconcili-
ation to the parties that have been at odds for several years and bring honor to Christ
and His church. We look for further instruction and exhortation from the Commit-
tee on Reconciliation and from the General Assembly itself as we are involved with
this situation on a daily basis.

     R. Wynja
     Immanuel OPC, Session

Communication 9

From the Presbytery of Northern California March 23, 1993

At its spring stated meeting on March 19-20, 1993, in Modesto, the Presbytery
of Northern California of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church on motion determined
to forward a communication to the 60th General Assembly.

Re: Modern English Study Version of the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter 2,
Paragraph 1 "passive properties."

The language of the Westminster Confession of 1646, "without body, parts or
passions," in part, expressed the truth that God does not possess emotions (pas-
sions) like those of human beings. The word "passion" means a violent, intense or
overmastering feeling, ungoverned or unmitigated by reason. Hence God's love is
not the love of attraction. It is a love directed to unworthy creatures by choice. His
wrath is not explosive rate, but rather, a settled and intense disposition against sin and evil. By using the word "passions," the Westminster Divines attempted to distinguish between imperfect human emotions and God's perfect attributes.

The words, "passive properties" do not faithfully reproduce the thought of the Confession of 1646. It is true that God cannot be acted upon, so He has no "passive properties." That is to say, God is not receptive to, nor is He determined by impressions or influences outside of Himself. But this was not the intent of the Westminster Divines when they used the words, "without . . . passions."

If the Modern English Version is intended to be a faithful translation of the Confession of 1646, the language at this point needs careful attention. The word "emotions" would be a weak substitute for "passions" as it does not accurately and fully convey the sense of "passions." In the absence of a more suitable word, we would suggest retaining the original word "passions."

Richard C. Miller
Stated Clerk

Communication 10

From the Presbytery of New Jersey

Enclosed is the response of the Presbytery of New Jersey to the request of the 59th General Assembly (cf. Minutes, §219) for the biblical and confessional rationale for the presbytery's law suit against the State of New Jersey. Included as attachments are two of the responses that the presbytery received pursuant to the GA's suggestion "that individuals, sessions and/or presbyteries send an expression of their convictions on this matter to the Clerk of the Presbytery of New Jersey . . . ." The presbytery received a total of four such responses, all of them in support of the presbytery's action.

Richard A. Barker,
Stated Clerk

(Note: the response is found on page 338)

Communication 11

From the Presbytery of Southern California

At the Second Stated Meeting of the Presbytery of Southern California, meeting April 16-17, 1993, presbytery included the following Judicial Committee notation and subsequent presbytery action in reference to the complaint of David L. Bahnsen against the Session of Covenant Community Church of Orange County, appealed to the 60th General Assembly in its minutes:

Mr. Garrisi read communication #16.b, and advised presbytery that,
Appendix

concerning the appeal of the David Bahnsen complaint against the Session of the Covenant Community Church of Orange County that was heard at the last stated meeting, presbytery has received notice that Mr. Bahnsen has carried his appeal to the General Assembly. In his covering letter to the General Assembly, Mr. Bahnsen requests that the General Assembly rebuke presbytery three times.

On motion it was determined that presbytery authorize the moderator to appoint a deputy to defend presbytery should the requests to rebuke presbytery come before the General Assembly.

Presbytery took the following action:

It was determined, on motion, that the presbytery, through its clerk, communicate to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, our hope that the Assembly will not consider items #2 through #4 of Mr. David Bahnsen's letter (appeal dated March 4, 1993, communication #16.b and #21) as they constitute new complaints against the presbytery.

Robert M. Coie  
Stated Clerk

Communication 12

From the Presbytery of Southern California  
April 20, 1993

At the Second Stated Meeting of the Presbytery of Southern California, meeting April 16-17, 1993, "on motion presbytery determined to inform the General Assembly that it concurs with the overture of the Presbytery of the Dakotas concerning the Christian Reformed Church.

Robert M. Coie  
Stated Clerk

Communication 13

From the Presbytery of New York and New England  
April 21, 1993

The Presbytery of New York and New England informs the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church that with respect to the 59th General Assembly's directive re the Stevenson Complaint against the Session of Westchester Church, Mt. Vernon, the members of presbytery listed below believe that that part of the directive which called upon the presbytery to ask the forgiveness of the Stevensons was inappropriate for the following reasons:

1. In so doing, the presbytery was directed to ask forgiveness for its actions upholding the constitutional prerogatives of one of its judicatories. The Book of
Discipline, V.2.a.(3) provides for erasure as an act of discipline without full process “when a member . . . persists in attending such a church in preference to his own.” The fact that the Stevensons were guilty of such conduct was clearly, fully, and persuasively documented and argued by the special committee of presbytery at its October 11,12, 1991 meeting. It is irresponsible and inconsistent for the presbytery to contravene that constitutional decision without good reason. Its action had the practical effect of undermining the legitimate disciplinary actions of one of its churches—an action recommended by the presbytery’s own special committee for the well-being of the Westchester congregation.

2. The 59th General Assembly did nothing ministerially and declaratively to prove that the Stevensons had been sinned against by the presbytery in its action. The Assembly’s judgments regarding the manner in which the Stevensons were treated did not disprove the fact that the Stevensons “persisted in attending (another) church in preference to their own,” the constitutional standard applicable in this act of discipline. The Assembly’s direction to the presbytery to ask forgiveness had the effect of requiring an implicit faith on the part of the presbytery, contrary to the Form of Government, III.3. and the Westminster Confession of Faith, XX.II.

3. It is wrong to ask forgiveness for something that is not sinful. Neither the 59th General Assembly nor the proceedings of the October 12-13, 1992, presbytery meeting demonstrated sin in the presbytery’s failure to sustain the Stevensons’ complaint against it. The presbytery made a mockery of the solemn act of asking forgiveness for sin if it did so only to submit to the General Assembly and appease the various parties in this case. cf. “Whatsoever is not done in faith, nor accompanied with a personal persuasion of obligation or lawfulness of it in the sight of God, is pronounced to be sin, Rom. 14:23,” Robert Shaw, *The Reformed Faith: An Exposition of the Westminster Confession of Faith*, p.206. Also: “One must never confess as sin what he is not sure biblically, is sin. Nor should he confess to sins he does not believe he has committed merely in order to appease another who has charged him with such wrongdoings.” Jay Adams, *From Forgiven to Forgiving*, p.101.


Stephen L. Phillips
Stated Clerk

Communication 14

The Session of the Covenant Community Church of Orange County

April 13, 1993

The lateness of this letter is not because I have taken a long time to write it, but because I only learned of the need to communicate with you on April 11, 1993. The specific object of this letter is to preliminarily give you some history and
background of the complaint brought by Mr. Bahnsen against the session of Covenant Community Church (CCCOC).

In Mr. Bahnsen's letter to the General Assembly he reports that "this matter (of Mr. Arnold running away with Cathie Bahnsen) was not sufficiently urgent to the session to bring charges before two full years had elapsed. Two years!"

The matter of Mr. Arnold aiding and abetting Cathie Bahnsen in her sin was of serious and immediate concern to the session of CCCOC. Immediately after Mr. Arnold and Cathie Bahnsen's departure on June 13, 1989, the session appointed a special committee consisting of Mr. Jones and Mr. Curto to work with the Bahnsens in locating the whereabouts of Cathie Bahnsen and Mr. Arnold and in assisting the Bahnsen family in every way it could. In August 1989, after having learned of Mr. Arnold's whereabouts, the Special Committee flew to Florida to confront Mr. Arnold concerning this whole matter. Then from September 1989 to September 1990 the Special Committee of session maintained both written correspondence and telephone conversations with Mr. Arnold calling him to repentance for his sin. During this period of time Mr. Arnold was willing to hear the session and dialogue with the Committee, though not convinced in all matters as to his sin.

On August 10, 1990, the session received a letter dated July 14, 1990, from Mr. Arnold requesting that he no longer be considered a member of CCCOC stating his reasons for the request.

The session did not act on Mr. Arnold's request sending him instead a letter telling him why the session would not take action on his request and again calling him to repentance for his sin and for further communication with the session. This letter was sent both to his home in Florida and his mother's address in Oxnard, California. Mr. Curto also tried calling Mr. Arnold's mother to try and obtain information concerning Mr. Arnold's whereabouts, but she refused to speak to him. The session also during September and October 1990, while waiting for a reply from Mr. Arnold, contacted elders of the Presbytery of Southern California to seek their wisdom as what to do or how to proceed with the case of Mr. Arnold in light of his having asked to be erased.

In November 1990, having received no reply from Mr. Arnold, the Special Committee conferred about drawing up formal charges against Mr. Arnold. The Committee decided that due to the impending situation of Dr. Bahnsen's relationship with CCCOC that we would wait until the first of the year, 1991, to draw up formal charges and prosecute the case against Mr. Arnold. We believed this to have been in accord with BD V.2.a.(2) and BD III.2.

The matter of Dr. Bahnsen's relationship with CCCOC was brought to the first stated meeting of the Presbytery of Southern California February 1991 and immediately after that meeting the Special Committee conferred and began drawing up formal charges against Mr. Arnold and proceeded in steps to bring him to trial.

In an appeal brought by Mr. D. Winslow, Mr. Arnold's appointed counsel, the presbytery determined that the session erred in not erasing or filing formal charges without delay upon Mr. Arnold's request to be no longer considered a member of CCCOC in the fall of 1990. The presbytery at first upheld the Censure of Excommunication of Mr. Arnold, but then by complaint reversed that decision and instructed the session to erase Mr. Arnold's name from the rolls of CCCOC and record the circumstances in its minutes.
The session, therefore, following presbytery’s instruction entered into its minutes an acknowledgment of the session’s error, the Erasure of Mr. Arnold (an act of discipline, BD V.2.) and a Censure of Rebuke to Mr. Arnold which was all read to the congregation of CCCOC and copied to the Bahnsen family (Mr. Arnold was also notified of these matters according to the BD.)

With regard to the session not seeing the matter as “sufficiently urgent” as to have appealed to General Assembly concerning the presbytery’s reversal of our censure, Mr. Bahnsen never raised the issue or brought a complaint to session in this regard. The session was trying to follow the presbytery’s guidance in Biblical submission. Mr. Arnold was erased from the rolls of the Church with a public Censure of Rebuke.

The session of CCCOC did publicly acknowledge the error of which the Presbytery of Southern California found it to be delinquent. What the session denied in Mr. Bahnsen’s complaint (and presbytery upheld the session’s denial) was that the session’s action in the case “constitutes a severe failing in his calling, work and qualification as an elder in the Church, for which there is no moral excuse.”

L. Anthony Curto
Moderator of Session

Communication 15

The Presbytery of Philadelphia May 1, 1993

The Presbytery of Philadelphia informs the 60th General Assembly that the presbytery believes that the Assembly should not grant the plea of the overture from the Presbytery of the Dakotas (Overture #2), relative to termination of the fraternal relationship of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Christian Reformed Church (CRC), on the following grounds:

(1) A letter to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church in this same matter is being proposed to the assembly by the Committee of Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations which itself includes the warning that “your handling of this matter may affect our relationship with you in the future.”

(2) Such an approach to another church, which gives it an opportunity to respond to a heartfelt plea, is preferable to giving it an ultimatum to do a certain thing by a certain time, or else.

(3) Past experience shows that it is unwise to decide on a future course of action, which is to be based on someone else’s action, before knowing the grounds of their action. The overture would trigger automatic consideration of termination of our fraternal relationship with the CRC by our next (1994) General Assembly regardless of what circumstances or considerations may or may not have entered into the decision of the CRC. It is well to remember the biblical wisdom that man cannot know what even a day will bring forth.

(4) The overture sends a strident signal to the CRC that would at least tend to undo the plea to them that is at the heart of the proposed letter of the Ecumenicity Committee, namely greater faithfulness to the Word of God.
(5) Such a premature action is not necessary. If the 1993 Synod of the CRC does not take a stand that the presbytery believes proper, it can overture the 1994 Assembly, on then known grounds, to do what the presbytery deems appropriate. It would thereby automatically be on the docket of that (1994) Assembly.

A. LeRoy Greer
Stated Clerk

Communication 16

Presbytery of the Northwest

At its stated meeting April 23-24, 1993 the Presbytery of the Northwest extended a call to Mr. G. Mark Sumpter, a licentiate of presbytery, to undertake the office of evangelist as a home missionary in Wasilla, Alaska. Because Mr. Sumpter has not completed a course of study in a theological seminary equivalent to that required for a regular three-year theological degree, presbytery determined to report the following to the General Assembly:

The Presbytery of the Northwest finds Mr. G. Mark Sumpter qualified for ordination to the gospel ministry and believes he should be granted an exception to the rule requiring a regular three-year seminary degree, for the following reasons: (1) he earned the MAR degree from Westminster Theological Seminary, Escondido, California; (2) he has passed rigorous presbytery examinations; (3) he has demonstrated competence in ministry, serving many years as a ruling elder and advisor to the denomination in youth ministry; (4) he has further demonstrated well his gifts and competence for the ministry of the word, serving regularly and faithfully the past four years as a church planter in Wasilla, Alaska; (5) presbytery has demonstrated its confidence in Mr. Sumpter by extending him a call to serve as an ordained evangelist in Alaska; and thus presbytery respectfully asks the 60th General Assembly for its advice in this matter, as provided in the Form of Government, Chapter XXIII, sec. 3.

Presbytery further appointed Mr. Poundstone, with Mr. Dillard as an alternate, to present its request to the Assembly.

Donald M. Poundstone
Stated Clerk

Communication 17

Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland

Greetings in the Name of our risen Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. We wish to thank you most sincerely for your kind invitation to send a delegate to your 60th
General Assembly in June of this year. We would have loved to have been able to respond in the affirmative, but, as Mr. Galbraith acknowledged in his letter, distance prohibits at this time. God-willing we shall be able to send a delegate on some future occasion if the invitation is still there.

We would, however, ask that you convey to the Assembly our fraternal greetings. The relationship between our two Churches continues to be precious and vital in these days of evangelical compromise. Our prayer is that the Lord would be pleased to strengthen the bond between our Churches in years to come.

Please inform the Assembly of encouraging progress in many of our congregations. Although we are a small denomination and much despised by many, we have seen a steady trickle of conversions and of believers from compromised Churches coming into our fold. We take this as a token of the Lord’s goodness to us.

Some of our churches find themselves affected by the ongoing conflict in our country. They are situated in areas of sectarian tension, or else have members who are in the security forces and are daily exposed to the threat of terrorism. We believe that none but God himself can bring lasting peace to our land and would ask you to pray to that end.

Our chief concern is to see the standard of Truth raised high throughout the country. We are dismayed, not only be the rise of secularism by the decay of evangelicalism. Many, even of those who claim to be Reformed, have capitulated in key areas of doctrine. We remain in the conviction that only faithfulness to Christ and the Evangel can hope to build a stable and effective Church on earth.

We thank you for your interest in us and pray that you may have a profitable time in Assembly together.

Mark G. Johnston
EPC Inter-Church
Relations Committee

Communication 18

Reformed Churches of Australia

May 12, 1993

Thank you for your Church’s warm invitation to send a fraternal delegate to your General Assembly in Beaver Falls during June. We appreciate the warmth of our ongoing relationship. Last year we were privileged to have our Dr. Keith Warren attend your Assembly and bring our fraternal greetings in person. His report reflected this warmth that we speak of.

However, we are not able to delegate anyone this year but our written fraternal greetings are conveyed in just that way, fraternally. May the Spirit of Christ guide you as you engage in deliberating the issues designed to prosper the Church and may He lead you into greater unity, a sound hope and much joy. We look forward to hearing good things from you and in the meantime remain,

Ray Hoekzema
Stated Clerk
Communication 19

Presbytery of the Southwest  

At the Spring Stated Meeting of the Presbytery of the Southwest, the presbytery determined to seek the advice of the 60th General Assembly regarding the licensure of Charles K. Carroll, who is currently under care.

The following is the motion approved by the presbytery:

With a view to the licensure of Mr. Carroll, on motion the presbytery determined to report the whole matter of Mr. Carroll's examinations, with the exception of a lack of the requirement of a Bachelor of Arts degree, to the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, seeking their advice regarding waiving this requirement (FG XXI.6), believing that the exception is warranted by the manifest qualifications of Mr. Carroll for the office of the gospel ministry.

Presbytery appointed Mr. John R. Hunt, Jr. to represent the Presbytery of the Southwest before the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church concerning this exception.

I have included a work sheet on the motions passed to give an overview of what actions were taken.

John H. Johnson  
Stated Clerk

Communication 20

Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland  

I want, on behalf of the Business of Synod Committee of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland to express our warmest thanks for the kind invitation received recently from your Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations Committee to send a delegate to the General Assembly in Beaver Falls. It would be a great pleasure to accept this invitation but the distance involved, the cost of travel and the proximity to our own Synod meeting which begins Lord willing on 14th June mean that we are unable to accept. We assure you of our deep interest in your work and witness and our prayer that the Lord will richly bless your Assembly this year.

The first Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland met in 1811 though the first Irish Reformed Presbytery had been set up in 1763. The membership of the Church in Ireland including Covenant children is at present approximately 4000. We value your interest and prayer support as we minister in the difficult circumstances in Northern Ireland. Recently one of our Church buildings in Belfast was re-opened after being severely damaged over a year ago by an I.R.A. bomb. In the face of such events we give thanks to God for His preserving care and for the evidence of His blessing on the Church's witness.
We look forward, Lord willing, to meet some of you at the Commemoration of the Westminster Assembly organized for September in London. This should provide and opportunity for closer fellowship and contact between our churches.

One of the proposals at our Synod meeting in June is that we send a delegate each year to the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. If this is passed it may well be possible in subsequent years for the delegate to attend your Assembly also. This would be a privilege for us and we trust it will, in the Providence of God prove possible.

We send our greetings in the Lord and pray that you will continue to know His presence and His blessing on your service for Him.

Knox Hyndman (Clerk)

Communication 21

The Reformed Church in Japan

June 15, 1993

It is my great pleasure to greet you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ as you gather together at the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Thank you very much for your kind information about, and invitation of us to the Assembly meeting. May we take this opportunity to share with you some of the recent developments within the Reformed Church in Japan, for it is not practically possible to send our fraternal delegate to your Assembly meeting.

As you may know by now, we the RCJ will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding. We will adopt two declarations of faith: one on the doctrine of predestination (which will be a part of material of a new future confession of faith), and the other on the theme of evangelism (or mission). The former tries to appropriate to the spiritual lives of the believers one of the most central doctrines of the Reformed Churches, which, however, has been easily misunderstood and hence disliked by many. It will underscore the basic spiritual/pious and practical/pastoral characteristics of the doctrine. The latter focuses on the relevancy of the Christian mission in Japanese context today. It will point out such an essential relation between the Church and the mission that the mission identifies the Church in terms of the progressive advancement and fruit-bearing of God’s redemptive revelation in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.

Another gracious possibility is that the Rev. Stuart E. Lauer, OPC missionary, may help Kobe Reformed Theological Seminary as its official teaching staff. The OPC Japan Mission has greatly helped the RCJ’s growth with evangelism and Church building particularly in the northern presbytery over the past many years. In addition to this, there is recently coming out an idea how the OPC can help the RCJ in another way than in the ordinary way since the time of Mr. M. T. Bube’s visit with us in May 1991. Kobe Reformed Theological Seminary, which is the RCJ’s only official institute for theological education and ministerial training of the candidates for the Church ministry, has now only two full-time professors and several part-time professors and instructors, and hence needs more full time teaching staffs for the seminary’s better educational and training equipment. We truly hope that the Lord
of providence will make our talk and plan come true. We ask you to pray for this for the Lord’s further guidance.

May the almighty God of creation and redemption richly bless all of you at the 60th memorial General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church for the promotion of the Reformed faith and life toward the enhancement of His own kingdom.

Yoshio Mitani
Stated Clerk
COMPLAINTS

Appeal to the General Assembly of Complaint 1

From the Session of Immanuel OPC Thornton, CO  March 27, 1993

And now, this 27th day of March 1993, comes the session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, CO, and appeals from the decision of Presbytery of the Dakotas, March 2-4, 1993, in denying the complaint of the Thornton session against presbytery dated December 5, 1992. The complainants believe that presbytery erred in denying this complaint in as much as the complaint at three points cites presbytery as erring by failure to follow the Form of Government, and presbytery, by denying the complaint, continues in its violations of the Form of Government.

The Complaint

And now, this 5th day of December 1992, comes the Session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, Colorado, and complains against the action of Presbytery of the Dakotas as recorded in the presbytery minutes 92-50-89, whereby presbytery appointed a committee of six (in part) "I. . . to meet with any members of the Park Hill Presbyterian Church who may desire to become members of the OPC . . . (and) . . . to approve the reception of the former members of the Park Hill Church only on the following conditions . . ." and in support of this complaint sets forth the following specifications of error:

1. Presbytery's action is in violation of FG XIII.7 and 9, which state, at parts relevant, "The session . . . shall receive, dismiss, and exercise discipline over the members of the church . . ." and "The names of members shall be placed upon or removed from the rolls of the church only by order of the session, and according to the provisions of the Book of Discipline." Presbytery's action clearly intrudes into the exclusive prerogatives of sessions, contrary to presbyterian order.

2. Presbytery's action is in violation of FG XIII.10, which provides for the augmentation of a session by elders appointed by presbytery, "with the consent of the governed." It is acknowledged that presbytery's act is not an entire augmentation. It is, however, clear that the presbytery's action is a pro re nata augmentation, an augmentation of the Thornton session for one specific purpose, the task of examining former members of Park Hill. And, absent the consent of the Thornton congregation, this action is out of conformity with the Form of Government.

3. Presbytery's action closes a door that FG XXIX.A.1 requires presbytery to leave open. This provision states, at part relevant, "A group of believers, meeting regularly for worship on the Lord's Day and under the jurisdiction of a session of presbytery, and not yet organized as a separate congregation of the OPC, shall be denoted in the records of presbytery as a mission work." In spite of this constitutional requirement, presbytery's mandate to its Committee of Six disallows Thornton to designate Park Hill a mission work. In fact, Thornton has already so designated,
and presbytery is without lawful authority to disallow that designation (witness the use of "shall" as opposed to "may"). Further, presbytery has both approved Thornton's call of an Associate Pastor for this very labor and denied a complaint against that call.

4. Presbytery's action is in violation of BD II.B.2.c. Because Park Hill Presbyterian Church is not regarded in presbytery as a church of like faith and practice, its members desiring membership in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church would be received by reaffirmation of faith. This article of the Book of Discipline sets the criteria by which reaffirmations of faith are to be judged. The criteria is a credible profession of faith. Presbytery proposes to add another test for membership, repentance for a specific sin. This is in error for the following reasons:
   a. It is legalistic to make repentance for specific sins elemental to a credible profession of faith unless it is presbytery's purpose to require specific repentance for all other known sins.
   b. It is unconstitutional and unbiblical to tack on specific performance beyond a credible profession of faith as a criteria for church membership (Galatians 3).
   c. It is within the Biblical definition of repentance to consider that someone alleged to have left the fellowship of the OPC without Biblical warrant repents by petitioning to return to the OPC.

As amends, the complainant(s) respectfully petition presbytery;
1. To seek forgiveness of the Thornton congregation for its unlawful acts toward it, and
2. To revise the mandate of the Committee of Six and bring the mandate within the confines of the Church's standards of government.

(End of complaint)

The Action of presbytery complained against is the following:

Presbytery minute 92-50-89 from the 1992 stated September meeting reads, "The presbytery erect a committee of six composed of 3 teaching and 3 ruling elders to meet with any members of the Park Hill Presbyterian Church who may desire to become members of the OPC, that the members of the committee be drawn from the 3 OPC churches in the Denver area, and that the committee be instructed to approve the reception of the former members of the Park Hill church only on the following conditions: (a) that there be satisfactory evidence of repentance for the sin of schism, (b) that the persons who wish to be received agree to regularly attend worship services in whichever OPC church they wish to join, (c) that the committee bring a full report of its activities to the March 1993 stated meeting of the presbytery." 
"... The motion carried." Messrs. Male, Nilson and Johnson had their negative votes recorded. The moderator ruled that each session would appoint one ruling and 1 teaching elder to the committee of 6 and that the convener will be the teaching elder of each church to rotate alphabetically each year.

What caused this motion to be passed by the Presbytery of the Dakotas was a committee set up by our session, of ruling elder Arthur F. Johnson and the Rev. Jonathan D. Male, to meet with any who attended Park Hill Presbyterian Church and
wished to become members of Immanuel OPC of Thornton. These men had met with several individuals when the presbytery Visitation Committee from Trinity OPC of Denver reported this to presbytery at its September stated meeting in 1992. The presbytery then set up a committee made up of the Rev. G. I. Williamson and the Rev. Jack Unangst to meet with the elders of our session who were present at that September stated meeting. After discussing the matter with the Thornton session members who were present, several motions were proposed by this special committee. The Thornton session is complaining against this motion which passed and asks the General Assembly to uphold the Form of Government against presbytery’s unwarranted action at the following three points. The session agrees that specification of error #4 in the original complaint should not be pressed further, and it is hereby abandoned. These three points amplify the first three specifications of error.

1. The Form of Government XIII. 9 states clearly that the credibility of a (in this case) reaffirmation of faith is determined by vote of and rests in the hands of the session, ONLY. The action of presbytery clearly intrudes into this most fundamental right of a session. Further, even if only incidentally, presbytery’s action expresses distrust of the Thornton session’s ability to rightly discern a credible reaffirmation of faith made by certain individuals. The Thornton session’s competence to exercise such a discernment is established, first, by its very existence as the session of a church in good standing with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and second, by the fact that the session has specifically addressed the issue of schism with former elders of Park Hill and has documented its actions to presbytery. A copy of the session’s action in regard to the issue of schism is attached for reference by the Committee on Appeals and Complaints. Clearly, presbytery has exceeded its authority, and specification of error #1 in the session’s complaint should be sustained.

2. The Form of Government XIII.10 states clearly that a session can be augmented only with the consent of the governed. Augmentation of the Thornton session for the purpose of examining members of Park Hill for membership in the OPC is clearly in view in presbytery’s action. By the terms of presbytery’s action, reception of members of Park Hill could not take place simply by vote of the Thornton elders. The Committee of Six is placed in the position of approving individuals for membership in the Thornton congregation. Without the consent of the congregation of Thornton, members of the Committee of Six cannot obtain that authority. In fact, they have not been extended that authority by the Thornton congregation. Presbytery has exceeded its authority and specification of error #2 in the session’s complaint should be sustained.

3. The Form of Government XXIX.A.1 clearly allows the Thornton session to designate Park Hill as its own mission field, as it has done by specific session action. Notice that presbytery is given no discretion in the matter. “A group of believers (a test Park Hill meets) meeting regularly for worship on the Lord’s Day (a second test Park Hill meets), and under the jurisdiction of a session (a third test Park Hill meets) or presbytery, and not yet organized as a separate congregation of the OPC (a fourth test Park Hill meets), SHALL (no discretion to disallow it) be denoted in the records of the presbytery as a mission work.” Presbytery’s action pre-empts the Thornton session from carrying out legitimate mission work, work for which presbytery has approved the call for an Associate Pastor. (Note that Mr. Male serves as Thornton’s
Associate Pastor and not as presbytery’s Evangelist for the work at Park Hill.) Presbytery is, then, on the horns of an impossible dilemma. If its Committee of Six is examining people for membership in Thornton, it is operating as a session without warrant. If it is examining members of Thornton’s mission work for its own rolls at large, it is annexing a mission work. Presbytery has intruded into Thornton session’s proper jurisdiction and has exceeded its own authority, and specification of error #3 in the session’s original complaint should be sustained.

The Thornton session requests of the General Assembly that it asks the Presbytery of the Dakotas:

1. To seek the forgiveness of the Thornton congregation for its unlawful act toward it.
2. To rescind its action and dissolve the Committee of Six.

Complaint 2

From the Session of Immanuel OPC Thornton, CO

And now, this 27th day of March 1993, comes the session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, CO, and appeals from the decision of Presbytery of the Dakotas (POD) on March 2-4, 1993, in sustaining the complaint of the Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church of Denver, CO session against the Thornton session regarding the Thornton session having ruled out of order certain charges against Messrs. Cyril T. Nightengale, LeRoy Petrie and Arthur Samiran on the grounds of the statute of limitations (Book of Discipline III.2). Note that, in the charges filed against Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran, that no sin whatsoever is alleged to have been committed by the accused on December 16, 1990, but only in oral arguments delivered to the Thornton session by the accusers during a meeting in January of 1993 was the effort made to allege sin on the part of the accused on December 16, 1990. The appellant further notes that the oral recasting of the charges in January 1993 appears to the Thornton session to be an effort to regain the possibility of a conviction, but not an effort to more clearly set before the accused their alleged transgression and/or call them to repentance. The fact remains that the words “leading up to” December 16, 1990 in the charges means and is equivalent to “prior to” December 16, 1990 and thus a charge filed December 16, 1992 is still beyond the statute of limitation. The complainants are handicapped in carrying this appeal, in as much as the minutes of presbytery are not yet available, and hereby reserve the right to update this appeal to correct any mis-statements when those minutes become available. The complainants believe that when presbytery sustained Trinity’s complaint, it went against the constitution and set aside the law of the church. The complainants believe that their answer to the Trinity session when they first denied the complaint contains sufficient argument and rationale why the General Assembly should reverse the decision of presbytery and vindicate the Thornton session’s denial of the complaint.
The Complaint

To the Rev. Richard Wynja, Clerk of Session of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian:
And now this 20th day of January, A.D. 1993, comes the session of Trinity OPC and complains against the action of Immanuel session in connection with rejecting the charge of 16 Dec. 92 regarding the sin of schism against Mr. Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran.

1. The sin charged is the act of schism on 16 Dec. 90. This date was the culmination of a series of divisive actions led by these three men apexing to this final act, the division of the congregation of Park Hill (the body of Christ) into two segments. If the form of the charge lacks clarity then do not dismiss it on technical grounds (BD III.7.b), but change the form, as, “We...charge Mr. L. Petrie, et.al., with the sin of schism on 16 Dec. 90 by leading the Park Hill Orthodox Presbyterian Church (PHOPC) to divide into two segments at that time.” This in essence was explained under the paragraph on specifications. It is the division that occurred on 16 Dec. 90 that is the schismatic act. All their actions up to this date were cumulative divisive maneuvers.

2. When Trinity OPC session last met with Immanuel’s session to discuss the other charges pending, the date discussed for the filing of the schism charge was on or about 17 Dec. 92 (actual date is 16 Dec. 92). The reason this date was jointly discussed was because the schism and the rending of the body of Christ at PHOPC occurred at that time. There was no confusion at that time. There was no confusion then regarding when schism occurred. The final vote of the congregation was the date everyone had in their mind at that joint session meeting. Now Immanuel’s session rejects the charge saying the date was not the one we had all discussed at that meeting. You never told us of the change of mind until the charges were filed 16 Dec. 92. We ask you to remain loyal to the date we discussed previously.

3. The letter the three men sent to POD members 10 Aug. 92 intimates their taking responsibility for schism by saying they caused “more hurtful strife and division within the presbytery” by their previous actions relating to the church.

4. The three men, still elders, violated their duty as officers in Christ’s church. They had a biblical and confessional obligation to maintain the unity of the body of Christ (I Cor. 12:21,25; WCF XXVI.2). They ignored these standards and willfully led the PHOPC into schism, the final act of 16 Dec. 90.

5. Presbytery of Dakotas Visitation Committee, the Rev. Steve Doe, urged the three men (along with the congregation) to follow due process, prior to 16 Dec. 90. The men refused to follow the avenues available to them to redress grievances in the OPC and chose to lead the congregation to schism on 16 Dec. 90.

6. The sin of schism was verbally addressed to the three men charged on Aug. 21 and 22, 1992. It was during the GA visitation team’s (Tyson/Peterson) work on reconciliation that they were confronted, but there was no admission of guilt then. They remained silent.

7. The overture from Bethel OPC (POD minutes 91-44 to 91-46 declaring the Park Hill congregation schismatic, (upheld at 59th GA of OPC) was based on their 16 Dec. 90 vote to leave the OPC. This was seen as the culmination of the events orchestrated by the Park Hill elders (Petrie, Samiran, Nightengale). Their sin of schism, 16 Dec. 90, was also the sin of schism of the congregation. The elders
remaining in the OPC while leading the congregation out adds to their duplicity. They fostered, encouraged and enticed others to jump into the division and side against the regional court, hampering unity and promoting a party spirit.

8. The three men's vote of abstention 16 Dec. 90, as elders, and not even speak against schism nor to counsel the congregation to heed the church's court and follow their grievances to the end was in itself schismatic since they were under solemn vows to promote the peace and unity of the church as elders. They did not resign their office then. The vows were binding.

9. On 3 Nov. 90 the congregation voted the first time to leave the OPC. There were no abstentions then. The three men gave no regard for the at least 1/3 of the congregation who voted not to leave. There was no counsel stopping this, but to the contrary, in Oct. 90 they had already voiced their desire to leave the OPC at a meeting at elder Nightengale's house with members of the congregation present.

10. The General Assembly of 1991 did not act in a judicial (overview) manner regarding the charge of schism against the three men because this charge was not brought before them in written formal character until 16 Dec. 92.

Amend: for the complaint against Immanuel Session, 20 Jan. 93:
1. The Session of Trinity OPC requests the reinstatement of the original charge of schism on 16 Dec. 92.

Sincerely in Christ,
Rev. Jack K. Unangst,
Moderator, Trinity OPC Session

(end of complaint)

The charge brought against Mr. LeRoy Petrie:

We, Mr. Roy Van Zweden, Ruling Elder Samuel Bridgeman and Deacon Vincent Lewis, of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, charge Mr. LeRoy Petrie with the sin of schism leading to the splitting of the congregation of Park Hill OPC into two groups: FG XXV.6.b.(4); I Cor. 12:25; I Cor. 3:1-3; Ex. 20:16; Rom. 1:31; II Tim. 3:3; Larger Catechism #143-145; FG 10.2; WCF 22.26; Pro. 6:12, 14, 16, 19.

Specifications: All the actions below, leading up to a division at PHOPC, are a course of events supporting the offense, the division occurring on 16 Dec. 90.

1. That on or about 16 July 90 Mr. LeRoy Petrie, et. al, was charged by Pastor Unangst, et. al, with particular sins and by 1 Aug 90 Mr. L. Petrie, C. Nightengale and A. Samiran (all elders) asked the pastor to resign. He refused, and they called a special session meeting 3 Aug. 90 to call a congregational meeting 19 Aug. 90 to vote on this issue. The congregation (minus the now congregation of Trinity OPC) voted in favor of their request.

A letter was drafted, 16, 17 Oct. 90, by elder Petrie and driven around by him (16 Oct.) to over 1/4 of the congregation to hold a congregational meeting to vote on remaining or withdrawing from the OPC on or about 19 Oct. 90. A meeting was held at elder C. Nightengale's house (attended by members VanZweden, Bridgeman,
Lewis) for the purpose of explaining the petition to withdraw and the necessity to leave the OPC. The elders (Petrie, Nightengale, Nunley) conducted the meeting.

Mr. Petrie stated (19 Oct.) to the effect that the church (Park Hill) needed to get out now, from underneath the Presbytery of the Dakotas because they were out to get Park Hill (and elders) and they needed to protect themselves and later on they’d try to get back into the OPC under another presbytery. Mr. Nightengale said in effect that the POD was wrong in what it was doing to them and the POD already had its mind made up. He did not dissent from Mr. Petrie.

On 3 Nov. 90, after the trial of these elders, (where they were found guilty then), the congregation voted to leave the OPC, except for the members of now Trinity OPC; there were no abstentions, the elders voting with the majority to leave. On 16 Dec. 90 the congregation voted finally to leave the OPC. The congregation was divided and members of Trinity OPC remained in the OPC and the three elders remained in the OPC, abstaining in the final vote, having their names put on the roll of the regional church. They (Mr. Petrie also) remained in and still attend the independent work of Park Hill and do so, as Mr. Petrie states, “exclusively.” Mr. C. Nightengale is included here, also, Samiran.

2. On or about 19 Oct. 90 Mr. LeRoy Petrie at the meeting at C. Nightengale’s home, fostered, encouraged and argued for the congregation to vote to leave the OPC and side against the regional court openly encouraging a party spirit and thus splitting the congregation. The accusers argued to the contrary, to the effect, to follow out due process in the courts, but were not heeded.

3. On or about 16 Oct. 90, Mr. L. Petrie signed the petition to request a congregational meeting for the purpose of voting whether to remain in the OPC.

4. On or about 16 Dec. 90 the PHOPC voted to withdraw from the OPC and Mr. L. Petrie remained in attendance with that group aiding and abetting their division/schism from the rest who voted to remain in the OPC (called Trinity OPC now).

Witnesses: Mr. Roy Van Zweden, Mr. Vincent Lewis, Mr. Samuel Bridgeman, Mr. Gregorio Nightengale, Mr. Tom Watts, the Rev. Jack Unangst.

Documents: ‘69+’ page document, POD Court trial (Oct. 31-Nov. 2, 1990); Lewis/Bridgeman letters.

The response to the complaint of Trinity OPC by the Session of the Immanuel OPC of Thornton:

The session of Immanuel OPC, Thornton, CO respectfully denies the complaint of the Trinity session and determines that it cannot grant the amends requested. As grounds, we answer each specification in the complaint as follows:

1. Specification #1 cannot be sustained for two reasons. First, the complaint states that “the sin charged is the act of schism on 16 Dec. 90.” But the charge plainly accuses of “the sin of schism LEADING TO the splitting of the congregation . . .” (emphasis ours). The language of “leading to” plainly indicates that sins alleged in the charge were alleged sins committed prior to December 16, 1990. For this reason,
this session correctly dismissed the charges on the grounds of the two year statute of limitations. Second, the session rejects the appeal that "if the form of the charge lacks clarity then do not dismiss it on technical grounds (BD III.7.b) but change the form." Violation of the statute of limitations is neither a failure of clarity nor a correctable technical error. It is a violation of the rules of order, a sin of omission, and a failure to confront in a timely fashion.

The session finds that it cannot detect even a trace of an accusation of sin committed by the accused on December 16, 1990. That concern is simply not written into the charge document. The session deeply regrets that the spoken intent of the men filing the charge communicated to us on January 23, 1993 cannot now find legal expression. However, this session would remind those who filed these charges that the cause of this frustration cannot rest with this session which must obey its vows to uphold the standards of government and discipline of the church.

Specification #2 cannot be sustained in as much as, even if there were confusion at last fall's meeting with this session as to the applicable statute of limitations, the written rules of the church are so abundantly clear re: the statute of limitations that those filing the charges may only blame themselves for allowing relevant statutes to expire. December 16, 1992 was described by this session as a last possible statute of limitations. But it is inescapable that the statute of limitations for an alleged offense committed on October 16, 1990 is October 16, 1992, that the statute of limitations for an alleged offense committed on October 19, 1990 is October 19, 1992, and that the statute of limitations for an alleged offense committed on November 3, 1990 is November 3, 1992. The date of December 16, 1992 is relevant only as the statute of limitations for an alleged offense committed on December 16, 1990. This session rejects any and all explicit or implicit allegations that it mislead members of the Trinity session as to the statute.

Further, this session would remind the Trinity session and those filing the charges that the statute of limitations was not written with a view to encouraging 11th hour filings. In the Biblical meaning of discipline, calls to repentance are to be issued in a timely fashion. To allow a brother to languish in impenitence is, and ought to be, inconceivable. The statute of limitations was written as a reminder that after a reasonable period of time, offenses must be presumed to be either forgiven and reconciled or no longer worth pursuing. Those who crowd the statute of limitations without affirming that reasonable explanations exist for their delay miss this meaning of Biblical discipline. The failure of those filing these charges to affirm such reasons for delay means that they must now bear the responsibility for their frustration, a frustration brought upon themselves by their inexplicable delaying.

3. Specification #3 cannot be sustained. The charge alleges causing the division of a local congregation. The complaint quotes the accused as conceding that their actions caused "more hurtful strife and division within the presbytery." There exists no prima facie case, and there exists no argument that the acknowledgment of the latter is a confession of the former. We find this to be a confusion of apples with oranges.

4. Specifications #4-7 cannot be sustained and will be addressed together. This session finds that the Trinity session confuses the issue by lumping together diverse definitions of schism, and by using these definitions interchangeably. The overture of Bethel OPC, Carson, ND, for example, plainly designates as schism...
withdrawal from the OPC without Biblical warrant. The constitutionally required admonition from Rev. Doe uses this same understanding of schism. The complaint uses this same definition of schism in its own argumentation in specification #4, but then changes the definition in the rest of its arguments. The “new” definition of schism, previously never addressed nor alleged in the written charge presently at issue, is the breaking of the unity of the Park Hill congregation. And, as stated previously, the absence of this allegation, with this new definition, from the written charge document means that this session cannot lawfully begin to address it now.

Further, this session finds only the naked accusation that the accused willfully fragmented the unity of the Park Hill congregation. No argument is advanced as to how this alleged willful fragmentation was accomplished. We appreciate the anxiety of those who found themselves caught between their perception of loyalty to their local church and their perception of loyalty to their denomination. Some of us also found it necessary to make painful choices resulting from that conflict. However, it is, to us, entirely plausible that the accused intended no fragmentation of the local church, but instead intended that the entire congregation unitedly withdraw from the OPC. This session promises and pledges to inquire further into the withdrawal of Park Hill from the OPC. At the same time, this session finds that a unilateral accusation of fragmenting the local church without supporting arguments may, in the future, prove to be an assertion that the minority must prevail over the majority.

5. Specifications #8-9 cannot be sustained, and will be addressed together. These specifications must be denied in as much as these accusations are entirely absent from the written charge. This session states, again, that while it bears responsibility to correct deficiencies in form in charges, it bears no responsibility derived from the standards of the church to introduce brand new arguments to a defectively written document, deriving those arguments from verbally expressed wishes and/or from complaints communicated to us after the statute of limitations on the accusations have expired. This session, further, repeats its understanding that the resultant lamentable situation is caused not by the failure of “the system,” but by the failure of those bringing the charge to confront the issue in a timely fashion.

R. Wynja  
Clerk pro tem

Complaint 3

From David L. Bahnsen  
March 4, 1993

My family and I have experienced intense pain and injustice for over three years now within the church due to its failure to appropriately discipline a man who ran off with my mother (and eventually married her). Our hurt over the church’s lack of care and its judicial negligence regarding this scandalous situation has even robbed us on occasion of our confidence in the Christian faith. Please hear my appeal to you.
I have tried my best to follow presbyterian procedure, but to no avail. Almost everybody I know, believers as well as unbelievers, are alarmed that a man can run off with the pastor’s wife and aid her in abandoning her family, refuse to repent, and not face excommunication from the body of Christ. I plead with you to intervene and correct the wrong that has been done to me and my family by the church. Please do so for the sake of the innocent, to vindicate the honor of Christ, for the instruction and warning of the church, and for the good of the offender.

By this letter I am carrying to you a complaint—written all the way back in November 1991—which has been denied by the session of Covenant Community Church (which had taken over two years to bring charges against the unrepentant man) and then denied by the Presbytery of Southern California (which took an entire year before properly hearing my complaint) in February 1993. Are not the elders of the church somehow remiss in their duties if they permit a man to sin flagrantly, tear apart a family, inflict horrible emotional suffering, refuse to repent, and escape excommunication?

The specific object of my complaint is the negligence of the session of Covenant Community Church. However, the complaint now has a history of its own which should lead the General Assembly, I hope, to consider the original occasion and subsequent handling of this whole matter as well. In humility I would ask you, please, to consider these things:

1. Nearly four years ago a man within the congregation of Covenant Community Church scandalously ran off with my mother, would not repent, but eventually entered into an adulterous marriage with her. This matter was not sufficiently urgent to the session to bring charges before two full years had elapsed. Two years! Thus when the man’s conviction was appealed to the presbytery, not surprisingly the presbytery judged this to be an inordinate delay. To the consternation of many, instead of rebuking the session, the presbytery reversed the unrepentant man’s conviction. The matter was not sufficiently urgent to the session that it would appeal presbytery’s removal of the man’s censure of excommunication. So on November 18, 1991, I complained against the session of Covenant Community Church for delinquency. It refused to acknowledge its error and denied the complaint. I would request that the General Assembly of the church rebuke the session.

2. As indicated, the Presbytery of Southern California agreed with the man’s appeal that the session was guilty of inordinate delay in bringing charges. However, when I complained against the session’s delinquency for this inordinate delay, the presbytery would not uphold the complaint. I would request the General Assembly to rebuke the presbytery for this inconsistency.

3. Also, as indicated, the presbytery used the session’s procedural delinquency to take the alarming step of reversing his conviction and attendant censure. I would request the General Assembly to rebuke the presbytery for allowing a miscarriage of substantive justice in a notorious case of sin on the basis of a formal irregularity.

4. Further, although I carried my complaint to the presbytery in January of 1991 and specifically asked that it be heard at the stated meeting in February of that year—in order to allow me opportunity, if necessary, to carry the matter to last year’s
General Assembly—the presbytery put me off and did not properly hear the complaint until a full year later, in February of 1993! I would request the General Assembly to rebuke the presbytery for not showing a timely concern to deal with this case—just as the session failed to do so originally.

Gentlemen, I have been bewildered by the indifference of the session and the presbytery to see to it that Biblical justice would be done for the sake of me (and my family), the church, the offender, and the honor of Christ. Does not Paul direct the church that an unrepentant sinner should be excommunicated (I Cor. 5)? Nothing was so “beyond the control” of the session or presbytery that this should not have been accomplished. Should not the church, then, be rebuked for its failure? I sincerely ask the General Assembly, please to now set matters right.

The Complaint:

To Robert Coie, Moderator of the Session of Covenant Community Church of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church:

And now, this 18th day of November, 1991, comes David L. Bahnsen and complains against the delinquency of the session of Covenant Community Church in its failure to actively pursue discipline and lodge charges in a timely and just manner against a man who had courted an illicit relationship with my mother and who aided her in abandoning me, my brothers and sister, and my father; such irresponsibility and neglect of duty by the elders has brought open reproach upon Christ and the government of His church, evidenced rationalization of unbiblical priorities, and shown a lack of concrete pastoral sensitivity, care and protection for my family.

In support of this complaint, I set forth the following reasons:

1. On June 13, 1989, Mr. David Arnold ran away with my mother, helping her sinfully to abandon my father and the children of our family; recently they married. Prior to her desertion, the children were aware that Mr. Arnold’s relationship with their mother was not morally wholesome (for instance, secret embraces or phone conversations, his sneaking into my parents’ bedroom when our father was away, etc.). The session has not been ignorant of the facts related to this case. Indeed, at the time of the desertion my father was a pastor of the church.

2. Nevertheless, after a few months the session no longer made it a priority to pursue discipline with Mr. Arnold. He ignored them or put them off, and they did not take aggressive steps to bring him to justice. In April of 1990 my mother was excommunicated, even though she too had ignored the session—and Mr. Arnold still did not even have charges brought against him. Week after week, and month after month passed. A full year later, in April of 1991, Mr. Arnold still did not have charges brought against him.

3. The session was warned that Mr. Arnold would stall and put them off for awhile, then drop dealing with the session altogether; still the session did not initiate formal discipline. Accordingly, in July of 1990, Mr. Arnold wrote and requested his name be dropped from membership. The session wrote one letter of reply in August.
of that year and then did nothing whatsoever regarding Mr. Arnold for fully nine months.

4. In April of 1991, the Augmented Visitation Committee of the presbytery had to instruct the session no longer to ignore the Arnold discipline. After all this delay and at outside prodding, finally, in May of 1991, charges were lodged, with the trial not commencing until the end of August and ending in early September—well over two years after Mr. Arnold scandalized the church and my family by running off with my mother.

5. Regardless of the series of excuses offered by the session for delay after delay, I believe it is shameful that a man can run off the pastor’s wife and not face the discipline of the church for over two full years. Scripture makes confrontation with a notorious sinner a higher priority than that (Eph. 4:26; cf. Matt. 5:23-24).

6. In September of 1991 I objected to the session’s neglecting of the need to discipline Mr. Arnold. Mr. Curto later told me that I was completely off base to think this way about the session; rather, he told me, he himself was assigned to pursue the case but had simply not done anything at all on it for over four months. No satisfactory personal apology was offered. I believe that the admission of completely ignoring this important matter for such a length of time shows disregard for Biblical needs and priorities.

7. In October of 1991 the Presbytery of Southern California upheld an appeal against the session in the David Arnold trial, finding the session guilty of “inordinate delay” in instituting judicial process against him—specifically what I complain about here. In November of 1991 this was the basis for presbytery nullifying the verdict against Mr. Arnold, thus releasing him from facing what the Bible requires in the case of unrepentant and flagrant sin, namely the specific sanction of excommunication. The session’s neglect of their Biblical duty has thus produced a shameful and painful injustice for the church as well as for our family.

As amends for this delinquency and violation of their Biblical and sworn duty as elders in the church of Christ, I would ask that the session do the following:

1. The session should repent publicly before the congregation (without excuses or “explanations”) that they failed in their duty as overseers and pastors in Christ’s church by ignoring the immediate needs of discipline regarding an open and unrepentant sinner, thereby denying justice to the guilty, ignoring the needs of the innocent, and bringing reproach upon Christ;

2. The session should specifically apologize to my family for subordinating and for long periods of time totally ignoring our personal hurts and needs, pursuing other ends when they should have been pursuing discipline with the man who wrecked havoc in our family and protecting our good name (as well as my father’s);

3. Each member of the session should publicly acknowledge that this inability to do justice in a notorious case of open sin constitutes a severe failing in his calling, work and qualification as an elder in the church, for which there is no moral excuse.

(signed) David L. Bahnsen
Complaint 4

From Ben and Sandra Manring

To: Pastor Donald J. Duff, Clerk of the General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church:

And now, this 16th day of April, A.D. 1993, come Ben and Sandra Manring and give notice of intention to appeal to the General Assembly from the judgment of the Presbytery of the Midwest in the case of the Complaint of Ben and Sandra Manring against the Spencer Mills session.

The Complaint

And now, this 24th day of March, A.D. 1992, come Ben and Sandra Manring and complain against the action of the session of Spencer Mills Church, Gowen, Michigan (hereinafter “Session”) and its Steering Committee for the oversight of Grace Community Church, Lansing, Michigan (hereinafter “Steering Committee”) in connection with the following worship practice condoned and conducted at Grace Community Church, Lansing, Michigan and at Spencer Mills Church, Gowen, Michigan:

A. The introduction of “special music” into Sabbath Day worship services.

Definition: By “special music” (hereinafter “special music” without quotes) we mean vocal song performances in which a part, usually the majority, of the congregation is not expected to be involved vocally. This definition, however, does not intend to address situations where the congregation is engaged in antiphonal or responsive singing, or metrical singing by parts. Neither does it regard a person or persons who lead the congregation in its singing to be engaged in performing special music.

This practice engenders two further offenses about which we also complain:

B. Females being allowed to teach and admonish the congregation during worship services through singing by means of special music performances.

C. Institution of the above listed practice (A) and its correlate (B) in spite of the fact that 1) they are not necessary to the proper worship of God, and 2) they are offensive to the consciences of some of the worshipers.

Preamble to Reasons for the Complaint

Recognizing that the conducting of special music performances is a long-standing practice in many congregations of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and having
had some slight experience in voicing our complaint against it informally, we beg the attention of the Session and the Steering Committee to consider seriously the reasons set forth in support of our complaint. We realize that the subject may appear to some to be insignificant and unworthy of serious attention. If we might, we ask that you meditate upon the following excerpt from a book review by the highly respected Southern Presbyterian theologian of the last century, R. L. Dabney. The book he was reviewing concerned a matter of worship practice, although one different from the subject of the present complaint. Dabney begins his review of John L. Girardeau’s controversial book, Instrumental Music in Public Worship, by saying,

The author in his eloquent conclusion anticipates that some will meet his arguments with sneers rather than serious discussion, which he proposes to endure with Christian composure. It is a reproach to our church, which fills us with grief, to find this prediction fulfilled in some quarters. Surely persons calling themselves Presbyterians should remember that the truths they profess to hold sacred have usually been in small minorities sneered at by the arrogant majorities. So it was in the days of the Reformers, of Athanasius, of the Apostles, and of Jesus Himself (The Presbyterian Quarterly, July 1889).

While we do not mean to call into question your integrity in answering us, nor to accuse you of sneering at us, nor think you to be arrogant, we would simply point out that we are a minority which holds a conservative point of view that has been lately regarded by many as eccentric. It therefore behooves you to hear us with all the more care and deference.

Reasons for Complaint

In support of said complaint we set forth the following reasons:

I. Scriptural and Confessional Reasons

I.1 Special music, along with all other worship practice, is governed in Scripture and in the confessional standards of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church by the regulative principle which is expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith XXI.1 under the heading of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day: “But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture” (emphasis ours).

I.2 In support of this assertion the Confession cites Deut. 12:32, Matt. 15:9, Acts 17:25, Matt. 4:9-10, Deut. 4:15-20, Ex. 20:4-6, and Col. 2:23 of which the following are given here:
"You shall not make for yourself any carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth" (Ex. 20:4).

"You shall not worship the Lord your God that way ... Whatever I command you, be careful to observe it; you shall not add to it nor take away from it" (Deut. 12:31-32).

"And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:9).

1.3 To these Scripture references might be added the following (italics are ours):

"According to all that the Lord had commanded Moses, so the children of Israel did all the work. Then Moses looked over all the work and indeed they had done it; as the Lord commanded, just so they had done it. And Moses blessed them" (Ex. 39:42-43).

"Take heed to yourself that you do not offer your burnt offerings in every place that you see; but in the place which the Lord chooses, in one of your tribes, there you shall offer your burnt offerings, and there you shall do all that I command you" (Deut. 12:13-14).

"When I brought them into the land for which I had lifted my hand in an oath to give them, and they saw all the high hills and all the thick trees, there they offered their sacrifices and provoked Me with their offerings. There they also sent up their sweet aroma and poured out their drink offerings" (Ezek. 20:28).

"And if you make Me an altar of stone, you shall not build it of hewn stone; for if you use your tool on it, you have profaned it" (Ex. 20:25).

"I have stretched out My hands all day long to a rebellious people, who walk in a way that is not good, according to their own thoughts; a people who provoke Me to anger continually to My face; who sacrifice in gardens, and burn incense on altars of brick" (Is. 65:2-3).

"They have also built the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings to Baal, which I did not command or speak, nor did it come into My mind" (Jer. 19:5).

"Then Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, each took his censer and put fire in it, put incense on it, and offered profane fire before the Lord, which He had not commanded them. So fire went out from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord" (Lev. 10:1-2).

"So he made offerings on the altar which he had made at Bethel on the fifteenth
The regulative principle is not complicated. It teaches us to approach the worship of God with fear and trembling, yet rejoicing in the knowledge that what we do has the approbation of God. If we abide by the regulative principle we need not fear that we have sinned against the Lord by presuming to enhance our worship of Him with our well-intentioned but sinful ideas. The teaching of the Scriptures on this matter adds up to a summarizing principle that can be stated no better than in the words of Solomon:

"Walk prudently when you go to the house of God; and draw near to hear rather than to give the sacrifice of fools, for they do not know that they do evil" (Ecc. 5:1).

The Westminster Assembly's Larger Catechism expresses the regulative principle more fully in its Question 109, What are the sins forbidden in the second commandment? giving in answer, "The sins forbidden in the second commandment are, all devising, counselling, commanding, using, and any wise approving, any religious worship not instituted by God Himself; ... corrupting the worship of God, adding to it, or taking from it, whether invented and taken up of ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good intent, or any other pretence whatsoever; ..."

Since there is no positive Scriptural command, either by example or injunction, for the church to engage in the worship practice of special music it is disallowed on the basis of the regulative principle. It is not necessary that a Scriptural prohibition be found in order to ban such a practice, only that there exist no positive command enjoining it.

Since it may not be equally clear to all that special music is forbidden by the regulative principle, further reasons against it, and illustrations of how the regulative principle applies to it are given below.

It may be objected by some that there exists in the Scriptures a command by example for certain persons to arise out of the congregation or from behind the pulpit to address God or God's people in song. For example, some believe Psalm 134:1-2 to be a greeting from the priests with morning watch duty to those coming off of the night watch, while verse 3 is the response of the night watch to the morning watch. Similarly it is possible that Psalm 118:2-4 involves a sort of responsive singing between the congregation and the priests.

We reply that our objection to special music is not intended to restrict the congregational singing such that this sort of responsive interchange may not take place between portions of the congregation as they sing the Psalms. The practice in question is that which involves a person or persons arising from
their places to stand before the congregation to sing, as it were, apart from the congregation. Such singing differs from that of the two examples above in that the singers sing alone while the remainder of the congregation looks on.

I.10 Neither is our complaint intended to deny that under the Old Testament system of worship certain divisions of the Levites were set apart for singing (I Chr. 9:31-33) while other divisions were responsible for other matters in and about the Temple and did not necessarily take part in the daily singing associated with various Temple ceremonies. The Levite singers had a dual purpose: 1) that associated with the ceremonial aspects of the Temple ministry (II Chr. 23:18; 29:25-28), and 2) to lead the congregation in worship (II Chr. 23:13). These singers were men (I Chr. 6:31-47), "heads of the fathers' houses of the Levites" (I Chr. 9:33).

I.11 Although there is mention of "women singers" in the Old Testament, it is evident that they performed non-ecclesiastical functions in the civil sphere (I Sam. 18:6; II Chr. 35:25) and as entertainers (II Sam. 19:35). Ezra and Nehemiah are careful to distinguish between the Levite singers and the "men and women singers" who were not of the Levites (Ezra 2:41, 65; Neh. 7:44, 67). There is never mention of the women singers as a distinct group taking part in Temple worship, either ceremonially or as leaders of the congregation.

I.12 Prior to the institution of the Tabernacle worship there is mention of Miriam "the prophetess" leading the women in a dance with timbrels and song at the celebration over God's triumph over Pharaoh at the Red Sea in an antiphony to the song of Moses and all Israel. This we do not believe to bear on the question at hand first because we have not complained about antiphonal/responsive singing in the congregation, second because the events connected with the Red Sea crossing are not normative in all aspects for post-revelational worship, and third because the context is not that of formal worship.

I.13 From Deuteronomy 32:44 one might think that the Song of Moses was a special music presentation by Moses for the children of Israel. However, it is clear from the previous chapter, verse 22, that Moses received it to teach the children of Israel. In fact, he taught it to them the same day he received it. Since it was newly received from the Holy Spirit, simple logic dictates that it is impossible that the congregation could sing it without first being taught anyway. This example provides a useful paradigm in approaching any inspired song with a view to its significance for the question of special music. It must be kept in mind that fresh revelation from the Spirit of God, when it was meant to be sung, had to have been sung first by the prophet alone; it was only sung corporately after the congregation had it taught to them.

I.14 It may be posited that the Song of Mary (Lk. 1:46b-55), the Song of Zacharias (Lk. 1:68-79), and the Song of Simeon (Lk. 2:29-32) constitute Scriptural examples of the offering of special music. This we deny for the following reasons:
I.15 1) These prophetic utterances, although they are often called songs, bear a tenuous relationship to literal song. The Scriptures do not call them songs. They are introduced by the words, "Mary said, . . ." "Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying, . . .," and "[Simeon] said, . . ." Although they might loosely be called songs because of their lyrical tenor, they are in fact prophetical utterances of the same genre as the oracles of Balaam found in Numbers 23 and 24.

I.16 2) These prophetic utterances are precisely that, i.e., prophetic utterances. As such, the activities of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon associated with uttering them can have no direct application as examples for us to follow in our worship. This is because Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon were behaving under the special revelatory inspiration of the Spirit of God. For the same reason we may not take New Testament examples of tongues speaking or prophecy as normative for our worship.

I.17 3) The context of these utterances was not worship in the congregation of God's people. If these utterances had been song, and if they were not uttered upon the instant of the Holy Spirit's revelatory inspiring influence, they would still not be sufficient examples of special music as it is being practiced in the churches. Our complaint is not aimed at stifling persons from singing in the presence of other persons in general, but at removing unauthorized activity from the worship service.

I.18 In summarizing the argument from Scripture we would simply say that there is no Scriptural command, either by injunction, example, or good and necessary inference which may be adduced in proof of the assertion that we are to be conducting special music during our worship services. It may occur to some, to use a technical term, that we have been arguing from silence. We answer that indeed we have. Silence regarding a matter of worship is all that is needed to prove that the matter is forbidden.

II. Historical Reasons

II.1 In addition to demonstrating that there is no Scriptural justification for the practice of conducting special music during worship we would note that this practice has no precedent in the Calvinistic branch of the churches of the Reformation. Actually, it was not even a part of the Church of Rome until after the time of Aquinas. We find Erasmus, the contemporary of Luther and a Roman Catholic, complaining of it and its novelty in these words:

We have brought into our church a certain operose and theatrical music; such a confused disorderly chattering of some words, as I hardly think was ever heard in any of the Grecian or Roman theatres. The church rings with the noise of trumpets, pipes and dulcimers; and human voices strive to bear their part
with them . . . . Men run to church as to a theatre, to have their ears tickled. And for this end organ-makers are hired with great salaries, and a company of boys, who waste all their time in learning these whining tones. Pray now, compute how many poor people, in great extremity, might be maintained by the salaries of those singers. (Cited by Girardeau, Instrumental Music in Public Worship, 162.)

II.2 Although the Lutherans continued the Roman Catholic practice of maintaining choirs, Calvin, Knox, and their Puritan heirs repudiated it, insisting that the singing of the Psalms belongs to the entire congregation. Accordingly, the Westminster Assembly’s Directory for Public Worship enjoins only congregational singing, directing that each member of the congregation have a Psalm book. The Puritan aversion to church choirs is further demonstrated in that Anglican choirs were eliminated during the Commonwealth period. Skipping ahead a number of years for the sake of brevity, the Directory for Public Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., at least up through 1914, in a similar manner to the Westminster Assembly’s Directory, provides direction only for congregational singing.

II.3 It is only within the last 100 years that special music has become widely accepted in Presbyterian and Reformed churches. Much of it is surely due to its acceptance in the non-Reformed churches where worship has not been carefully guarded by Biblical principles. Can anyone doubt that the influence of Ira Sankey’s singing on the platform of D. L. Moody’s traveling evangelism service persuaded many a church to have an Ira Sankey of their own?

II.4 With such a weak foundation it is no wonder that we find an uncertain and insufficient reference to special music in the OPC’s Directory for Worship. Without transition, the Directory for Worship devotes the last sentence in its discussion of congregational singing to special music by saying, “No person shall take a special part in the musical service unless he is a professing Christian and adorns his profession with a godly walk.” No attempt whatever is made to clarify what this means, whether it be referring to the piano player, the precentor, the choir, the orchestra, the soloist, the band director, the minstrel, the harpist, or the studio technician. If it is possible to justify the soloist and the choir by this ambiguous allusion then why not the others? This only demonstrates that present justification for special music in the OPC is resting not so much on principle as it is on custom.

---

1We would point out that contemporary special music, although similar to the choir, contains more pronounced elements of entertainment and personal elevation of the singer than does the choir.
III. Practical Reasons

III.1 We would finally mention a few practical reasons why special music ought not to be condoned in our churches. The first is enunciated in part B of our complaint proper. Here we point out that women are taking a teaching role in the church by engaging in special music performances. This is particularly offensive when the special music is composed of a woman soloist. The Scriptures are clear that women are not to teach in the congregation:

"And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence" (I Tim. 2:12).

III.2 Singing involves teaching; "teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Col. 3:16). Therefore, women soloists are teaching and admonishing, and that publicly. At one of the worship services at Grace Community Church we experienced a perfect example of how natural it is for someone offering special music to also read the Scriptures to the congregation. Just prior to singing a selection to the congregation one Sunday morning, one of our members read a few verses out of the Scriptures to the congregation. The verses were meant to explain the intent of the song she was about to sing. It was a very natural thing for her to do in our opinion. However, since she was a woman, the Steering Committee instructed her not to read to the congregation before singing in the future. Conceivably, then, although she was not the author of the song she sang in the incident above, under the present policy of our church she can write her own songs and deliver her own message to us by singing, but she may not read God's Word to us using her normal speaking voice.²

III.3 Some would object to the application of I Timothy 2:12 to special music, arguing that women are allowed to sing with the congregation. Why, they might ask, are they not charged with teaching and admonishing when they join with the congregation in song? Unless such persons are attempting to deny the abiding validity of I Timothy 2:12 altogether, what they are really saying is that congregational singing and special music are no different from one another, therefore since women can join in the congregational singing they may perform special music.

² Incidentally, if the standards of our church are to be taken seriously, not only women, but most men as well would not be allowed to read the Scriptures to the congregation:

The public reading of the Holy Scriptures is performed by the minister as God's servant (OPC Directory for the Public Worship of God III.2).

Q. 156. Is the word of God to be read by all?
Answer: Although all are not to be permitted to read the word publicly to the congregation, yet all sorts of people are bound to read it apart by themselves, and with their families . . . (Westminster Larger Catechism).
III.4 That we should have to answer such an objection at all is an unfortunate commentary on the carelessness with which so many approach matters pertaining to the Lord's house. There is clearly a difference between congregational singing and the singing that takes place when one person stands in front facing the congregation. Reasoning which seeks to make special music identical to congregational singing could just as easily be put to service to justify the practice of allowing women to lead the congregation in prayer. When the pastor prays the congregational prayer is the congregation not praying with him? Then there is no difference between the prayer of the pastor and that of the congregation. What does it matter who does the actual praying then? According to this latitudinarian perspective it might just as well be a member of the congregation, male or female.

III.5 Besides the obvious differences of location and number of people singing, congregational singing differs from special music in many other ways. In the first instance someone is singing as a part of the congregation, in the latter they are performing special music while the congregation remains silent. In the first instance the Psalms or hymns are usually chosen by the pastor or the elders from the approved hymn book, in the second the singer usually has chosen the selection herself, perhaps with the approval of the session. When the congregation sings, all may participate. When special music is offered only those with special musical ability sing. When the congregation finishes its singing it sits down without clapping for itself. It is often the case that after a special music performance the singer goes to his or her seat to the sound of applause. These are but a few differences.

III.6 If it is still impossible for some to see that soloists are teaching and admonishing the congregation, what are they doing? We can think of only three other things that might be happening during a solo besides, or in addition to, teaching and admonishing: 1) personal worship is being offered on the part of the soloist while the congregation looks on, 2) the soloist is leading the congregation in worship similar to the way the pastor leads the congregation in prayer during the congregational prayer, 3) the soloist is entertaining the congregation. If the first option is the case, where is the warrant for excluding the congregation from a part of the worship? If the second option, how can it be lawful for a woman to lead the congregation in worship? The Scriptures not only forbid women from teaching the church, but from speaking at all in church:

"Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says... for it is shameful for women to speak in church" (I Cor. 14:34, 35).

God forbid that any of us should try to defend the practice based on the third alternative, entertainment.

III.7 This brings us to another practical objection to the practice of special music in
church. Special music, whether it is intended to be entertainment or not, is indistinguishable from entertainment. How else can one explain the applause which often follows special music? For a time applause following special music was a common occurrence at Grace Community Church. The reason we no longer have applause following the special music is because it was re-dressed, both in the pulpit and in the bulletin. There is now a notice in the bulletin which specifically requests that the congregation not clap after the special music. The notice is an unwitting testimony to the propensity of people to clap and applaud after a special music performance. One member's child at a congregational meeting asked, Why can't we clap after the special music if I think J____ did a good job?" A very good question. The problem is not with clapping. The real problem is with the special music itself.

III.8 Another practical reason which testifies against special music performances in church is that not all of God's people may participate in worship as it is presented in the special music format. Although there is no requirement that those offering special music be ordained, and that any one in good standing may offer worship through special music, yet only those who possess musical talent, or who think that they possess musical talent, actually participate in worship in such a manner. The result is that this particular act of worship is relegated to a select few, even though the Scriptures do not separate individual non-ordained members to distinct roles in worship. The only justification that can be given is that God gave certain persons talents which He did not give to others. What that means, if such an argument is allowed, is that substantive elements of worship may be governed by natural, as opposed to special, revelation. This is an absurdity, especially considering that, in the matter of talent, men become the judges of what is or is not naturally revealed.

III.9 Finally we would submit that the practice of conducting special music during public worship is offensive to the consciences of some of the worshipers. It is offensive to many besides ourselves; we have personally known non-Reformed people who have been offended by special music in their own churches. Of course, offensiveness in itself is not enough to proscribe a practice, indeed, we should have to stop preaching the gospel if that were the case. However, when we offend others by an unnecessary practice, it should be immediately abandoned (I Cor. 8:13; 10:32). This is true in day to day living. How much more is it true when the practice concerns a matter of public worship?

III.10 Are there any who would contend that our worship is deficient, i.e., God is not pleased by our worship, when special music is not performed during the service? Do we return home impoverished in spirit when we have not heard someone sing a song to us in church? If not, then special music is not an essential part of worship services conducted by the church. Since it is not necessary, and it is offensive to some, it should be rejected for this reason alone. If the elders of the church insist upon clinging to an unnecessary practice, and force the church to abide it, they are walking in the foot steps of the Pharisees.
whom Jesus chastised by saying, "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:9).

Conclusion

For the forgoing reasons we request that our complaint be sustained and that:

A. Special music performances be eliminated from the worship services conducted by Spencer Mills Church, Gowen, and Grace Community Church, Lansing.

B. The Session of Spencer Mills Church, Gowen, in cooperation with the Steering Committee of Grace Community Church, Lansing, petition the General Assembly to propose to the presbyteries the following amendments to the Directory for Worship:

1) That the last sentence be struck from Chapter III Section 6, and in its place be inserted, "That the whole congregation may join in the singing, every one that can read is to have a hymn book." (The substituted words are a close paraphrase of the third paragraph of the Westminster Assembly’s Directory for the Publick Worship of God under the heading, Of Singing of Psalms, except that the word hymn has been substituted in for the word psalm.)

2) That the words “in the circumstances of this” be substituted for the words “in this” in the first sentence of Section 7 of Chapter II.

3) That Section 7 of Chapter II be further amended by the insertion of the following sentence between the second and third sentences of the present edition:

Substantial elements of the worship of the church are limited to those prescribed in the Scriptures, none of which are to be neglected, neither are they to be augmented.

Respectfully submitted,
Complainants
Ben Manring
Sandra Manring

The Manrings had an Addendum to Complaint 4 in the printed Agenda for the 60th General Assembly. It was “An Answer to the Report of the Committee Considering the Appeal of Dr. and Mrs. Manring.” The General Assembly in §77 of the Journal said that the addendum to Complaint 4, with the exception of sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and
Those sections which are to be printed are as follows:

**Recovery of the Orthodox View of the Regulative Principle**

**III. J. H. THORNWELL'S VIEW OF CIRCUMSTANCES IN WORSHIP.**

**III.1** In the second paragraph of its Introduction, the committee produces a statement of J. H. Thornwell, taken from his debate with Charles Hodge on the propriety of maintaining church boards. Thornwell’s position was that church boards constitute a human addition to God’s prescribed form of church government, presbyterianism. He maintained that the elders must rule the church themselves, using committees to dispose of matters that would be unmanageable for an assembly of elders to supervise. Hodge, asserting a greater degree of freedom to the *how* of presbyterian government, said that boards were every bit as legitimate as committees: “It is obvious that these principles (in support of committees) do not involve anything to distinguish Dr. Thornwell’s system from that advocated on the other side (in support of boards)” (Hodge quoted in *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell*, IV, 625).

**III.2** In part of this debate Thornwell was maligned, being accused of maintaining that absolutely everything concerning church government must be positively prescribed in the Bible. Dr. Thornwell replied by stating, as his position, the orthodox form of the regulative principle, which presbytery’s committee quoted in their Introduction. His statement reflects the well-known principle that in any commanded thing there are certain circumstantial matters that must be “ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence” (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, I.6).

**III.3** Presbytery’s committee mistakenly seized upon Thornwell’s words, supposing that they supported the committee’s position that the regulative principle addresses only “the *what* we are to do, not particularly the *how*.” If the committee had turned back a page it would have seen that Thornwell was no friend of theirs: “What is the nature of these circumstances? A glance at the proof-texts on which the doctrine relies enables us to answer. Circumstances are those concomitants of an action without which it either cannot be done at all, or cannot be done with decency and decorum” (*Writings*, IV, 246).

**III.4** He continues, “We must carefully distinguish between those circumstances which attend actions *as actions*—that is, without which the actions could not be—and those circumstances which, though not essential, are added as appendages. These last do not fall within the jurisdiction of the church. She has no right to appoint them. They are circumstances in the sense that they do not belong to the substance of the act. They are not circumstances in the sense that they so surround it that they cannot be separated from it. A liturgy is a circumstance of this kind . . .” (*Writings*, IV, 247).
III.5 "As under the Old Dispensation nothing connected with the worship or
discipline of the Church of God was left to the wisdom or discretion of man,
but everything was accurately prescribed by the authority of God, so, under
the New, no voice is to be heard in the household of faith but the voice of the
Son of God . . . (The church) is to add nothing of her own to, and to subtract
nothing from, what her Lord has established. Discretionary power she does
not possess" (Writings, IV, 163).

IV. JOHN OWEN ON MANNER AND CIRCUMSTANCE.

IV.1 Owen is explicit in his denial of man's prerogative in ordering the manner, i.e.,
the how, in which worship is to be conducted:
The principle that the Church has power to institute anything
belonging to the worship of God, either as to matter or manner,
beyond the circumstances which necessarily attend such ordi-
nances as Christ Himself hath instituted, lies at the bottom of all
the horrible superstitions and idolatry, of all the confusion,
persecution, blood and war, which have spread themselves
over the Christian world (cited by Wm. S. McClure in The Psalms

IV.2 "It is said men may add nothing to the substance of the worship of God, but
they may order, dispose, and appoint the things that belong to the manner and
circumstances of it, and this is all that is done in the prescription of liturgies.
Of circumstances in and about the worship of God we have spoken before, and
removed that pretence. Nor is it safe distinguishing in the things of God where
himself hath not distinguished. When he gave out the prohibitions mentioned
under the Old Testament, he was appointing or had appointed his whole
worship, and all that belonged unto it, in matter and manner, way and order,
isubstance and circumstance. Indeed, there is nothing in its whole nature, as it
belongs to the general being of things, so circumstantial, but that if it be
appointed by God in his worship, it becomes a part of the substance of it" (The
Works of John Owen, XV, 40).

IV.3 If it appears from the above quote that Owen disagrees with the Westminster
Standards regarding the freedom ascribed to the church in ordering truly
circumstantial matters, in fact he does not. His sentiments are expressed in
nearly identical words to J. H. Thornwell's:
Circumstances are either such as follow actions as actions, or
such as are arbitrarily superadded and adjoined by command
unto actions, which do not of their own accord, nor naturally
nor necessarily attend them. Now, religious actions in the
worship of God are actions still. Their religious relation doth
not destroy their natural being. Those circumstances, then,
which do attend such actions as actions not determined by
divine institution, may be ordered, disposed of, and regulated
by the prudence of men (Works, XV, 35).
Appendix

V. GEORGE GILLESPIE ON DISCRETIONARY POWER OF THE CHURCH.

V.1 George Gillespie, arguably the most influential of the commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, who is said to have guided the Assembly through some of its most trying and difficult debates, the traditional framer of the answer to the fourth question of the Shorter Catechism, was also the author of an extensive exposition of the doctrine of worship, A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies Obru ded Upon the Church of Scotland. Refutations of arguments of the kind posed by presbytery's committee can be found throughout the book. We quote one of them here: "Bishop Lindsey's opinion touching the power of the church, whereof we dispute, is, that power is given unto her to 'determine the circumstances which are in the general necessary to be used in divine worship, but not defined particularly in the word.' . . . Now by this ground that the Prelate holdeth, the church may prescribe to the ministers of the gospel the whole habit and apparel of the Levitical high-priest (which were to Judaize). For apparel is a circumstance in the general necessary, yet it is not particularly defined in the word" (The Works of George Gillespie, vol. 1, 128).

VI. CONCLUSION

VI.1 We conclude that the regulative principle as understood by presbytery's committee is defective, and that if special music is to be admitted into the worship of the church, a positive command enjoining it must be furnished from the Scriptures. Special music is not an essential circumstance of church music, such that without it, singing "cannot be done at all or with decency and decorum."

Conclusion

XI. IS SPECIAL MUSIC ENJOINED BY COMMAND, IS IT AN OPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCE, OR IS IT FORBIDDEN FOR LACK OF WARRANT?

XI.1 The committee answered one way one time and another way the next. When it appeared doubtful whether the committee could muster a command, special music was an optional circumstance. When it was an unnecessary burden on the consciences of dissenters, the committee said it's commanded. "How long halt ye between two opinions?" Presbytery must answer this question with only one of these mutually exclusive options.

XI.2 We have no doubt as to the correct answer to this question. Congregational singing is commanded (Ps. 32:11, 35:18, 42:4, 66:1-4, 95:1-2, 100, 107:31-32, 111:1, 149:1; Jer. 17:26; Matt. 26:30; Heb. 2: 12). Special music has no warrant and is therefore forbidden.
Complaint 5

From A. M. Laurie

To: Robert M. Coie, Clerk of the Presbytery of Southern California of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Notice of Intention to Appeal:

And now this 22nd day of April 1993, A.D., comes A. M. Laurie and gives notice of intention to appeal to the General Assembly from the judgment of the Presbytery of Southern California with respect to his complaint heard by the presbytery on April 17, 1993.

The Complaint

And now, this 23rd day of March 1993, A.D., comes A. M. Laurie and complains against the action of the Presbytery of Southern California in connection with their approval of the minutes of the Session of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church without exception when those minutes contained an action by the session declaring that "the Roman Catholic Church is no true church of Jesus Christ." (See presbytery minutes, February 5-6, 1993, pages 169 and 170 and Session minutes, November 6, 1992, page 560), and in support of said complaint sets forth the following reasons:

1. Judgment of whether a Christ-professing body is a true church is properly the business of the general assembly, since:
   a. such judgment concerns the whole church (FG XII.2)
   b. such judgment is part of its mandate to "seek to promote the unity of the church through correspondence with other churches." (FG XV.6)

   Note: An obvious "first" step in fulfilling this mandate is coming to a judgment of whether a professing body is a true church.

2. Judgment of whether a Christ-professing body is a true church is not listed in our Standards among the responsibilities of the session. (FG XIII.7, & 9)

Requested Amends: That the presbytery reverse its action of approving the minutes of Calvary Orthodox Presbyterian Church without exception or notation and rather take action to approve them with the exception set forth in presbytery minutes, February 5-6, 1993 (page 169) and with no notations.

A. M. Laurie
REPORT OF THE STATED CLERK

SYNOPSIS

This has been a year of much learning for the Stated Clerk as he has taken on the task on a full time basis. The Clerk hopes he has served the church adequately and that his service can improve in the year ahead.

I DOCKET

A. Proposed Amendment to the Book of Discipline
   The following proposed amendment to the Book of Discipline was ordered by the 59th General Assembly to be put on the docket of the 60th General Assembly (cf. §243 page 70 of the Minutes of the 59th General Assembly). That the Book of Discipline, Chapter V. Section 2.b., be amended by adding the following as a new point (3):

   (3) When a minister, without adequate reason, persists in attending a church not of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, the presbytery shall seek to dissuade him from his course; and, if these efforts fail, it may erase his name from the roll by a two-thirds majority of those voting.

   Ground: ministers under the oversight and discipline of presbyteries should have the same duty and obligation to attend and support the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as members under the oversight and the discipline of sessions (I Timothy 3:2 and I Peter 5:3).

   This has been placed on the docket as item 30.

B. Assignment of complaints
   Since there are five complaints which have been brought on appeal to the 60th General Assembly along with some major recommendations of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints, the Clerk is proposing that there be two advisory committees on Appeals and Complaints and furthermore that one of the complaints be given to yet another advisory committee. The Committee on Appeals and Complaints is aware of this proposal.

   Another appeal of a complaint was received by the Clerk on November 9, 1992, and it was given to the Committee on Appeals and Complaints. That Committee wrote to the complainants on November 17, 1992 stating their opinion that the appeal of the complaint, as presented, was out of order. On January 14, 1993 the Clerk wrote to the complainants to say that neither the Committee on Appeals and Complaints nor the Clerk had heard further from the complainants and unless the Clerk did hear further it was his intention to tell the 60th General Assembly that he had received an appeal of a complaint which does not appear in the Agenda. As of the writing of this report the Clerk has not heard further from the complainants.
C. Time Schedule

The time schedule is much like last year but adjusted for the fact that we are beginning to meet a day earlier in the week this year. The Assembly should remember that we have one less day scheduled than we had last year in which to do the business of the Assembly.

II AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO THE PRESBYTERIES

One amendment to the Form of Government (FG) and one amendment to the Book of Discipline (BD) were proposed by the 59th General Assembly to the presbyteries for adoption.

A. Form of Government

Chapter XVI.7 in re: a congregation withdrawing from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (cf. Minutes of the 59th General Assembly §101)

Approved: (12) DK, MA, MW, NJ, NY, NC, NW, OH, PH, SO, SC, SW
Disapproved: (0)
Adopted. Approved by a majority of the presbyteries.

The moderator, in accordance with FG XXXII.2, should declare the amendment to FG XVI.7 approved and is to go into effect on January 1, 1995.

B. Book of Discipline

Chapters II.B.3.d and V.2.a in re: a member who “persists in attending a church of another denomination in preference to his own” (cf. Minutes of the 59th General Assembly §167, §168)

Approved: (11) DK, MA, MW, NJ, NY, NC, NW, OH, SO, SC, SW
Disapproved: (1) PH
Adopted. Approved by a majority of the presbyteries.

The moderator, in accordance with FG XXXII.2 should declare the amendments to BD II.B.3.d and BD V.2.a approved and are to go into effect on January 1, 1995.

III AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO THIS ASSEMBLY

A number of amendments to the Standing Rules (SR) were proposed to this Assembly for adoption. The pending amendments to the SR (cf. Minutes of the 59th General Assembly, §38, §39) are as follows:

1. That the following be added to SR III.B.5.e.(1)(a): “The Clerk may propose measures for the early resolution of questions affecting the docket or Advisory Committee assignments raised by conflicting matters of business being brought to the Assembly”.

2. That the following be added to SR IV.6: “; it shall include orders of the day to insure that all overtures and pending amendments to the standing rules are taken up before the projected terminus of the Assembly”.

3. That the following amendments be made to the SR:
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III.B.4.f: Change “General Assembly purposes” to “the General Assembly Operation Fund”

III.B.5.j: Change “Assembly’s funds” to “Assembly Operation Fund”

III.B.5.j.(1): Change “operating expenses of the General Assembly to “General Assembly Operation Fund”

III.B.5.j.(4): Delete (already covered in III.B.4.f)

V.10: Change “Budget” to “Operation”

V.11: Change “Budget” to “Operation”

X.4.: Change “Budget” to “Operation” (two places)

X.4.a: Change “Budget” to “Operation”

X.5.b(1): Change “General Assembly purposes” to “the General Assembly Operation Fund”

IV WORK OF THE STATED CLERK

A. Overview

As the Clerk reported last year much of the Clerk’s work is editing and correspondence. The Clerk wrote approximately letters in this past year. 101 letters were written soon after the General Assembly in connection with the work and actions of the Assembly. The editing of the Minutes and the Directory along with the preparation of the Agenda require a great deal of time. In addition the Clerk has mailed out all the documents just mentioned which has saved some money over past years but has been a major undertaking.

The Clerk is responsible ultimately to the General Assembly for his work, but he recognizes that the Trustees of the General Assembly are charged by the Standing Rules with the task of reviewing his performance as the Stated Clerk. The Clerk has submitted reports on his labors and a job description to the Trustees. He has attended all the meetings of the Trustees to report in person. The Clerk will make his reports to the Trustees available to the Advisory Committee which considers this report.

The Clerk believes that it is a good thing to have the office of the Stated Clerk in the same place with the other offices of the church in Horsham. Those in the offices have been most helpful to the Stated Clerk this past year. It is the Clerk’s hope that together we can increase our efficiency in the matter of shared information and the use of such things as mailing lists as well as equipment.

There are several tasks the Stated Clerk would like to see accomplished. Some of these things were mentioned in the Clerk’s report to the 59th General Assembly. This past year the Clerk has concentrated on getting out the Minutes and the Directory along with the other things that have to be done in the job. Hopefully, having had a years experience, some of these tasks can be done more efficiently and other tasks can then be taken up in the not too distant future.

B. Publications

1. Minutes
   a. The Minutes of the 59th General Assembly were 57 pages shorter
than the Minutes of the previous year. Final proofs went to the printer on December 4, 1992 and the Minutes were delivered on December 23. Most of them were mailed out in the first two weeks of January.

b. Cost. The printing of 725 copies of the Minutes was $8,174.00. One needs to realize that there is a good deal more expense in editing, copying, and postage.

c. The Clerk had a great amount of help from his wife as well as others in getting out the Minutes. For instance, the Rev. Robert Vining helped with proofreading.

2. OPC Directory

a. The OPC Directory was sent in final form to the printer on January 11. 8,000 copies were received on January 27 and they were distributed to the churches. The cost of printing them was $5,969.00. There is advertising in the Directory and we have as of the writing of this report received $4,775 for that.

b. It is imperative that when there are changes to be made to the Directory that those changes be sent to the Stated Clerk.

3. Book of Church Order

This is one area that the Stated Clerk has not spent much time on in the last year. The Clerk is working with Great Commission Publications on this matter in preparation for a new printing. The BOCO is ordered through Great Commission Publications.

4. Finances

The Clerk prepared 72 vouchers in 1992 for expenses charged to the GA Operation Fund. The fiscal year for the GA Operation Fund goes from August 1 to the next July 31. Giving to the Fund however is requested on a calendar year basis. This makes for some confusion.

V THANKS

This Clerk would like to thank Mr. Richard A. Barker for his willing assistance in giving the Clerk files, answering numerous questions, and helping in many ways to make the task of learning the job and doing it much easier. Others, such as the Rev. John P. Galbraith and the Rev. Stephen L. Phillips, have also provided much assistance and encouragement. Peggy Duff has truly been a helper in the task of typing, editing and mailing.

VI RECOMMENDATION

That the 60th General Assembly approve the amendments to the Standing Rules as proposed to the Assembly by the 59th General Assembly. (The proposed amendments are found in III.C. numbers 1, 2, and 3 of this report.)
REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I MEETINGS

The Trustees of the General Assembly have met twice since the 59th General Assembly, on January 26, and March 16, 1993.

II INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

A. The Trustees continue to correspond with the Internal Revenue Service in regard to the group ruling granted to the Trustees of the General Assembly and the subordinate units of the General Assembly. This group ruling gives tax-exempt status to all the local congregations and other agencies listed in the current Directory of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. The reference number to be used in correspondence concerning tax-exempt matters is 23-7001990.

B. It should be remembered that:
   1. the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and its member churches have been certified by the Internal Revenue Service as being exempt from filing Federal income tax returns under sections 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code and have been given I.R.S. Identification Number 23-7001990. Donors may deduct, on their Federal income tax returns, contributions to the Denomination and/or member churches under Section 170 of the Code. This certification of exempt status is also useful by any member church in obtaining permission to mail through the U.S. Postal Service at special third-class rates. If needed by any member church, a certificate of the church’s membership in the Denomination and/or copy of the I.R.S. certification letter may be obtained from the Secretary of the Trustees of the General Assembly.
   2. the tax exempt status detailed above has no relationship with exemption from state sales taxes. Each state which has a sales tax has its own rules for making tax exempt purchases for the church’s use. For these details, the church should write to the Department of Revenue of the state at its capital.

III STATED CLERK

A Job Description and Form for Performance Evaluation of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly were adopted. Mr. Duff was evaluated on the basis of the aforementioned documents. The Trustees evaluate Mr. Duff’s performance as “excellent.” We particularly note the publication of the minutes of the 59th (1992) General Assembly before the end of 1992.

IV IN RE: FG XXXII.3 REFERRED BY 59TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Assembly passed the following motion:

In accordance with the provision of FG XXXII.5 refer to the Trustees the
following amendment proposed by this General Assembly for report to the next General Assembly with recommendations, in accordance with FG XXXII.3: In FG XXXII.3 insert “having proposed an amendment” after “The general assembly” and before “shall appoint a committee” and amend by substituting the word “it” for “any proposed amend ment.” See recommendation 2.

V ELECTIONS

The terms of the following listed trustees expire at this Assembly: Steven F. Miller (minister) and Willard E. Neel (ruling elder.)

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the following listed remuneration package for the Stated Clerk for 1993-94 be adopted:

   Salary $42,000.00
   F.I.C.A. Reimbursement (1/2) 3,213.00
   Pension (6% of Salary) 2,520.00
   Hospitalization, Surgical, Major Medical Insurance 5,040.00 (est.)
   Disability Insurance 378.00
   Worker’s Compensation Insurance (Est.) 200.00 (est.)
   Total $53,351.00

2. That the General Assembly substitute the following language for that referred to the Trustees (see IV above):
   a. Insert the following language after the words “general assembly” in FG XXXII.3 on line 5, page 157: “shall determine whether a suggested change is worthy of consideration. If so determined, it “
   b. Delete the words “proposed amendment” on line 6 and insert the words “suggested change”

   The text then will read as follows: “The general assembly shall determine whether a suggested change is worthy of consideration. If so determined, it shall appoint a committee to consider any suggested change and to report to the next regular assembly, etc.”

   Grounds:
   (1) This language will enable the general assembly to discharge its duty to decide the worthiness of any suggested change before being required to erect a committee for a more thorough consideration of the suggested change.
   (2) The words “suggested” and “change” are substituted for the words “proposed” and “amendment” (see line 6, section 3, page 157) to eliminate confusion with the technical use of “proposed” and “amendment” in sections 2 and 3, whereby a general assembly initiates the process of amending the Constitution by “proposing” an “amendment” to the presbyteries, by which act a suggested change becomes a “proposed amendment.”
VII ESTIMATED EXPENSE

The Trustees estimate their costs for the next year will be $50.

Steven F. Miller,
President
REPORT OF THE STATISTICIAN

This report summarizes statistics for 1992 from each presbytery and congregation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. The detailed Statistical Reports of the Churches are located in the Yearbook, followed by a Summary of Statistics for the whole church and a recapitulation of membership statistics since 1938.

I SUMMARY

OPC statistics in 1992 indicate a continued upward trend in nearly every category of measurement. Total membership reached 18,767 with an increase of 2.88 percent (525 persons) for the year. Morning worship attendance registered an even larger increase (3.9 percent), rising by 568 persons to 15,150, as measured in November. Sunday school attendance rose 2.9 percent to 9,273. Total giving reached its highest level ever, $15,492,093 by registering an 8.1-percent increase. The benevolence portion of total giving benefited from an 11.8-percent increase to finish the year at $3,025,824, following a four-year period during which total benevolence giving remained nearly constant at about $2.7 million. Table 1 provides a synopsis of these statistics and others, with listings for each of the twelve regional churches and a comparison of the totals to those of recent years.

II CHURCHES AND MISSION WORKS

As Table 1 indicates, the number of churches increased by three to 173, which actually is greater than at the end of any previous year. All three additions were congregations organized as new and separate churches in 1992. These are listed below with their respective regional churches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONS (3)</th>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity, Denver CO</td>
<td>Dakotas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Fellowship, Philadelphia PA</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life, Key West FL</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six new unorganized mission works were started in 1992, bringing to 29 the total number of mission works at the end of the year. New mission works started were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONS</th>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPC, Bath/Brunswick ME</td>
<td>NY &amp; New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Fellowship, Maple Grove ME</td>
<td>NY &amp; New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope, Hanford CA</td>
<td>No. California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Trinity, Franklin PA  Ohio
Christ, Washington PA  Ohio
Covenant Community, Columbia TN  South

III MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

Last year’s report noted how God has graciously provided our church with stability in a society that is marked by a great deal of transition and mobility. Once again in 1992 we can see God’s hand at work. Even though 93 members died, 868 people were dismissed (some, of course, to other OP congregations) and 581 names were erased from the rolls for various other reasons, still a net gain in membership was realized as hundreds of new members joined the OPC (some through birth, some through new birth, and the remainder from other churches.) One particularly encouraging statistic is that 553 new members joined OP churches by profession of faith in 1992; an average of more than ten each Sunday. This is a 22-percent improvement over 1991 and 1990, and is comparable to the number of professions of faith recorded yearly from 1981 to 1986. Thus, one out of 23 communicant members at the end of 1992 had made a public profession of faith upon joining our church during the year.

The total membership of 18,767 persons at year’s end consisted of 321 ministers, 12,630 communicant members, and 5,816 baptized children (non-communicants). This represents an increase of 525 persons (2.88 percent) from 1991’s adjusted total of 18,242 members. Table 1 contains a short summary of membership and attendance statistics for 1992 for each of the regional churches and for the whole church.

The downward trend in the number of young people making a profession of faith which was noted in last year’s statistical report shows a significant turnaround in 1992. In 1992 a total of 149 baptized non-communicants (one out of 39, or 2.6 percent) made a profession of faith, compared to only 117 the year before. During the 1980’s the yearly average of youth professions of faith was 160 (2.89 percent), while in the 1970’s the average exceeded 3 percent of the total number of baptized children.

Figure 1 summarizes membership data since 1970 for the whole church. The plotted data depict the sudden drop in membership in 1989-1990 and the beginnings of recovery in 1991. The recent drop-off was due almost entirely to the withdrawal of several congregations. Many OP churches continued to grow during that period, as indicated by the resumption of the earlier growth pattern.

Attendance figures for morning worship and Sunday school are shown in Figure 2. Worship attendance averaged 15,150 in November 1992, which is about 81 percent of total membership. This is an increase of 568 persons (3.9 percent) from a year earlier, and exceeded the attendance figure of 14,777 recorded in 1988 when these data were first requested from the churches. Although worship attendance data was not gathered prior to the 55th General Assembly, its general trend can be estimated from the total membership data shown in the figure. Sunday school attendance averaged 9,273 in November 1992. This is 262 persons (2.9 percent)
higher than in 1991, and is the highest since 1986-1987 when attendance briefly exceeded 10,000.

At the end of 1992, twenty OP churches had a membership exceeding 200 persons. Eleven of these churches also had an average weekly worship attendance exceeding 200 in either May or November. These churches are listed below in order approximately by size, along with similar figures from four years earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCHES</th>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>ATTEND.</th>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>ATTEND.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethel, Oostburg, WI</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary, Cedar Grove, WI</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia OPC, Columbia, MD</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Community,</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipsburg, NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Mills, Gowen, MI</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life, San Diego, CA</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Sherwood, Orlando, FL</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster,</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holliadaysburg, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany, Oxford, PA</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity, Hatboro, PA</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, Ipswich, MA</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these churches which appear not to have grown much have been actively engaged in starting and supporting mission works which may not be reflected in these membership statistics.

IV CONTRIBUTIONS

Total giving in 1992 increased 8.1 percent from the previous year, to a record high of $15,492,093. Per capita giving increased 4.7 percent to $1,227 per communicant member, also a new high. Total contributions and average giving per communicant member are listed in Table 1 for each of the regional churches.

The $15.5 million contributed to support all aspects of the ministry of the OPC in 1992 is divided into three categories. General offerings for local church expenses grew 8.5 percent to a total of $11,248,935, or 72.6 percent of giving. Benevolence offerings for missions, outreach, and diaconal ministry increased 11.8 percent to $3,025,824, and comprised 19.5 percent of total contributions. While this is an improvement over 1991, the rate of benevolence giving remains about one percentage point ($150,000) below the average rate that prevailed throughout the 1970’s and 1980’s. Special offerings for capital improvements totaled $1,217,331, or 7.9 percent of giving.

Contribution data since 1970 are summarized in Figure 3 by category as described above. In this figure each curve is plotted separately (unlike Figure 1 which is cumulative.) The slope of each curve is a direct indication of its rate of change. For example, from 1984 to 1991 the fact that rate of increase of benevolence
giving did not keep pace with the growth in general offerings is apparent from the difference in slope between the curves. Large year-to-year variations in offerings for capital improvements are a result of occasional large church building projects.

V ORDAINED OFFICERS

There were 321 ministers in the OPC at the end of 1992. The following actions resulted in a net increase of six ministers on the rolls of OPC presbyteries.

MINISTERS ADDED (14)

Ordained:

- Joseph Auksela
- William O. Slack, II
- Samuel N. Folta
- William J. Gorrell
- John Vroegendewey
- Murray I. Uomoto
- Michael D. Dengerink
- Michael D. Pasarilla

Received into the OPC:

- Sam M. Allison, RCUS (in 1991)
- John Carrick, Independent
- Gary B. Magur, ARPC
- Larry D. Conard, PCA
- William J. Hobbs, PCUSA
- Robert A. Berry

MINISTERS REMOVED (8):

Deceased:
- Roswell R. Kamrath
- Bruce F. Hunt

Dismissed from the OPC:
- L. Kenneth Hash, PCA
- John H. Harbison, PCA
- Dennis E. Johnson, PCA

Removed at own request:
- Douglas Rogers, PCA

Divested without censure:
- Paul J. Hill, PCA

Deposed:
- David W. Kiester, PCA

From To

PRESBYTERY

RCUS (in 1991) Dakotas
Independent Mid-Atlantic
ARPC NY & New England
PCA Northwest
PCUSA No. California
PCA South

PRESBYTERY:

Dakotas
New Jersey
NY & New England
NY & New England
No. California
Northwest
So. California
Southwest

In addition to these changes twelve ministers transferred between OP presbyteries in 1992.
The number of ruling elders in the church increased by 15 to 787. 72 per cent of these, or 565, are currently serving on sessions. The Total number of deacons is 422, which is an increase of nine over 1991. Altogether, there are 1,530 ordained officers in the church.

VI CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The statistics from 1992 provide many reasons for encouragement. Our church has experienced sustained membership growth, an upturn in adult and youth professions of faith, a new high in the number of churches, record attendance and giving totals, and a long-awaited gain in benevolence giving. Let us respond in praise and thanksgiving to God for what he has done and continues to do in our fellowship, and press on with the work that lies ahead. “As each one has received a special gift, employ it in serving one another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. Whoever speaks, let him speak, as it were, the utterances of God; whoever serves, let him do so as by the strength which God supplies; so that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom belongs the glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen” (I Peter 4:10, 11, NASB).

Respectfully submitted,
Luke E. Brown, Statistician
### A. REGIONAL CHURCH SUBTOTALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCH</th>
<th>LOCAL MISSION CHURCHES</th>
<th>ROLL OF MEMBERS TOTAL* CHANGE</th>
<th>WORSHIP ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>SUNDAY SCHOOL TOTAL* CHANGE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS: TOTAL PER CM MIN. R.E. DEA.</th>
<th>OFFICERS: TOTAL CHURCHES TOTAL* MIN. R.E. DEA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAKOTAS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>823 +3.4%</td>
<td>651 453</td>
<td>$575,503 $999</td>
<td>16 53 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-ATLANTIC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,681 +2.3%</td>
<td>1,354 988</td>
<td>1,703,474 1,455</td>
<td>29 63 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,870 +2.9%</td>
<td>2,252 1,294</td>
<td>1,789,485 934</td>
<td>30 148 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,050 -0.4%</td>
<td>1,600 873</td>
<td>1,624,441 1,167</td>
<td>31 75 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY &amp; NEW ENGLAND</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,118 +5.3%</td>
<td>1,869 1,157</td>
<td>1,802,194 1,264</td>
<td>40 95 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>805 +3.6%</td>
<td>713 348</td>
<td>783,564 1,397</td>
<td>15 31 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>893 0.0%</td>
<td>848 313</td>
<td>690,624 1,138</td>
<td>20 44 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,379 +11.2%</td>
<td>1,130 729</td>
<td>1,061,901 1,113</td>
<td>19 46 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,468 +1.9%</td>
<td>2,096 1,299</td>
<td>1,986,291 1,188</td>
<td>45 91 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,105 +6.6%</td>
<td>987 605</td>
<td>1,036,915 1,301</td>
<td>26 49 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO. CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,587 -3.1%</td>
<td>1,156 692</td>
<td>1,727,466 1,582</td>
<td>32 63 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>667 +7.9%</td>
<td>494 322</td>
<td>710,235 1,524</td>
<td>18 29 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLE CHURCH</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>18,446 +2.9%</td>
<td>15,150 9,273</td>
<td>15,492,093 1,227</td>
<td>321 787 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### B. WHOLE CHURCH TOTALS BY YEAR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR</th>
<th>LOCAL MISSION CHURCHES</th>
<th>ROLL OF MEMBERS TOTAL* CHANGE</th>
<th>WORSHIP ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>SUNDAY SCHOOL TOTAL* CHANGE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS: TOTAL PER CM MIN. R.E. DEA.</th>
<th>OFFICERS: TOTAL CHURCHES TOTAL* MIN. R.E. DEA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>18,446 +2.9%</td>
<td>15,150 9,273</td>
<td>$15,492,093 $1,227</td>
<td>321 787 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>17,927 +0.6%</td>
<td>14,582 9,011</td>
<td>14,331,549 1,172</td>
<td>315 772 413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>17,812 -3.1%</td>
<td>14,052 8,834</td>
<td>13,369,461 1,100</td>
<td>325 764 402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>18,387 -3.4%</td>
<td>14,233 8,668</td>
<td>13,852,017 1,102</td>
<td>323 793 433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>19,041 +1.1%</td>
<td>14,777 8,898</td>
<td>13,446,161 1,026</td>
<td>335 - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ministers are not included in member totals shown here.
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I THE BROADER MINISTRY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

A. Goal Areas
   There are six subcommittees of the Committee, each of which is responsible for research and promotion of a particular ministry, as well as assisting the Committee to encourage and support these ministries as they are performed by the membership of the denomination. Subcommittees are listed below, together with their members, goals and activity.

1. Worship (Wilson, Miladin, Williamson)
   a. Goal: to encourage and guide the individual, family, and congregational praise of God, engaging the intellect, will and emotions of his people in the varied ministry of Word, sacraments, music and prayer
   b. Activity
      (1) Great Commission Publications (GCP) markets *Trinity Hymnal* and continues to supply the adult study books, *Discovering the Fullness of Worship* and *Worship Planbook*, as well as the catechism bulletin inserts, and Q & A, a series of flyers for teaching the catechism to the congregation.
      (2) *Our Songs in God’s Worship*, containing reports presented to the 13th and 14th General Assemblies on the subject of what are appropriate materials for singing praise to God in public worship, and annotated bibliographies on congregational and family worship, are available to the churches together with Lawrence C. Roff’s *Let Us Sing*, on worshiping God with our music.
The subcommittee is working to develop a liturgical compilation (including Salutations, Calls to Worship, Benedictions, etc.)

2. Teaching (Curry, Felch)
   a. Goal: *To assist the church in learning, applying and obeying in all of its life the whole counsel of God as revealed in Scripture and summarized in our doctrinal standards, with an understanding of God's past leading of the church and his promises for the future*
   b. Activity
      (1) The Committee considers any questions, comments and criticisms of GCP published materials that are communicated in writing, and makes any recommendations to GCP that it deems appropriate or brings the matter to the attention of the full CCE.
      (2) Through the services of GCP, Sunday school material is provided for ages four through adult, and through a cooperative agreement with the Christian Reformed Church its material for two- and three-year olds has been revised and prepared for our use.
      (3) The summer, 1993 Vacation Bible School curriculum, available through GCP, is entitled “Love The Lord With All Your Heart.”
      (4) The Committee continues to promote regional teacher training seminars through providing our churches with informational brochures and granting them financial assistance.
      (5) The general secretary conducted sixteen seminars in 1992 on a variety of subjects, including: Catechetical Instruction, Church Membership, Teaching Sunday School, Family Worship, Covenant Nurture, and Peacemaking.

3. Fellowship (Malcor, Poundstone, Curry)
   a. Goal: *To promote the communion of saints for spiritual edification in the love of Christ and ministry in outward things, both within and without our denomination*
   b. Activity
      (1) The Booklets on church membership, *We Invite You*, together with *There Is Good Reason* and *Introducing a Contemporary Presbyterian Church*, continue to be made available to churches as a three-part resource for use with visitors and new members.
      (2) At the Committee's request, GCP has completed revision of C. K. Cummings' *Confessing Christ*, together with a brand new Teacher's Manual.
      (3) The booklet, *Focus on Fellowship*, which gives a descriptive list of ways to promote fellowship in the church, continues to be made available to the churches.
      (4) *A Handbook for Camps and Retreats*, prepared by the subcommittee, was previously distributed to each presbytery, and is still available upon request.

4. Evangelism (Miladin, Peterson)
   a. Goal: *To help equip the church for its mission to make disciples of all nations*
b. Activity
(1) The report, *Evangelism in the OPC*, which documents numerous ways in which a congregation might engage in evangelism, continues to be made available to our churches.

(2) The tract, "Pray For Us" (formerly "Ora Pro Nobis") is available to churches, free of charge, upon request of the CCE staff.

(3) An article explaining the use of "Letter Tracts in Evangelism" appeared in the April 1992 issue of *New Horizons*, together with an invitation to churches to send for samples. To date numerous churches and individuals have responded.

5. Diaconal Service (Winslow, Woiwode)
   a. Goal: To equip and inspire the people of God for their ministry of compassion, mercy and good deeds to a needy world
   b. Activity
      Informational and promotional articles on the work of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries appeared throughout the year in *New Horizons* on a page reserved for that purpose. The magazine also carries articles on ministries of mercy by OPC congregations and by individual members.

6. Christian Schools (Woiwode, Gidley, MacDonald)
   a. Goal: To encourage the establishing and conducting of Christian schools and to promote the passage of legislation which protects the rights of such schools
   b. Activity
      (1) Articles promoting the general cause of Christian schools are in various stages of preparation by subcommittee members for submission to *New Horizons* or distribution by other means.

      (2) The general secretary has prepared various materials on the need for and nature of Christian schools, and is available to conduct seminars.

      (3) Members of the subcommittee have been reading books on Christian schools with the intent of reviewing them for the Committee and /or *New Horizons*.

B. Special Committees
The Committee has special committees whose mandates fall outside the above-mentioned goal areas.

1. Equipping Ordained Officers (Gidley, Wilson, Winslow, Peterson)
   a. Mandate: To prepare study materials for churches, designed to assist the office-bearers of the church in their God-given task of the edification of the whole body
   b. Activity
      In 1992 the Committee published three issues of *Ordained Servant*, a journal which provides materials for the equipping of office bearers to serve more faithfully. The goal of this journal is to assist the ordained servants of the Church to become more fruitful in their particular ministry so that they in turn will be more capable to prepare God’s people for works of service. *Ordained Servant* includes articles (both old and new) of a theoretical and practical nature, with the
emphasis tending toward practical articles wrestling with perennial and thorny problems encountered by office bearers. It is sent free of charge to all OP Churches for their officers, and to other ministers, licentiates and men under care who request it. Others may subscribe at $12 per year. *Ordained Servant* is edited by G. I. Williamson, the subcommittee serves as the editorial board, and Pleroma Press in Carson, N. D. is responsible for production.

2. Youth Ministry (Winslow, Felch)

a. The chief responsibility of this special committee is that of providing oversight for the Youth Consultant, Mark Sumpter, who edits *Reaching Youth* and *Youth Tracks for New Horizons*, reviews materials designed for youth and youth leaders, and provides (via telephone, primarily) advice to our churches in the area of youth ministry.

b. Three *Reaching Youth* inserts were published in the January, May and October issues of *New Horizons*, respectively. For 1993, the Committee has determined to publish two issues per year of *Youth Tracks*, a *New Horizons* insert designed to address the youth of our denomination directly, and to continue publishing *Reaching Youth* once per year.

c. Still available to our churches is an annotated bibliography, *Youth Leaders' Resource Directory*.

d. Mr. Sumpter is planning a nationwide training conference for both youth and youth workers to be held in Oostburg, Wisconsin in 1995.

3. Standards in Modern English (Elder, Williamson, MacDonald)

a. The special committee issued a November 1992 refinement of the Modern English Study Version (MESV) of the Confession of Faith of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, which was mailed to each member of the Committee in early December and reviewed in detail and slightly revised at a meeting of the entire Committee on Christian Education held in January 1993.

b. The Committee on Christian Education determined to recommend that the 60th General Assembly approve the January 1993 version of the MESV for publication, and instructed the General Secretary to mail a copy of this version in parallel columns with the Confession of Faith of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to “all ministers and members of sessions of the Church not later than January 31, 1993” in accordance with the directive of the 58th General Assembly.

c. In recommending publication of the MESV for the use of the church, the Committee on Christian Education affirms that we recognize the need for such a modern English study version as an aid for our ministers and sessions to use in acquainting our people with our doctrinal standards, and further affirms that the MESV is simply a study aid, and not a replacement for the Confession. Each page of the MESV carries the disclaimer that the MESV does not have any official authority.

d. The Committee on Christian Education presents the following principles to be used as guidelines in evaluating the MESV:

(1) Introduce no change in theology or in content
(2) Modernize obsolete vocabulary
(3) Eliminate archaic word forms
(4) Consider whether words have significantly changed their meaning or broadened (or narrowed) their meaning so as to give the modern reader an incorrect understanding of the text

(5) Shorten sentence structure, where feasible

4. Joint Committee on OPC History Project (Elder, Gidley)
   a. The Joint Committee on the OPC History Project consists of the Historian, the Committee for the Historian, and two members of the Committee on Christian Education. The director of the project, under the supervision of the Joint Committee, is Charles Dennison, the Historian. The committee began its work in September 1990, and continues to the present.
   b. The scope of the History Project includes the following:
      (1) archiving of oral tradition through audio recorded interviews of OPC ministers (and carefully selected additional persons who were part of the denomination during its formation and early years;
      (2) production of a 30- to 45-minute video presentation on the history and identity of the OPC; and
      (3) publication of a book (suitable for adult Sunday school use) containing a brief history of the OPC.
   c. Dennison has been able to obtain the audio tapes through personal visits relatively inexpensively, using high quality portable equipment. The geographic scope includes most areas of the United States where the interviewees are located. This initial archival collection is nearly complete, with over a hundred interviews involving about fifty individuals. The originals are being kept in the OPC archives in Philadelphia, with Dennison retaining copies. He expects to continue to add to this collection from time to time, as part of his ongoing duties as church Historian.
   d. The video project is much more expensive, and requires the use of professional equipment by trained personnel. Because of (1) the technical nature of this project, (2) the requirement to get a professional quality product at minimum expense, and (3) the selectivity involved, this project is taking longer than anticipated. We hope to present about ten minutes of the video (with sound) at this Assembly, and give an outline of the script. An experienced video producer, Charles V. Ardovino, who is a member of Grace OPC, Columbus, Ohio, is working with Dennison on the project as producer and technical advisor.
   e. The OPC history is being written by John Muether, of the Lake Sherwood OPC, Orlando, Fla., in collaboration with Daryl Hart, of Westminster Theological Seminary (in Philadelphia). The manuscript is now expected to be ready for final editing by the end of December 1993.

5. Long-Range Planning (Elder, Phillips)
   This committee exists in order to stimulate and coordinate the long-range planning activities of the various sub-committees of the Committee on Christian Education. This serves to encourage and enable the Committee to set goals and strategies for the future as well as to predict the financial support needed to carry out the various facets of the ministry of Christian Education for the next five to ten years.
C. Ministerial Training Subcommittee

1. Membership

This subcommittee consists of six members who are chosen directly by the General Assembly. The Bylaws require that it include at least two ministers and two ruling elders. The members of the committee are: James Gidley and David Winslow (class of 1995), John P. Galbraith and Donald M. Poundstone (class of 1993), and J. Donald Phillips and G. I. Williamson (class of 1994).

2. Duties

The duties of this subcommittee, as set forth in the Standing Rules (Chapter 10) involve assisting the churches and presbyteries in seeking out and preparing men for the gospel ministry. The subcommittee is to consider means for not only strengthening the preparation of men for the ministry but also continuing their education and development in the ministry. The subcommittee's work has also involved consulting with seminaries and administering the Glenn R. Coie Fund and the Internship Program.

3. Internship Program

a. Introductory

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, through its Ministerial Training Subcommittee, provided 20 intern programs throughout the country during 1992. Thirteen men served in summer internships designed to give seminarians a taste of the pastoral ministry and to allow them to test their gifts and their calling by God. Seven men served in year-long internships, normally the final phase of preparation for entering the ordained ministry. These longer internships are designed for men who believe that God is calling them to the pastoral ministry and who have made a commitment to pursue licensure in the OPC. We express our gratefulness to the dedicated core of congregations, pastors, and sessions, who have committed themselves to this necessary and sacrificial service of providing this vital training and ministry. The Committee itself spent $52,508 in helping to fund interns in 1992.

b. Following is a list of interns and churches involved in year-long internship programs during 1992:

Charles Telfer  Church of the Covenant, Hackettstown, N.J.
Louis Koncsol  Grace, Westfield, N.J.
Calvin Keller  Garden Grove, Garden Grove, Calif.
Daryl Daniels  Calvary, Glenside, Penna.
Chris Andrus  Church of the Covenant, Hackettstown, N.J.
Archie Allison  Bethel, Carson, ND

Following is a list of interns and churches involved in summer internship programs during 1992:

Chris Andrus  Calvary, Wildwood, N.J.
Jim Zozzaro  Calvary, Wildwood, N.J.
John Kramer  Stratford, Stratford, N.J.
Paul Browne  Calvary, Bridgeton, N.J.
David Salazar  Garden Grove, Garden Grove, Calif.
Larry Woodard  Fait Pole, Tavern, N.J.
Robert Bjerkaas  Covenant, Abilene, Tex.
Nick Ganas  
Covenant, San Jose, Calif.

Charles Carroll  
Providence, Austin, Tex.

Ken Jensen  
First, Ipswich, Mass.

Boyd Miller  
Knox, Silver Spring, Md.

Eric Woody  
Covenant, Berkeley, Calif.

Scott Smith  
Second Parish, Portland, Maine

d. Report on Recent Interns: the Committee is pleased to note that eight of our eleven 1991 year-long interns have been, or are in the process of being, called to serve Orthodox Presbyterian pastorates or mission works.

e. The Ministerial Training Subcommittee also administers The Glenn R. Coie Memorial Scholarship Fund which supplies interest-free loans up to a maximum of $1,500, and grants up to an annual maximum equal to the current projected annual income of the fund, to qualified OPC ministerial candidates enrolled in a seminary-degree program. Loans are repayable in monthly installments beginning one year following graduation.

Balance 12/31/91 $14,111
plus Revenue 1,330
Balance 12/31/92 15,441
Cash 13,331
Loans receivable 2,110

No new applications were received during the year. Selected seminaries have been made aware of the fund's existence and use.

4. Consulting with Seminaries
A subcommittee of three members maintains contact with Westminster Seminary (in Philadelphia) and three others with Westminster Seminary in California in order to communicate and discuss the ways in which these seminaries can best serve the OPC in the training of our prospective ministers.

5. Report of the Observer to the Board of Westminster Seminary (in Philadelphia)

a. Introductory
The 59th General Assembly received the invitation of the Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary (in Philadelphia) to send an observer to the meetings of the Board. GA took the following action:

That the General Assembly accept the invitation of Westminster Theological Seminary (in Philadelphia) to send an observer to the meetings of its Board of Trustees, and designate the General Secretary of the Committee on Christian Education, or, in the event of his unavailability, someone designated by that Committee, to serve as observer; and that the observer be requested to include such report to the General Assembly as he cares to make, in the Report of the Committee on Christian Education.

b. At the request of the Stated Clerk of the OPC and in an ad hoc capacity, I had already attended meetings of the Board on December 3-4, 1991, and on May 28, 1992. Following are my observations:
Meetings of December 3-4, 1991: Similar invitations had been sent to all member churches of NAPARC to send an observer to the meetings of the Board. At this meeting only the OPC and the Korean Presbyterian Church were represented by an observer (officially or unofficially). Both were accorded greetings, and both responded for their respective churches. The business of this meeting was primarily housekeeping in nature.

Meeting of May 28, 1992: I was the only observer present at this meeting, and was once more accorded a warm welcome. The Board approved in concept a 53-page “Strategic Planning Report,” including the following mission statement:

Westminster’s first purpose is to train men for the ordained gospel ministry, forming them to serve as pastors, evangelists and teachers. Our desire is to prepare ministers who believe, love, propagate and defend the system of religious conviction and practice set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms and which is further expressed in the principles of Presbyterian church government.

Secondly, Westminster exists to enrich the body of Christ by offering instruction in Scripture and theology for those women and men who wish to serve the Lord and His church in vocations other than the ordained pastoral ministry.

And, thirdly, this seminary wishes to serve as a center of Christian research and scholarship, communicating to the church and to the world the results of its biblical, theological, apologetic, historical and practical studies.

Further, the Report affirms “that the following are the specific areas of ministry and service for which we seek to train individuals... listed in the order of our institutional priorities” [emphasis mine]:

1. The pastoral ministry
2. Christian higher education
3. Missionary service (Christian ministry in a culture other than the one which is dominant at Westminster)
4. Christian counseling
5. Christian living in the professions”

Thus, the Report sees Westminster primarily as a seminary for the training of pastors and only secondarily as a graduate school of theology for the training of men and women other than pastors. However, it is significant that the Report lists certain proposed additions to the 1992-93 budget in the following order of priority:

1. Hire a full-time Head Librarian
2. Improve Faculty, staff, and Administrative Salaries
3. Increase the budget for Library Acquisitions, physical plant maintenance and improvement and add the equivalent of a half-time Faculty secretary
4. Hire a new Faculty member in the Department of Practical Theology

Accordingly, at this point I wondered whether Westminster’s primary commitment to the training of pastors would dictate a higher priority for the hiring of a homiletician than this list reflected, and whether the Board, upon further thought, would order some revision of this prioritization.
c. I was invited to attend the Board/Faculty Discussion on Pastoral Training, held on Monday, December 7, 1992 at Sandy Cove, Md., and as usual was accorded warm hospitality. Additionally, I attended the Board meeting of the following day but was not able to stay through Wednesday. After conferring with the secretary of the Board regarding significant decisions made after I left, I observe as follows:

Priority of Pastoral Training: I had previously forwarded this concern in writing to the Board. However, during my time at the meetings on December 8, I noticed that the matter did not surface, and I assumed that it came up only after I had gone. As it turned out, my letter had been inadvertently misplaced and thus did not come before the Board at all. I have been assured that it will be circulated prior to the next meeting in May of 1993. I intend to pursue the matter further in an appropriate fashion. Meanwhile, two matters give encouragement: first, the Board has given the hiring of a homiletician “the highest priority of any new faculty appointment,” and second, although in 1992 there were 120 Ph.D. students (compared to 136 M.Div.) the record shows that of all Ph.D. students through 1991 fully 60% are pastors.

Financial Picture: Toward the end of 1992 the seminary received a large gift, a portion of which was used to pay off an operating deficit and to improve salaries, with the balance being invested in a fund to ward off future deficits. This remarkable improvement in the financial picture will no doubt impact the priority list: the institution may now seek to implement its desire to hire a new faculty member in the Department of Practical Theology, particularly in the area of homiletics, unimpeded by budgetary restraints.

6. Encouragement to Presbyteries Regarding Ministerial Candidates
   a. The subcommittee encourages presbyteries to require their ministerial candidates at Westminster Theological Seminary in California to take the courses in American Presbyterian History and in The Westminster Standards.
   b. The subcommittee encourages presbyteries to suggest that their candidates and credentials committees request student transcripts (with the student’s permission) of their ministerial candidates from the seminary which they have attended.
   c. The General Secretary participates regularly as an evaluator at Readiness For Church Planting Seminars which are sponsored by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension of the OPC. Such seminars have been conducted on the campuses of Westminster Theological Seminary (in Philadelphia) and Westminster Theological Seminary in California.

D. Magazine

1. Introductory
   The Committee, through its Magazine Subcommittee (MacDonald, Galbraith, Malcor), and through the editor and the managing editor, has sought to carry out the will of the church set forth in the following motion adopted by the 57th GA:
"that the General Assembly instruct the Committee on Christian Education to continue publishing *New Horizons* ten times each year in a 16-24-page format using the following guidelines:

1. The magazine shall include:
   a. reports from the CHMCE, CFM, CCE, Committee on Diaconal Ministries, COC, a prayer calendar and news of the local, regional, national and worldwide church, and
   b. a feature article, doctrinal exposition, church history, pastoral and missiological concerns, letters to the editor, pro-con debate and book reviews

2. There must be a general balance in the number of pages between 1.a and 1.b in each issue

3. It is not necessary that each element in 1.a and 1.b above be in every issue"

2. Production

During 1992 the editor, under the direction of the Magazine Subcommittee, planned issue contents, arranged for the writing of copy and provided general oversight of the magazine production. Managing Editor James Scott composed the magazine in PageMaker and handled most of the details of the magazine's production. Production Assistant Ali M. Knudsen prepared the Prayer Calendar and did the proofreading. GCP Art Director John Tolsma assisted with photography and design, and Harmony Press, Phillipsburg, N. J., printed the magazine. Additional computer programs and a scanner were purchased during 1992, giving the editorial staff new capability in both copy preparation and graphic design.

3. Redesign

The magazine was redesigned, beginning with the October, 1992 issue, by Mr. Tolsma working together with the editorial staff. New features include: a full-color cover and color capability on three other pages, black and white inside copy, an editorial page, coordinated headings, redesigned page format, and a children's page.

4. Finances

The total cost of publishing *New Horizons* in 1992 was $139,887 compared to a budget of $140,000. The Committee has determined to seek a budgetary increase in 1994 that would allow the production of 11 instead of 10 issues per year.

E. Staff (at the end of 1992):
   General Secretary/Director of The Intern Program Thomas E. Tyson
   Production Assistant (three days a week) Ali M. Knudsen
   Managing Editor (1,200 hours per year) James Scott
   Youth Consultant (two days a month) Mark Sumpter
F. Officers (at the end of 1992):
President - Donald M. Poundstone
Vice-President - Paul S. MacDonald
Secretary - Douglas A. Felch
Treasurer - J. Donald Phillips

II GREAT COMMISSION PUBLICATIONS

A. Purpose
1. An excerpt from the newly revised Junior High curriculum summarizes the central focus of Great Commission Publications: "From Genesis to Revelation . . . (we) discover the unfolding of God's plan to save his people, the fulfillment of that plan in the work of Jesus Christ, and the way the Holy Spirit worked then and works now in the lives of God's people." GCP's ministry is built around teaching the whole counsel of God and unwrapping that sacred account of his redeeming grace. The Junior High course, with its covenantal theme, is the apex of the Sunday school curriculum—with the other departmental courses flowing to and from this one.

2. Amid numerous transitions in recent years, the GCP Board and staff have reaffirmed the organization's basic mission: "to serve as agent for the PCA and the OPC in their work of propagating the Reformed faith . . . " (from article 3 of the joint-venture charter). And to further strengthen GCP's work, additional procedures have been initiated which safeguard its integrity and quality.

3. GCP's job is to provide resources in keeping with the Reformed foundations and priorities of the OPC and PCA. Yet the responsibility goes farther—the long-range objective, working arm in arm with both denominational Christian Education Committees, is to facilitate the proper, biblical building up of the church.

B. Office Location
1. When GCP had to vacate the former OPC office building in the fall 1990, the Board of Trustees established the business department in Georgia and the editorial/production departments, along with the Executive Director, in Horsham, Penna. The setup was approved for a minimum three-year period.

2. The GCP Board currently is considering location options for fall 1993 and beyond with a focus on what best will foster the ministry's relationship and service to both of its parent denominations, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in America.

3. The Board has heard two proposals on office location from its Long-range Planning/Development Committee, but has not made a decision to date. Most recently (March 1993), a recommendation to move the Executive Director to the Atlanta office failed in a tie vote; the OPC Committee on Christian Education had instructed its Trustees to vote against the motion.

4. A combined meeting of the OPC and PCA Committees on Christian Education has been called for August 16 & 17. The agenda for this meeting will include the question of GCP's office location—along with other more fundamental issues concerning the joint venture.
C. Staff

1. GCP's Executive Director is the Rev. Thomas R. Patete, a PCA minister; he is based in the Horsham office. (Mr. Patete also is acting Coordinator of Production while that position temporarily is vacant.) The Horsham facility houses the resident editorial/production staff, currently consisting of two full-time and three part-time persons.

2. In addition, GCP has ongoing agreements with seven free-lance editors for work on specific publication projects. Numerous free-lance consultants, writers, musicians, designers and illustrators across the country are on line and utilized as needed.

3. The business office, located in Norcross, GA (near Atlanta), consists of the Controller plus three persons who assist with order processing, clerical/bookkeeping tasks and advertising. GCP contracts its warehouse and order-fulfillment operations to P&R Publishing Co. of Phillipsburg, NJ.

D. Publication Program

1. Sunday school curriculum

The Sunday school curriculum stands as the centerpiece of GCP's publication program. It accounts for the largest percentage of editorial work (and budget) and approximately 70% of total sales. In order to keep the materials fresh, GCP revises the curriculum, one departmental course at a time, on a ten-year cycle. Revision of the original GCP curriculum (developed by the OPC) was begun in 1978 and completed in 1989. The second revision is fully underway now:

- Senior High course introduced in fall 1989
- Preschool course introduced in fall 1991
- Junior High course to be introduced in fall 1993
- Primary course to be introduced in fall 1995
- Junior course tentatively scheduled for fall 1997

2. Adult Discipleship Studies

During 1992, no new titles were published nor were any current books reprinted. This was in part to cut expenses amid a financial recovery period. In 1993, as funds are available, selected new and out-of-print titles will be published. As mandated by the OPC Committee on Christian Education, GCP is producing a study guide on the Westminster Assembly and its work, entitled *Windows on Westminster*; the Rev. David Hall is the author.

3. Vacation Bible school curriculum

The new VBS curriculum for 1993 is based on the theme *Love the Lord with All Your Heart* (from Deuteronomy 6:5). Materials are designed for a five-day format and cover four age groups, from Pre-K to Junior. The central theme provides a unifying concept for the lessons and the local church's promotion of VBS. While these materials have been redesigned from the ground up, they are drawn from the original curriculum first published by the OPC in the early '50s.

4. *Trinity Hymnal*

The revised edition of *Trinity Hymnal* was introduced in mid 1990. Through 1992, some 58,000 copies of the regular pew hymnal had been purchased. After an initial peak the first two years, sales have leveled off at approximately
12,000 copies per annum. Thanks to the work of the Rev. Stephen Phillips, a Braille edition of the hymnal (hymn texts only) is available.

5. Church bulletins

GCP’s church bulletin series has undergone several changes in recent years in an attempt to find the combination of content and options that best serves our churches. Feedback from users has been extremely helpful to the staff in designing the bulletins, and further responses are welcomed.

6. Communicant training

The fourth edition of Confessing Christ by Calvin K. Cummings was released last year. First published in 1955, this revision was done by the author’s three sons, all of whom are OPC ministers. For the first time, a separate leader’s guide is available. GCP is compiling ideas and prototype materials for training covenant children for communicant membership. Several requests have been received from sessions grappling with the timing and process of guiding children toward profession of faith. Suggestions or inquiries should be directed to the GCP Executive Director.

E. Finances

In 1992, GCP realized a “gain” (income over expenses) of $49,151 compared to a $111,274 “loss” the year before. The difference largely is explained by a 12% reduction in expenses. Sales increased in every category except two: Trinity Hymnal and adult electives. Sunday school sales overall grew 9%.

F. Orthodox Presbyterian Church Trustees

F. Kingsley Elder, Jr., Paul S. McDonald, Larry E. Wilson, George C. Miladin, Donald M. Poundstone and G. I. Williamson.

III BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine administration</td>
<td>$57,681</td>
<td>$58,730</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine printing</td>
<td>63,217</td>
<td>59,970</td>
<td>74,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine distribution</td>
<td>18,989</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Program</td>
<td>43,125</td>
<td>55,090</td>
<td>60,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Services</td>
<td>7,233</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>81,541</td>
<td>85,560</td>
<td>98,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>271,786</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>353,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Outreach</td>
<td>118,565</td>
<td>149,900</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>New Horizons</em> (WWO)</td>
<td>139,886</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>20,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>$259,955</td>
<td>$291,000</td>
<td>$353,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the 60th General Assembly authorize the publication of the January 1993 edition of the Modern English Study Version, in parallel columns with the Confession of Faith of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

2. That if the 60th General Assembly approves publication of the MESV the following statement be included on each page:

   This Modern English Study Version does not have any official authority.

V ELECTIONS

A. To aid commissioners in making informed choices in their selection of men to serve on the Committee we list those members whose terms expire at this assembly together with their present subcommittee assignments:

   1. Ministers
      a. Allen D. Curry—Teaching/Fellowship
      b. John P. Galbraith—Ministerial Training/Magazine
      c. Donald M. Poundstone—GCP/Fellowship/Ministerial Training

   2. Ruling elders
      a. F. Kingsley Elder, Jr.—GCP/Standards Modern English/Long-range Planning/OPC History
      b. Paul S. MacDonald—GCP/Magazine/Christian Schools/Standards Modern English

B. The Standing Rules of the General Assembly require three ministers and two ruling elders for each class of the Committee membership. A Ministerial Training Subcommittee of six members, in three classes, is elected directly by the General Assembly. This subcommittee must include at least two ministers and two ruling elders. There are one minister and three ruling elders already in the classes of 1994 and 1995. The Assembly must elect two men to the Ministerial Training Subcommittee, class of 1996, at least one of whom must be a minister.

VI MINORITY REPORT

A. Modern English Study Version (MESV), formerly Modern English Version (MEV)

The undersigned much appreciates the diligence of the subcommittee that was assigned the task of preparing a modern English form of the Church’s Confession of Faith; and he deeply regrets that he must differ with some of his colleagues in this matter. Also he recognizes the large amount of time, effort, and expense that have gone into the project. He understands, too, the desire to supplant inferior efforts toward the same objective that are extant. Yet none of these factors, nor all of them
together, can be of sufficient warrant to outweigh any possible compromise with the truth, any inadvertent digression from the meaning of our official Confession of Faith, any damage to our witness. While time is always important we must not allow ourselves to be stampeded by a desire to “get on with it”; truth, not haste, must be our primary concern. Nor may we jeopardize the good will of other Reformed churches that have watched our Church over the years and have come to respect us for our firm commitment to Scripture and the Confession, and for our carefulness in handling the truth. Some of them have even entered into agreement with us to seek one another’s counsel to help one another.

The undersigned, however, along with others, is concerned not only about the integrity of the text of the document but also about the way in which it may, and would easily lend itself to, be used. If the common gravitation toward the path of least resistance is followed the MESV will be used as the primary text for instruction, displacing the true, or official, Confession in the minds of those being taught. We must consider, then, the effect of having an “unofficial” Confession, and be very cautious about how we proceed in such a matter.

The undersigned recommends:

That the Assembly determine that before considering “approval of the January 1993 version of the proposed OPC Modern English Study Version (OPC/MESV) for publication” as recommended by the Committee on Christian Education, it seek the counsel of other churches that hold to the Westminster Standards, including the churches with which the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship (the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Korean American Presbyterian Church, the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in America, the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America), the churches to which an invitation to such a relationship has been given (the Presbyterian Church in Korea [Kosin], and the Reformed Church in Japan), other churches with which the OPC has an active correspondence (the Reformed Churches of New Zealand) and of individual theologians outside the OPC (to be chosen by the Stated Clerk) asking (1) for their advice concerning the advisability of publishing such an “unofficial” wording and interpretation of our “official” Confession of Faith, (2) for their evaluation of the text of the document and, (3) to give us the favor of their advice by December 31, 1995.

**Grounds:**

(1) It may be surprising for some to know that prior to January 18, 1993, the full Committee had never, at any meeting, discussed or studied together any draft of the text of the (then) MEV that it had submitted to the Church for study.

(2) The Committee has not had before it the substance of the suggestions and criticisms received by the subcommittee. Additionally, when changes were made in the text of the previous draft neither the Church nor the Committee had any indication of where to find the textual changes. All that anyone had (sometimes) was a two-column draft that required difficult and complicated comparisons of the respective columns. Such deficiencies regarding a document of such far-reaching
importance do not inspire confidence in the final product, however diligent the efforts of the small subcommittee may have been.

(3) The January 18, 1993 meeting has been the only meeting at which a full text of either the MEV or the MESV was discussed, and that was only by a telephone conference call. Such a meeting offers, at best, less-than-ideal conditions for any discussion, let alone for a subject of such great moment as the basic statement of our Church’s faith. Of significance also is the fact that the meeting was held from 7:00 p.m. EST, until after one o’clock in the morning for a majority of the Committee, a time when fatigue has subtle effects on judgment.

This method for this supremely important matter was especially deficient in view of it being the only opportunity to discuss a text that must be an accurate rendering/interpretation of our most basic doctrinal standard.

(4) The Committee, wishing the MESV text to be published right away and as is, compounds the deficiency of inadequate consideration of the text by—with minimal discussion in the Committee, without organized discussion by Church or General Assembly, and without seeking counsel from any other churches—asking the Assembly for its “approval of the January 1993 version” of its basic confession of its faith for use in the Church and presumably elsewhere.

(5) So we observe that the Committee is not asking only for permission to publish the MESV regardless of its merits or demerits. It is, rightly, asking for approval first of the content: “approval of the January 1993 version” so that it may be published. The first must precede the second. It is expected that one, least of all a church of Jesus Christ, would not want to publish a witness—which is what a Confession of Faith is—that it has not approved. Surely no Orthodox Presbyterian General Assembly would do other than require approval of a text of such import before giving permission to publish it. Nor, surely, would it approve the document before being able to evaluate it through hearing discussion of its strengths and weaknesses. We should not neglect the opportunity and obligation to edify one another provided by the Presbyterian system which we profess.

It should be noted here that the undersigned is not recommending that the Assembly approve or disapprove the text of the MESV at this time, with all the debate on the floor of the Assembly that would be involved. Rather, he is saying that we should humbly acknowledge that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is a very small segment of the Presbyterian Reformed church and that all wisdom does not reside in us. Therefore, before we make such a momentous decision we need the advice and evaluation of other churches that are close to us. And we should be aware that undoubtedly most of those churches would be gratified to be asked for their counsel on such a matter.

(6) In the judgment of the undersigned the Committee did not do as much as it could have to comply with the directive of the 58th (1991) General Assembly: it was instructed to prepare any new draft of an MEV “in a format that shows all deletions, substitutions, and additions relative to the Church’s Confession” (Minutes, §52 [d]). The purpose, obviously, was to provide the clearest and easiest way for the reader to see and evaluate the new text as to its faithfulness to the original.

a. The method used by the Committee—separating the proposed changes from the original text by putting them into separate columns—makes it
very difficult to compare the two texts precisely because it requires the reader to jump back and forth from one text to another in order to try to determine for himself what and where the proposed changes actually are; although the new wordings are all there in this method the change is less evident and more difficult to see. The difficulty becomes especially acute, and the change obscure, when entire phrases or clauses are deleted from one place and reinserted in another location, sometimes even into a different sentence. The problem is aggravated when one must compare one text/column with the other.

b. There is a widely-accepted way that was readily available to the Committee, but which the Committee declined to use. The MESV in that format is available to the Assembly. It puts all proposed textual changes, both deletions and additions, in juxtaposition with the original text so that the reader can read either text consecutively and make, in one place, a precise comparison of the proposed changes. Use of that method would have carefully and fully complied with the purpose of the instruction for presentation of another draft of the MEV and would have enabled the reader to have a clear rendering of the proposed changes before him in one text.

c. Greater endeavor by the Committee to fulfill the Assembly’s desired purpose would have enabled the Church to be more certain concerning the faithfulness of the MESV to the Confession.

(7) The MEV has now been renamed MESV—Modern English Study Version. The insertion of the word “Study” in the title is significant. It indicates that the MESV presents the way in which its authors believe that the official Confession is to be understood, i.e., to be interpreted. Although at the Committee’s most recent meeting, March 24-25, 1993, the use of the word “interpretation” to describe one facet of the MESV was resisted, that is precisely what it is: study is for the purpose of learning the meaning of supposedly obscure words and phrases, of interpreting them for the reader. In fact, interpretation cannot be avoided when words are changed, when words and phrases and clauses are deleted or added. The undersigned believes that when the OPC thinks about advising its people and others about the meaning of its Confession of Faith it, from its little corner in the larger Reformed church, needs as much advice as it can get before it approves or distributes such a document to them.

(8) Considering the claim that spurred this endeavor, that much of the existing Confession cannot be understood by this generation of Americans, the normal tendency in instruction would be to avoid confusing the student with ununderstandable language and to teach directly from the text of the MESV. The document than becomes not a “study aid” but itself, not the Church’s Confession, the object of the study. The real Confession inevitably would be largely disregarded. It would thereby become the Church’s de facto Confession without having gone through the constitutional process of amending it.

(9) The Orthodox Presbyterian Church has gone to great lengths to build bridges with other churches of like faith, to be able to seek their counsel and to encourage them to seek ours, going so far as to enter into agreements with them to do just that. In short, we have committed ourselves to the doctrine and practice of the unity of the church. We have talked about unity but when it comes down to the practice of it we shall show them that our words are hollow if we do not seek their
counsel on this statement of our basic doctrines before we publish it. To seek advice after the fact would be seen as, if not hypocritical, at least empty. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate the integrity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, by seeking counsel before we make our decision.

(10) We should not go our own way, disregarding the other Presbyterian Reformed churches as though they are meaningless. Such an attitude moves us in the direction of sectarianism, the tendency to disregard what others might think. We must not allow ourselves to develop such an attitude nor to give occasion to others to think that of us.

B. Bylaws of the Committee on Christian Education

The Bylaws of the Committee on Christian Education provide that persons who are not reelected to the Committee may continue to serve on the Committee for a period of time after their terms have expired and their successors have been elected by the General Assembly. This is contrary to both the Committee's own Charter and the General Assembly's operation and assumes superiority over both. An amendment to the Bylaws to correct this fault was presented to the Committee at its meeting on March 25, 1993, but the Committee declined (after the undersigned had had to leave the meeting for a plane connection) to adopt the proposal.

The undersigned recommends:

That the General Assembly direct the Committee to abandon immediately the application of its current Bylaws IV.2 and V.2 as respects the service of unrelected members and to amend its Bylaws at its next meeting so as to provide that no former members of the Committee not reelected by the General Assembly shall serve in any way as members or officers of the Committee nor as members of the Board of Trustees of Great Commission Publications after the General Assembly has elected their successors to the Committee.

Grounds:

(1) The present Bylaws violate the legal requirements of the Committee's Certificate of Incorporation.

The Certificate of Incorporation (Art. FOURTH, Par. (b) provides that the members of the Board shall "serve for three years and until their successors are elected", at which time their "terms as members of this corporation shall cease and terminate unless reelected" (emphasis ours).

(2) The present Bylaws void the decision of the General Assembly when by election it has determined to replace one member of the Committee with another.

a. Concerning membership on the Committee and on the Board of Trustees of Great Commission Publications, Bylaw IV.2 provides that even if members' terms have expired at the General Assembly elections in May or June and they were not reelected, "A term of office shall normally expire at the beginning of the regular September meeting of the Board. Nevertheless members not reelected and who are members of the Board of Trustees of Great Commission Publications shall serve on the latter Board until the end of its regular meeting in September" (emphasis ours).
b. Concerning officers of the Committee Bylaw V.2 provides that they are "to hold office for one year or until their successors are elected and qualified. The term of office for these officers shall expire at the end of the regular September meeting of the Board" (emphasis ours).

c. The extension of terms beyond those specified are illegal with regard to the legally-approved Certificate of Incorporation and could jeopardize the legality of decisions of the Board if discovered. It is, further, unethical to contravene the legal provisions.

d. The current Bylaws effectively increase the membership of the Committee to more than are allowed by both the Certificate of Incorporation and General Assembly rules: those with new terms and those with expired terms are all serving for months after the election. This is not only illegal but also introduces confusion as to who are the surplus members and who are the voting members and who may be elected as officers and as members of the Board of Great Commission Publications.

 e. If it is claimed that continuity requires such provisions, the other committees of the Church, which have similar problems, have had no problem operating under General Assembly rules. In any case a Committee, as a servant of the General Assembly, must operate as the General Assembly determines.

(3) The required changes will bring the Bylaws into accord with the Committee's legal base in the Certificate of Incorporation and with the operation of the General Assembly in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Galbraith
Among the scripture passages which combine to form our Savior’s Great Commission to his Church is the Acts 1:8 statement “But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the ends of the earth.” Here our Lord reveals his simple but profound strategy for the out-facing work of his Church. It is interesting to note that fully half of that strategy is directed to the home front. There is always a Jerusalem and a Judea—a local neighborhood and a geographical region—that we are charged to permeate with witness to his grace and truth. As the history of the New Testament Church unfolds, there is always a pushing back of the borders in a
drive to implement Christ's strategy. One generation's foreign missions becomes
the next generation's home missions—its Jerusalem and Judea. Until our Savior
comes again, home and foreign missions will stand side by side as the two parts of
his plan to gather in the harvest of his chosen people.

The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension joyfully works with
the presbyteries and congregations of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to bear
effective witness to the Jerusalems and Judeas of the United States. Throughout its
history the OPC has believed that effective gospel witness is done in and through
the church. As the age becomes increasingly secular and the costs of living in a society
drunk with the pleasures of this life increase we face tremendous challenges in the
work of establishing new churches. Meeting locations become fewer and more
costly, communities become increasingly hostile to the truth which declares that
there is only one way to peace with God; and the pressures to accommodate a word-
rooted message to a needs-oriented society are ever present. But the Committee
believes that the will of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is strong to rise to all three
of these challenges through earnest prayer, faithful giving, and deep commitment
to the historic truths of the Reformed faith as it articulates the love of God to a lost
generation. Accordingly the Committee is laying aggressive plans for active work
with each of the OPC's twelve presbyteries in their work of establishing new
churches in Jerusalems and Judeas throughout our needy land.

II FIELD SUPPORT IN 1992

A. Fields Supported

The following fields were provided with financial and other assistance in
1992 (listed by presbytery):

Dakotas
Denver, Colo. (Jack K. Unangst)
Overland Park, Kans. (T. Jeffrey Taylor)

Midwest
Appleton, Wisc. (William B. Acker)
Kentwood, Mich. (Gerald J. Neumair)

New Jersey
Marlton, NJ. (Gerald P. Malkus)

New York & NE
Boston, Mass. (Robert H. Tanzie)

N. California
Antioch, Calif. (Martin R. Ban)

Northwest
Kent, Wash. (Randall A. Bergquist)
Missoula, Mont. (Ronald J. McKenzie)
Wasilla, Alaska (G. Mark Sumpter)

Ohio
Shenango Valley, Pa. (David W. Kiester)

Philadelphia
Allentown, Pa. (Tim W. Young)
Stroudsburg, Pa. (William E. Laverty)

South
Hialeah, Fla. (Diego Gomez)
Key West, Fla. (William V. Welzien)
LaGrange, Ga. (Timothy J. Power)
Lake Worth, Fla. (Arthur J. Steltzer, Jr.)
Melbourne, Fla. (Donald M. Parker)

Southwest
Dallas, Tex. (Michael D. Pasarilla)

In January the Committee resumed aid to Fellowship OPC, Lake Worth,
Florida, upon Mr. Steltzer becoming the missionary/pastor. Mr. Kiester resigned as Associate Pastor of Calvary OPC, Harrisville, Pennsylvania, with church planting responsibilities in Shenango Valley early in 1992 with aid to that mission work discontinued in July. At the request of the Presbytery of the Dakotas, Mr. Taylor was officially designated as Missionary Pastor in Overland Park, Kansas, rather than RHM, beginning January 1.

B. New Fields
In June the Committee began providing aid to Trinity OPC, Denver, Colorado. During the year, regional home missionary Jim Heemstra labored in Maryville, Tennessee, to prepare the way for the calling of an organizing pastor and the beginning of support for that work of the Presbytery of the South in January of 1993. Also during the year the final stages of pastor search were completed by the Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic for the call and arrival of their new missionary pastor in Bowie, Maryland, at the beginning of 1993.

C. Field and RHM Support Policy
During the year the Committee studied its field and RHM support policies and amended its Manual to read as follows:

1. Aid for new mission works
   a. The Committee will provide financial assistance for a mission work up to 50% of its total budget and only if the presbytery and/or the mission work cannot fully support the labors of a full-time evangelist for that work. This support will be for no more than four years on a quarterly declining scale after the first year, contingent upon the renewed yearly recommendation of the presbytery and with the understanding that the Committee will be consulted in the selection of the evangelist.
   b. Before receiving initial support, the presbytery will submit to the Committee an historical sketch of the mission work, including guidelines and provisions for oversight and evaluation, and a plan for developing it into a self-governing and self-supporting congregation, including adequate provision in its budget for the labors of the evangelist on a full-time basis.
   c. Before receiving continued support for the second, third or fourth years the presbytery will submit by November 15 a request for such renewal, together with a written annual evaluation of the mission work, including an indication that provision has been made in its budget for the continued labors of the evangelist on a full-time basis and for benevolent giving to presbytery and denominational causes.

2. Aid for Regional Home Missionaries
   a. The Committee will provide financial assistance for a regional home missionary up to 50% of his total salary and benefits package. This support will be for no more than six years on a declining scale and with the understanding that the Committee will be consulted in the selection of the regional home missionary.
   b. Before receiving initial support, the presbytery will submit to the Committee its proposed program containing guidelines and provision for oversight and evaluation.
c. Before receiving continued support, the presbytery will submit by November 15 a request for such renewal, together with a written annual evaluation of its program, including such things as accomplishments, goals and problems.

The Committee reaffirms its desire to work in partnership with the presbyteries in establishing churches that are Reformed in doctrine and presbyterian in polity. Emphasis is also placed on the importance of every mission work identifying itself with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and including support of denominational budgets in the early ordering of its finances.

Monthly and quarterly reports are presented by church planters to the Committee as well as the missions committee of their presbytery. These include financial matters as well as attendance figures and a record of outreach calls being made. The Committee expects every church planter to make at least thirty outreach-type calls monthly. Items for praise and petition are also gleaned from these reports with some being passed on through PHONE HOME and the Prayer Calendar in New Horizons.

It is important to keep in mind that growth is not only measurable in numbers. The Committee is concerned about spiritual as well as numerical growth. It is difficult, however, to ascertain the degree of spiritual growth. At the same time, it is obvious that a healthy church must have both.

3. Support for Non-aid Receiving Mission Works

Financial support is not the only kind of aid provided for the development of mission works. The coordination of prayer support, making the whole church aware of the needs of its mission works and encouraging missionary pastors and young congregations is also a large part of field support. Accordingly, during the year the Committee added a policy statement to its Manual to acknowledge that while some new missions works do not require financial assistance they can all rightly benefit from the concerted prayer and encouragement of the whole church. That policy is as follows:

The Committee will provide the same prayer support normally rendered to aid-receiving mission works to non-aid-receiving mission works upon request of the presbytery with the following stipulations:

a. Non-aid-receiving mission works will make a commitment to report monthly on the challenges and blessings of the ministry for use in prayer support.

b. Services and assistance provided by the Committee will include prayer listings in New Horizons and PHONE HOME, in addition to those services which the Committee makes available to all congregations of the OPC.

c. Such requests from a presbytery will be on a yearly basis with renewal up to four years.

D. Support Concluded

At the end of 1992 four fields concluded their support relationship with the Committee with total financial aid as indicated: Appleton, Wisconsin ($23,580); Melbourne, Florida ($37,750); Overland Park, Kansas ($74,000); Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania ($48,094).
E. Special Projects Program

The Committee approved a program of special projects during the year:

1. To provide churches and interested individuals with the opportunity to participate, through giving and prayer, with mission works and missionary pastors in special works of outreach or ministry purchases which would be otherwise unaffordable.

2. To provide the Committee with the ability to offer to its supported mission works and missionary pastors funds to be used for those expenses unique to the start of a mission work through the construction of a list of special projects and ministry purchases published and promoted to the churches and through the development of a “Home Missions Club” for the purposes of providing each new Committee-identified mission work with $3,000 - $5,000 in start up costs for advertising, educational materials and worship and equipment purchases, developing a core of individuals and churches committed to assisting no more than three Committee-identified mission works each year through prayer and specified giving amounts in increments of $10, and by giving mission works and missionary pastors the opportunity to report God’s blessings on their progress to those who have committed themselves to pray and give.

This program was initiated as a result of the Committee’s inability, due to lack of financial resources, to implement a previous policy of providing each new mission work with $5,000 in upfront support to assist in meeting startup costs.

III REGIONAL HOME MISSIONARIES

The Committee has gone on record for many years in encouraging each of our presbyteries (currently twelve) to seek a full-time regional home missionary (RHM). In order to facilitate this goal, and assist our financially weaker presbyteries in particular, the Committee has set forth guidelines as reported above (II.C.2. a.b.c.) in granting financial aid to the presbyteries.

In setting before the church its goals for this decade to the 55th General Assembly, the Committee indicated its desire to help each presbytery to secure a RHM by 1995. In the intervening years the Committee has realized that this goal is unrealistic and is working on a revision of these goals, including those pertaining to the RHM program.

During 1992, the Committee provided financial assistance to three presbyteries for RHMs who serve in full-time capacities.

Ruling Elder James A. Heemstra continued his ministry for the Presbytery of the South laboring this year in Maryville, Tennessee, preparing that mission field for the arrival of their organizing pastor. The Rev. Bernard J. Stonehouse continued his ministry for the Presbytery of Philadelphia laboring during the year with the hope of the development of a new mission work in the Southeastern suburbs of Philadelphia in Kennett Square, Pennsylvania. The Committee rejoiced with the Presbytery of the Midwest in their September announcement of the appointment of the Rev. James L. Bosgraf as their new regional home missionary for the Chicago area. Mr. Bosgraf, who resigned as pastor of the denomination’s largest congregation in Oostburg, Wisconsin, to receive the presbytery’s call to return to his native Chicago
as a church planter reported work with four different groups of the Chicago suburbs by the end of 1992.

The Committee gives thanks for these dedicated and mature men and for their effective labors as church planters and church planting coordinators in their presbyteries.

IV URBAN AND ETHNIC MINISTRIES

During the year Dr. William C. Krispin, Executive Director of the Center for Urban Theological Studies in Philadelphia has continued to serve the Committee as part-time Director of Urban and Ethnic Ministries. In addition to working with our Boston urban field and our Hialeah, Florida, Hispanic field, he spent a considerable amount of time during the year working with contacts in the Korean Presbyterian community in the greater New York City area in the hope of developing for the OPC a new Korean ministry on Long Island. By year’s end it had become apparent that such a ministry would not be feasible in the near future.

The Committee remains committed to a strategy of ministering to two ethnic groups within the United States: Second generation Asian-Americans and the rapidly growing Hispanic population.

Dr. Krispin also assisted greatly with the development and final installation of a denominational statistical database for the OPC utilizing General Assembly statistical report data over the past 55 years. It is hoped that this statistical information will prove increasingly valuable to congregations and presbyteries in the coming years.

V CENTER FOR URBAN THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

The Committee continues its membership in the Sponsoring Association (SA) of the Center for Urban Theological Studies (CUTS). Although the CUTS constitution was amended to change the guaranteed right of Reformed agencies to hold 50% of the seats in the SA, the Committee is joined by the OPC Presbytery of Philadelphia and several OPC congregations in a fruitful and beneficial relationship as Sponsoring Association members. The Committee benefits greatly from CUTS’ focus on urban and ethnic ministry and recognizes its need to continue that focus.

VI EVANGELISM AND CHURCH DEVELOPMENT

The Committee views its ministry in the OPC as one of service to the presbyteries and the congregations. As such, it fosters and promotes ways of helping them to fulfill their God appointed tasks. Consequently the Committee maintains a diversified staff whose gifts combine to meet the needs of the churches and the presbyteries.

Ruling elder William J. Vermeulen continues to serve the Committee from his home in Ada, Michigan, as Director of Evangelism and Church Development. The
Committee believes that it reflects the General Assembly's will in its strong desire to encourage congregations in ministries of evangelism and effective outreach. Through Mr. Vermeulen's efforts CHMCE assists church planters in their outreach and offers evangelism education and training seminars to OPC congregations as well as mission works. In addition to serving eleven of our home mission fields during the year he also served 19 existing congregations of the OPC in their evangelistic efforts.

VII TRAINING AND PROMOTION

The Committee seeks to provide encouragement, training and tangible assistance to its home missions personnel. One of these efforts is the bringing together of CHMCE supported home mission pastors for an Annual Home Missions Training Conference held May 9-12 at Camp Geneva in Holland, Michigan. Professor Richard B. Gaffin of Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia brought seminary level theological studies on the doctrine of the resurrection and ruling elder Ken Sande, president of Christian Conciliation Services in Billings, Montana, conducted training in biblical methods of conflict resolution. Another annual event sponsored by the Committee is the bringing together in October of all regional home missionaries and representatives from the missions committees of the presbyteries. Again, in 1992 the gathering was hosted by Spencer Mills OPC in Gowen, Michigan, to whom the Committee expresses grateful appreciation. The Committee staff also offered "Readiness for Church Planting Evaluation Seminars" on the campuses of Westminster Theological Seminary in California and Philadelphia, and Knox Seminary in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. These seminars are designed to identify and provide training for young men who show interest and aptitude for church planting in the OPC.

In an attempt to keep the churches updated on developments in the fields, PHONE HOME was continued and used more widely as the year progressed. Twice monthly, current items of praise and petition, gleaned from reports from the fields, are made available by recorded message and mailed transcript. It was decided that the transcripts were valuable news for all the churches and would be sent to every OPC congregation along with Foreign Missions TELENEWS beginning with the first transcript of 1993.

Two pages of copy are provided for each issue of New Horizons to keep the church informed of God's working in our mission fields. The general secretary utilized part of this space to set forth biblical principles of church planting which will soon be available in pamphlet form.

VIII A STRATEGY FOR CHURCH PLANTING

The Committee has become convinced that it is not sufficient to simply set a goal for the number of churches planted as a discharge of its responsibility to foster the establishment of new Orthodox Presbyterian churches. A church planting
strategy is required. It must ask the hard questions Why? and How? It must ask what kind of churches should be planted and what scriptural principles govern the work of establishing such churches. To that end it had embarked on a slow and deliberate process of study and discussion the end result of which, it is hoped, will be a strategy for church planting which aggressively and winsomely takes the Reformed faith to a needy America.

Thus far two concepts have become clear to the Committee. The first is that biblical principle is foundational. In 1988, the Committee presented to the 55th General Assembly a statement of its principles and policies. In 1992, the Committee took up that document again with a view to revising, owning and improving it. Much work is still to be done here. The second is that forming CHMCE partnerships with its twelve presbyteries is the most sound and biblical means of effectively establishing new congregations. Encouraging advances have been made in a number of presbyteries where this concept has been embraced. In the fall of 1992, presbytery home missions representatives and regional home missionaries met with the CHMCE staff to refine a plan to establish at least 44 new OPC congregations among the twelve regional churches by the end of 1999. Presbyteries are now praying and planning toward the development of new congregations several years into the future, and the Committee is working hard with them to find missionary pastors and to plan and coordinate the mustering of financial resources at the time needed.

This gives us hope for a future of solid and sustained growth and cause to praise God for the continued and increased vitality of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the years to come.

IX AUXILIARY MINISTRIES

A. Questionnaire for Ministers/Licentiates and Vacant Pulpits List

The General Assembly has assigned to the Committee the responsibility of administering a file of completed questionnaires submitted by licentiates and ministers in our denomination who desire to have their availability known to churches without pastors. At the end of the year, 16 questionnaires were on file. All churches requesting this information are sent copies. An updated list of vacant pulpits is also maintained and sent to those requesting such information.

The Committee indicated to the 56th GA its desire to be relieved of this responsibility with the anticipation that it might be transferred to the Stated Clerk. It would seem, however, that this is not the time to add to the new Clerk’s responsibilities.

B. Salary Scale Guidelines

The salary scale, effective January 1, 1993, as adopted by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, provides a guide for assisting churches and presbyteries in setting salaries for home missions personnel in the initial phase of a church planting situation. The following base salary, in addition to manse or housing allowances, is suggested:
Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$19,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>20,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>21,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>21,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>22,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>22,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>23,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>23,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>24,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>24,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>25,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>25,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>25,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>26,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum base salary for those men not covered by the scale will be $27,499.

Further Provisions

1. **Salary.** The salary scale does not apply to ministers who have more than 15 years of service.

2. **Hospitalization.** The church will pay the cost of hospitalization coverage for the missionary and his family.

3. **Housing.**
   a. If a manse is not provided and the minister rents his house, a supplement for rent paid is suggested.
   b. If a minister owns his home, a supplement for interest, taxes and other charges is suggested.

4. **Utilities.** All utilities except personal telephone toll calls, and including heat, will be paid by the church in addition to salary.

5. **Pension.** The church will pay the missionary's pension premium.

6. **Social Security.** The church will pay one-half of the missionary's Social Security. For missionaries not in the Social Security program, the church will pay one-half of the annual investment in an established investment or retirement income plan, on the same basis and in the same amount as though the missionary were in Social Security.

7. **Car Allowance.** Churches and chapels are encouraged to supplement the above salary provisions with a car allowance to help the pastor meet this pastoral expense. At the least, the Committee suggests that auto expenses be reimbursed at the rate of 26 cents per mile.
HOME MISSIONS BUDGET
1992 - 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$385,668</td>
<td>$456,000</td>
<td>$456,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-OPC</td>
<td>7,635</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway Fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398,422</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>547,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISBURSEMENTS
Ministry Expenses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Planting</td>
<td>194,878</td>
<td>221,240</td>
<td>248,892</td>
<td>324,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Works</td>
<td>22,727</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism</td>
<td>13,363</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTS</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>151,172</td>
<td>173,466</td>
<td>175,358</td>
<td>176,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$393,310</td>
<td>$455,166</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$547,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XI CHURCH EXTENSION FUND

The Committee continued during the year to promote investments in the Church Extension Fund and is encouraged to see inquiries and new investments in direct response to limited promotional efforts. Total investments in the Fund on December 31, 1992, totaled $2,644,736. The Fund balance increased from $325,350 at the beginning of the year to $358,023 at the end of the year.

Over the years the Fund has been a key element in the growth of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. A large number of congregations have erected initial buildings or enlarged their facilities through the use of money invested by God's people in this Fund.

During the year interest rates in general for traditional investments continued to decline in the market place. The Committee determined to maintain its rates for investments in the Fund (Demand - 5.5%; Five-Year - 6.5%; Ten-Year - 7%). These rates attracted a number of new investors with a dramatic surge in investments that contributed to the fund balance reaching a record $3,000,000 by year's end.

These uncommitted investments enabled the Committee to assist some of our churches in reviewing their building indebtedness. The Committee provided Redeemer OPC, Dayton, Ohio, and Christ OPC, Janesville, Wisconsin, with new loans to enable them to refinance existing loans at a lower interest rate with the Committee. This in turn saved these churches money being paid on building
indebtedness that can now be used to augment their ministry. A loan was also made to New Hope OPC, Frederick, Maryland, to assist them in purchasing an existing church building. Westminster OPC, Hamden, Connecticut, was granted a loan to assist in building an addition to their present building. At the end of the year other requests for loans were pending.

The Committee began a thorough review of its administration of the Fund and the special challenges before it in view of the present size of the Fund and the changing nature of our economy as it affects investments. In December the Committee determined to continue for the first six months of 1993 the present interest rates for investments in the Fund and also decided to entertain requests during that time from any Orthodox Presbyterian Church for property-related loans or refinancing of their existing mortgage/loan; such requests to be considered in the order received.

Beginning in 1991 much of the administrative work associated with the maintenance of the Fund has been done by the office of the Committee on Coordination. Therefore the service fee for the Committee’s operation of the Fund reimburses the COC for expenses incurred in administering the Fund on behalf of CHMCE. That fee is three-fourths of one percent, computed on a monthly basis, based on total assets in the prior month. In 1992, COC received $19,723.

The balances due on all loans from the Fund as of December 31, 1992, are as follows:

Billings, MT - Rocky Mountain Community Presb. Church $148,669
Bonita, CA - Bonita Orthodox Presbyterian Church 46,297
Bothell, WA - New Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church 14,899
Cape Cod, MA - Presbyterian Church of Cape Cod 35,000
Cheyenne, WY - Northwoods Community Church (OPC) 11,790
Cheyenne, WY - Northwoods Community Church (OPC) 71,869
Cheyenne, WY - Northwoods Community Church (OPC) 6,503
Chula Vista, CA - Bayview Orthodox Presbyterian Church 31,325
Columbus, OH - Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church 139,351
Dayton, OH - Redeemer Orthodox Presbyterian Church 35,098
Dayton, OH - Redeemer Orthodox Presbyterian Church 89,956
Easton, PA - New Life Presbyterian Church 44,761
Eugene, OR - Oak Hill Orthodox Presbyterian Church 19,063
Frederick, MD - New Hope Orthodox Presbyterian Church 110,025
Gettysburg, PA - New Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church 73,498
Green Bay, WI - New Hope Orthodox Presbyterian Church 12,127
Hackettstown, NJ - Church of the Covenant (OPC) 68,019
Hamden, CT - Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church 190,000
Hanover Park, IL - Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church 85,715
Hialeah, FL - Sharon Orthodox Presbyterian Church 67,439
Janesville, WI - Christ Presbyterian Church 36,623
Kalamazoo, MI - Community Presbyterian Church 43,763
Lincoln, NE - Faith Orthodox Presbyterian Church 30,740
Lincoln, NE - Faith Orthodox Presbyterian Church 28,757
The Contingent Fund was created through special gifts to the Committee, including receipts from bequests. These funds have been used to provide loans for the purchase of church property, to assist in building needs and to supplement program funds to finance capital purchases. The Fund is also used to provide transfers from the cash reserve to the General Fund in the form of a loan to cover any deficit in that Fund. In 1992, this was necessary for most of the year. Therefore, the end-of-the-year deficit in the General Fund of approximately $5,000 is a loan from the Fund that is being carried forward into 1993.

In an attempt to rebuild the Fund and continue to assist the church in meeting needs, the Committee made special situation loans to two presbyteries (Midwest and New York and New England) during the year.

The balances due on all loans from this Fund as of December 31, 1992 are as follows:

- Ada, MI - Mr. William J. Vermeulen: $9,741
- Bellmawr, NJ - Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church: 16,422
- Gettysburg, PA - Living Hope Presbyterian Church: 25,522
- Hatboro, PA - Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church: 45,468
- Kalamazoo, MI - Community Presbyterian Church: 20,000
- Janesville, WI - Christ Orthodox Presbyterian Church: 51,069
- Milwaukee, OR - Faith Orthodox Presbyterian Church: 7,834
- Presbytery of New York and New England, OPC: 18,765
- Roswell, NM - Orthodox Presbyterian Church: 15,004
- Zoar, WI - Menominee Orthodox Presbyterian Church: 10,503

TOTAL: $220,328

The Contingent Fund has the following equity in real estate as of December 31, 1992:

- Fort Fairfield, ME - Church and Manse: $1
- Kalamazoo, MI - Land: 20,000
- Stratford, NJ - Church: 37,116

TOTAL: $57,117

TOTAL $2,100,421
XIII GENERAL ASSEMBLY (GA) MATTERS

A. Suggestion Re: Revision to Form of Government (FG)

The 59th GA proposed a revision to the Form of Government, Chapter XVI, Section 7, that was sent to the presbyteries and has received sufficient support to be placed in effect at the 60th General Assembly.

The Committee took note of that revision with grounds presented and suggests to the 60th GA that Ground (5) supporting the revision to the Form of Government, Chapter XVI, Section 7, as proposed to the presbyteries for consideration by the 59th GA, had less basis in fact than might otherwise appear because:

1. It implies that loans from the denominational Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to churches that have recently left the OPC are still outstanding. This is contrary to fact since all outstanding loans from the Committee's Church Extension Fund and Contingent Fund are presently to churches, presbyteries and individuals in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

2. The Committee has a policy that all loans from the Church Extension Fund and Contingent Fund will be payable in full by churches that later determine to withdraw from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and will have up to one year for any necessary refinancing from the date that the withdrawal is effected by the presbytery.

3. The Committee enjoyed good cooperation with those churches that had loans before the above stated policy was adopted. They willingly and expeditiously refinanced the loans that had been granted to them while part of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

B. Committee Representatives to the 60th GA

The Committee appointed the Rev. Ross W. Graham, General Secretary, and Messrs. John R. Hilbelink and David J. O'Leary as representatives to the 60th GA.

XIV ADMINISTRATION

A. Committee Members and Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Ruling Elders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1995</td>
<td>Mark R. Brown</td>
<td>Robert A. Kramm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salvador M. Solis</td>
<td>Leonard W. Schmurr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald S. Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1994</td>
<td>John R. Hilbelink</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyman M. Smith</td>
<td>Garret A. Hoogerhyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William E. Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1993</td>
<td>Glenn T. Black</td>
<td>Richard L. Hake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David J. O'Leary</td>
<td>Jack H. Julien, D.D.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard R. Gerber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officers

President, John R. Hilbelink
Vice-President, Lyman M. Smith
Secretary, David J. O’Leary
Treasurer, Robert A. Kramm

B. Executive Committee:
   Messrs. Barker, Gerber, Hoogerhyde, O’Leary and the President

C. Subcommittees
   Finance:
      Messrs. Barker, Black, Hoogerhyde (chairman), Julien, Kramm
   General Ministries:
      Messrs. Brown (Chairman), Solis Hake, O’Leary, Solis, Warren
   Urban and Ethnic:
      Messrs. Gerber (Chairman), Hilbelink, Schmurr, Smith, Taylor

D. Ministry Staff:
   General Secretary, Ross W. Graham
   Director of Evangelism and Church Development, William J. Vermeulen
   Director of Urban and Ethnic Ministries (part time), William C. Krispin

E. Office Staff:
   Secretary, Lisl M. Gaffin

XV ELECTIONS

The terms of the above named class of 1993 expire at this assembly. Mr. Smith, class of 1994, has presented his resignation because of his reassignment out of the country as a Navy chaplain.
1992 proved to be an exciting year and challenging year! The Lord continues to provide unusual opportunities and enabling for our foreign missions efforts. New fields are opening up and being aggressively investigated and developed. Similarly, on the home front, we continue to receive numerous inquiries and requests for help in starting up new works. Our Home Missions staff is working vigorously to wisely and efficiently manage the many faceted work of church planting in America. In the Christian Education area, we are benefiting from the re-designed *New Horizons* magazine. Several in-house publishing efforts are well along toward completion. Our publishing arm, Great Commission Publications, operated in the black for 1992 and for the second straight year required no subsidy from us.

We continue to face constant belt-tightening and the need to be good stewards of the funds given for Worldwide Outreach, as the total given in 1992 was short of the budget goal.

I PURPOSE

The purpose of the Committee is to coordinate the strategic planning of the three program committees (Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension) so as to help the Church maximize the use of its
resources for the fulfillment of its tasks, to support the ministry of the pastors and sessions in their responsibility to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the Church, and to help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three program committees in the development of support for their work.

The Committee is also charged with seeking to develop both short and long-range goals for the Church's program as a denomination and to recommend to the General Assembly priorities for the achievement of both short and long-range goals set by the program committees of the denomination, including the financial support needed.

II OPERATION

A. Membership

1. Elected by the General Assembly
   a. Class of 1993
      (1) The Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, Jr.
      (2) Ruling Elder Gordon H. Singer
   b. Class of 1994
      (1) The Rev. Steven F. Miller
      (2) Ruling Elder Peyton H. Gardner
   c. Class of 1995
      (1) The Rev. Roger L. Gibbons
      (2) Ruling Elder Russell W. Copeland, Jr.

2. Elected by the Program Committees
   a. Christian Education - Ruling Elder J. Donald Phillips
   b. Foreign Missions - Ruling Elder John D. Williams
   c. Home Missions - Ruling Elder Garret A. Hoogerhyde

3. General Secretaries (ex officio)
   b. Foreign Missions - Ruling Elder Mark T. Bube
   c. Home Missions - The Rev. Ross W. Graham

B. Officers

1. Chairman - Ruling Elder J. Don Phillips
2. Vice-Chairman - The Rev. Steven Miller
3. Secretary - Ruling Elder Gordon H. Singer
4. Treasurer - Ruling Elder Peyton H. Gardner

C. Standing Subcommittees

1. Administration
   The Administration Subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Gardner and Singer, is principally responsible for the orderly receiving and accounting of funds for the program committees.

2. Promotional Guidelines and Stewardship Education
   The Promotional Guidelines and Stewardship Education Subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. DeVelde and Hoogerhyde, is principally responsible for developing guidelines for the program committees, developing and preparing programs to encourage the practices of good stewardship, encouraging the procure-
ment of support from individuals through both current and deferred giving, and providing counsel, assistance and literature aimed at increasing the commitment of each member of the Church in the use of his or her means, time and talents in the work of Christ's kingdom.

3. Program Review

The Program Review Subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Miller, Copeland, Gibbons and Williams, is principally responsible for organizing the review of the program committees' programs and budgets and encouraging the development of short and long-range goals, strategies and costs by the three program committees.

4. The Chairman serves ex officio on all three standing subcommittees.

D. Temporary Subcommittees

A temporary subcommittee to search Committee records and prepare a manual of Committee policy began its work in 1992.

E. Meetings

As required by the Instruments of the General Assembly, the Committee met four times since the last Assembly: June 10, 1992; November 13, 14, 1992; January 25, 1993 (by conference call); and March 26, 1993.

III ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Worldwide Outreach Program

1. Financial situation

In 1992, the Church experienced a 6.8% increase in giving to Worldwide Outreach, with total Worldwide Outreach receipts for the year increasing from $1,202,440 in 1991 to $1,284,536 in 1992. These receipts were less than the approved 1992 budget of $1,400,000. Careful spending enabled the Committees on Christian Education and Foreign Missions to end the year only slightly in the red (approximately $11,800 and $23,200 respectively). The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension ended 1992 slightly in the black (approximately $3700).

In light of these recent events, and after prayerful consideration, the Committee is recommending a total Worldwide Outreach program for 1994. (See Recommendation 1 below) of $1,450,000, which represents a 3.6% increase over the approved 1993 budget.

2. Long-range planning

On March 26, 1993, members of the Program Review Subcommittee met with representatives of the three program committees to consider the relative weights of program priorities and to discuss possible adjustments to the method of allocating Worldwide Outreach receipts. A further meeting was set for September 13, 1993 to seek a more equitable method of allocating undesignated receipts, to take into account the ability of one of the program committees to raise significant funds in addition to Worldwide Outreach receipts. Factors emerging from this subcommittee's deliberations caused the full Committee to recommend a one year change in the method of allocating Worldwide Outreach receipts. (See Recommendation 2 below).
B. Coordinated Promotional Efforts
   1. 1992 Thank Offering
   2. Spring 1993 special offering authorized for the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension
C. Administrative
   Each year the Committee must specify a date upon which to close the books for the year. For 1992, the Committee determined that checks dated on or before December 31, 1992, and received by January 8, 1993, will be credited towards the 1992 budget. All other checks received after December 31, 1992, would be credited towards the 1993 budget.

IV ITEMS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A. Paragraph E.4.o. of the Assembly’s Instruments
   Under paragraph E.4.o.(2).(d), the names of the individuals whose fund raising activities among the presbyteries and congregations have endorsed and encouraged by the Committee under paragraph E.4.o of the Instruments must be reported annually to the General Assembly.
   At its regular April 1990 meeting, the Committee endorsed and encouraged the fund raising activities among the presbyteries and congregations for the Hubenthals under this paragraph through September 1992.
   At its regular January 1993 meeting, the Committee endorsed the fund raising activities for the support of the Rev. Donald H. Taws in Eritrea for three years.
   At its regular January 1993 meeting, the Committee endorsed the fund raising activities of the Rev. Charles Telfer in Eritrea for three years.
   At its regular March 1993 meeting, the Committee endorsed the fund raising activities of the Rev. Hailu Mekonnen in Ethiopia for three years.
B. Paragraph E.4.p of the Assembly’s Instruments
   Under paragraph E.4.p.(3).(f), all special relationships created under paragraph E.4.p must be reported annually to the General Assembly.
   At its regular November 1989 meeting, the Committee concurred with the Committee on Foreign Missions in approaching the Presbytery of New York and New England with a view towards the undertaking of a special relationship with the work in Suriname, and a special relationship was subsequently established. A group of congregations in the Presbytery of the Midwest have established a similar relationship with the English family in Suriname. This was approved by the Committee at its regular November 1989 meeting.
   At its regular March 1992 meeting, the Committee concurred with the Committee on Foreign Missions in approaching individual congregations, groups of congregations or regional churches with a view toward undertaking special relationships with new foreign missions works in Eritrea, Guyana, Manchuria, Mongolia, Nicaragua and Uganda.
   At its regular November 1992 meeting, similar concurrence was given for the Committee on Foreign Missions to seek special relationships with a planned new work in Bulgaria.
At its regular March 1993 meeting, similar concurrence was given for the Committee on Foreign Missions to seek special relationships with planned new works in Ethiopia and Kenya.

V 1994 BUDGET FOR THE COMMITTEE

The Committee's actual expenses for 1992, current budget for 1993, and proposed budget for 1994 are set forth below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting personnel</td>
<td>$84,366</td>
<td>$92,369</td>
<td>$99,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel &amp; expenses</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office rent</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>6,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment/maintenance</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office expenses</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee meetings</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed materials</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Audit/Financial</td>
<td>13,986</td>
<td>13,856</td>
<td>10,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Support/Supplies</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$147,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$152,140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other anticipated revenue for the Committee includes $10,000 in interest and $20,140 for managing the Church Extension Fund. Copies of the 1992 annual audit are available upon request.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the General Assembly approve the following Worldwide Outreach program for 1994 (see III.A.1 above):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>$157,016</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>554,173</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions</td>
<td>461,811</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$1,173,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **New Horizons** 155,000
   **Coordination** 122,000
   **Total 1994 Worldwide Outreach** $1,450,000
2. That the following words in Instrument E.4.i.(1) be suspended for 1994: “in the proportion which each program committee’s budget bears to the total budget;” and replaced with “in the following proportion: Christian Education 16%, Foreign Missions 42% and Home Missions & Church Extension 42%;” (see III.A.2 above).

VII ELECTIONS

The terms of the Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, Jr., and Ruling Elder Gordon H. Singer expire at this assembly. Under Standing Rule IX.2.h, both are eligible for re-election. Under the same rules, this Assembly must elect one minister and one ruling elder to the Class of 1996.

Appendix

Worldwide Outreach:
Receipts and Budgets: 1980 – 1992
1992 Source of Funds
1992 Use of Funds
Sources of Funds: 1992 – 1994
Use of Funds: 1992 – 1994
Fund Balances: 1986 – 1992

Revenues and Expenses:
Worldwide Outreach: Combined General Funds
Committee on Christian Education
Committee on Foreign Missions
Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension
New Horizons
Committee on Coordination

Historical Information (Allocated by Committee)
Budgets Approved by the GA: 1973 – 1993
## WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

**Total Budgets and Receipts: 1980 – 1992**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total WWO Receipts</th>
<th>Increase % Incr.</th>
<th>Total WWO Budget</th>
<th>Increase % Incr.</th>
<th>Receipts as % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$822,915</td>
<td></td>
<td>$812,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>839,561</td>
<td>$16,646</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>882,811</td>
<td>$70,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>782,714</td>
<td>(56,847)</td>
<td>−6.8%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>117,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,000,323</td>
<td>217,609</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>972,150</td>
<td>(27,850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>934,779</td>
<td>(65,544)</td>
<td>−6.6%</td>
<td>962,415</td>
<td>(9,735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>938,057</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,026,161</td>
<td>63,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,055,821</td>
<td>117,764</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>23,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>991,266</td>
<td>(64,555)</td>
<td>−6.1%</td>
<td>1,064,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1,276,283</td>
<td>285,017</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,329,261</td>
<td>52,978</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1,386,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,179,190</td>
<td>(150,071)</td>
<td>−11.3%</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,202,440</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,605,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,284,485</td>
<td>82,045</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>[adopted]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>[proposed]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WWO: Receipts and Budgets 1980–1992**

- Receipts: $34,502 (4.3%)
- Budget: $72,045 (6.5%)
**WWO: 1992 Sources of Funds**

- **OPC (91.4%)**
- **Reserves (3.1%)**
- **Misc (2.3%)**
- **Non OPC (3.2%)**

**WWO: 1992 Use of Funds**

*Program Services by Committee*

- **CFM (29.3%)**
- **CHMCE (16.8%)**
- **CE (3.6%)**
- **NH (10.0%)**
- **Sppt.Serv. (40.3%)**
### WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

Sources of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$1,284,485</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>44,759</td>
<td>59,875</td>
<td>67,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>33,069</td>
<td>38,125</td>
<td>43,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$1,362,313</td>
<td>$1,498,000</td>
<td>$1,666,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43,434</td>
<td>64,557</td>
<td>121,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$1,405,747</td>
<td>$1,562,557</td>
<td>$1,787,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WWO: Sources of Funds**

1992 – 1994

![Diagram showing sources of funds from 1992 to 1994](image-url)
## WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

### Use of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>$50,358</td>
<td>$65,440</td>
<td>$92,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>411,778</td>
<td>448,502</td>
<td>528,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions &amp; Ch. Ext.</td>
<td>235,964</td>
<td>305,792</td>
<td>359,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons</td>
<td>139,887</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Services</strong></td>
<td>$837,987</td>
<td>$959,734</td>
<td>$1,142,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORTING SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING SERVICES</td>
<td>567,760</td>
<td>602,823</td>
<td>645,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS USED</strong></td>
<td>$1,405,747</td>
<td>$1,562,557</td>
<td>$1,787,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graphical Representation

**WWO: Use of Funds**

1992 – 1994

- CE
- CFM
- CHMCE
- NH
- Sppt.Serv.
- Reserves
# Worldwide Outreach Program Committee Fund Balances

Source: 1986–1992 balance sheets prepared by Auditor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12/31/86</th>
<th>12/31/87</th>
<th>12/31/88</th>
<th>12/31/89</th>
<th>12/31/90</th>
<th>12/31/91</th>
<th>12/31/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christian Ed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$104,281</td>
<td>$122,661</td>
<td>$88,245</td>
<td>$166,928</td>
<td>$55,621</td>
<td>$30,973</td>
<td>$19,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Plant</td>
<td>47,092</td>
<td>45,772</td>
<td>37,359</td>
<td>31,658</td>
<td>192,193</td>
<td>201,772</td>
<td>188,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>89,223</td>
<td>81,306</td>
<td>105,337</td>
<td>121,824</td>
<td>325,715</td>
<td>336,194</td>
<td>325,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CE</td>
<td>$240,596</td>
<td>$249,939</td>
<td>$230,941</td>
<td>$320,410</td>
<td>$573,529</td>
<td>$568,940</td>
<td>$533,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Missions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>($107,429)</td>
<td>($273,500)</td>
<td>$20,610</td>
<td>$160,511</td>
<td>$51,155</td>
<td>$73,131</td>
<td>$40,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Plant</td>
<td>435,493</td>
<td>496,693</td>
<td>295,871</td>
<td>302,350</td>
<td>450,411</td>
<td>365,623</td>
<td>1,271,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68,639</td>
<td>192,575</td>
<td>195,615</td>
<td>326,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Proj.</td>
<td>89,698</td>
<td>99,084</td>
<td>145,599</td>
<td>148,583</td>
<td>151,561</td>
<td>122,506</td>
<td>75,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>282,217</td>
<td>291,049</td>
<td>286,665</td>
<td>309,142</td>
<td>463,042</td>
<td>424,215</td>
<td>398,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CFM</td>
<td>$699,979</td>
<td>$613,326</td>
<td>$748,745</td>
<td>$989,225</td>
<td>$1,308,774</td>
<td>$1,181,091</td>
<td>$2,111,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Missions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$40,704</td>
<td>$26,648</td>
<td>$86,930</td>
<td>$11,611</td>
<td>($44,463)</td>
<td>($7,738)</td>
<td>($2,626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>693,999</td>
<td>533,354</td>
<td>452,945</td>
<td>451,114</td>
<td>499,925</td>
<td>499,378</td>
<td>596,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Exten.</td>
<td>211,644</td>
<td>213,933</td>
<td>233,984</td>
<td>290,795</td>
<td>310,428</td>
<td>325,350</td>
<td>358,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Proj.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>215,395</td>
<td>217,997</td>
<td>219,865</td>
<td>219,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111,591</td>
<td>258,529</td>
<td>272,545</td>
<td>183,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19,382</td>
<td>24,529</td>
<td>49,164</td>
<td>104,017</td>
<td>76,597</td>
<td>68,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CHMCE</td>
<td>$965,129</td>
<td>$798,474</td>
<td>$823,023</td>
<td>$1,120,613</td>
<td>$1,286,433</td>
<td>$1,385,997</td>
<td>$1,423,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$10,223</td>
<td>($9,473)</td>
<td>$1,049</td>
<td>$870</td>
<td>($2,421)</td>
<td>($858)</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Budget</td>
<td>(2,142)</td>
<td>35,970</td>
<td>46,610</td>
<td>77,162</td>
<td>91,450</td>
<td>84,108</td>
<td>89,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Travel</td>
<td>32,339</td>
<td>29,634</td>
<td>19,933</td>
<td>15,080</td>
<td>13,854</td>
<td>23,452</td>
<td>34,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(6,303)</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>55,707</td>
<td>38,810</td>
<td>12,231</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total COC</td>
<td>$34,117</td>
<td>$63,020</td>
<td>$73,961</td>
<td>$148,819</td>
<td>$141,932</td>
<td>$118,932</td>
<td>$128,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds</strong></td>
<td>$1,939,821</td>
<td>$1,724,759</td>
<td>$1,876,670</td>
<td>$2,579,067</td>
<td>$3,310,429</td>
<td>$3,254,960</td>
<td>$4,197,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing fund balances for Christian Ed., Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Coordination, and Total All Funds from 1986 to 1992]
### WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

Combined General Funds: Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$1,284,485</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>44,759</td>
<td>59,875</td>
<td>67,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>33,069</td>
<td>38,125</td>
<td>43,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$1,362,313</td>
<td>$1,498,000</td>
<td>$1,666,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>$50,358</td>
<td>$65,440</td>
<td>$92,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>411,778</td>
<td>448,502</td>
<td>528,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions &amp; Ch. Ext.</td>
<td>235,964</td>
<td>305,792</td>
<td>359,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons</td>
<td>139,887</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Services</strong></td>
<td>$837,987</td>
<td>$959,734</td>
<td>$1,142,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>$81,541</td>
<td>$85,560</td>
<td>$98,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>197,721</td>
<td>185,555</td>
<td>206,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions &amp; Ch. Ext.</td>
<td>157,346</td>
<td>184,208</td>
<td>187,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>131,152</td>
<td>147,500</td>
<td>152,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supporting Services</strong></td>
<td>$567,760</td>
<td>$602,823</td>
<td>$645,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$1,405,747</td>
<td>$1,562,557</td>
<td>$1,787,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>($43,434)</td>
<td>($64,557)</td>
<td>($121,638)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding of Deficit (Surplus):
- From (to) CCE cash reserves: $11,831
- From (to) CFM cash reserves: 33,023
- From (to) CHMCE cash reserves: (112)
- From (to) NH cash reserves: 0
- From (to) COC cash reserves: (1,308)
- **Deficit (Surplus) funded**: $43,434

Notes:
- **1992 "Actual"**: Based on Auditor’s reports
- **1993 "Approved"**: Based on Committees’ reports, allocated as near as possible in the same manner as the Auditor.
- **1994 "Requested"**: Based on amounts requested by the Committees in their annual reports, allocated as near as possible in the same manner as the Auditor.
- **Supporting Services**: All salary and benefits for staff have now been allocated as Supporting Services. Prior year’s reports distributed a portion of these expenses to Program Services. As a result of this reclassification you will note increased costs for Supporting Services even though there are no significant changes to the staffing of the programs.
COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
General Fund: Revenue and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$114,950</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>9,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$120,068</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$190,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial training</td>
<td>$43,125</td>
<td>$55,090</td>
<td>$60,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training services</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained Servant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Workers' Inserts</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Services</td>
<td>$50,358</td>
<td>$65,440</td>
<td>$92,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative and Promotion</td>
<td>$81,541</td>
<td>$85,560</td>
<td>$98,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$131,899</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$190,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($11,831)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding of Deficit (Surplus):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-fund transfers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>11,831</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit (Surplus) funded</td>
<td>$11,831</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The salary and benefits paid to the General Secretary have been allocated as follows:
25.0% to New Horizons, 75% to Christian Education.
### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN MISSIONS
#### General Fund: Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$539,490</td>
<td>$539,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>33,509</td>
<td>25,975</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>9,525</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$576,476</td>
<td>$574,500</td>
<td>$640,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary support</td>
<td>$411,778</td>
<td>$448,502</td>
<td>$528,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; administration</td>
<td>$180,672</td>
<td>$170,555</td>
<td>$185,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>17,049</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supporting Services</strong></td>
<td>$197,721</td>
<td>$185,555</td>
<td>$206,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$609,499</td>
<td>$634,057</td>
<td>$735,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>($33,023)</td>
<td>($59,557)</td>
<td>($94,638)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding of Deficit (Surplus):**
- **Inter-fund transfers**: $0
- **Decrease (increase) in cash**: 33,023, 59,557, 94,638

**Deficit (Surplus) funded**: $33,023, $59,557, $94,638

**Notes:**
- The salary and benefits paid to all employees have been allocated to administration.
- 1992 revenues and expenses shown above do not reflect $121,236 receipts, nor $134,532 expenses for "Direct Missionary Support".
- 1992 revenues and expenses shown above do not reflect $41,588 receipts, nor $28,833 expenses for "Special Projects".
## COMMITTEE ON HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION

**General Fund: Revenues and Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$385,667</td>
<td>$456,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>7,636</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$393,422</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field support</td>
<td>$167,937</td>
<td>$207,592</td>
<td>$251,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional home missionaries</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other church extension</td>
<td>46,027</td>
<td>73,200</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Services</strong></td>
<td>$235,964</td>
<td>$305,792</td>
<td>$359,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; administrative</td>
<td>$151,176</td>
<td>$173,358</td>
<td>$176,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supporting Services</strong></td>
<td>$157,346</td>
<td>$184,208</td>
<td>$187,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$393,310</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$547,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>($5,000)</td>
<td>($27,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of Deficit (Surplus):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter–fund transfers</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>(5,112)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit (Surplus) funded</strong></td>
<td>($112)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
The salary and benefits paid to all employees have been allocated entirely to administration.
## NEW HORIZONS

General Fund: Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions – OPC</td>
<td>$139,887</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of Deficit (Surplus):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depr. expense (Capital Fund)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit (Surplus) funded</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION

General Fund: Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Approved 1993</th>
<th>Requested 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions – OPC</td>
<td>$104,491</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>27,969</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>30,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,308</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of Deficit (Surplus):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>($1,308)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

**Percentage Distribution of Budgets Approved by the General Assembly**

1973 – 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>CFM</th>
<th>CHMCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>[proposed]</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 1973 – 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE</th>
<th>CFM</th>
<th>CHMCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budgets Approved by the GA: 1973 – 1993

Percent Distribution by Committee
## WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

Percent of Approved Budget Funded: By Committee 1981—1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>177,384</td>
<td>205,170</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>321,535</td>
<td>313,621</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>245,385</td>
<td>256,620</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>165,214</td>
<td>235,700</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>302,881</td>
<td>360,665</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>215,085</td>
<td>292,795</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>244,911</td>
<td>234,315</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>366,428</td>
<td>347,196</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>287,942</td>
<td>273,652</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>210,588</td>
<td>229,243</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>343,579</td>
<td>339,680</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>260,057</td>
<td>267,728</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>214,940</td>
<td>250,206</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>370,160</td>
<td>370,343</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>266,836</td>
<td>292,212</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>221,486</td>
<td>241,800</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>431,160</td>
<td>393,390</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>272,690</td>
<td>294,810</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>197,630</td>
<td>227,850</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>407,054</td>
<td>393,390</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>279,430</td>
<td>308,760</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>205,875</td>
<td>225,382</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>582,203</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>346,211</td>
<td>361,212</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>198,293</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>594,146</td>
<td>556,000</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>345,119</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>166,770</td>
<td>254,660</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>477,275</td>
<td>662,270</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>354,151</td>
<td>534,000</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>95,650</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>492,016</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>397,293</td>
<td>534,000</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>114,960</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>539,491</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>385,667</td>
<td>456,000</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1981—1992 Average: 83.5 98.8 87.8

---

Percent of Budget Funded: By Committee
1981—1992

- **CE**
- **CFM**
- **CHMCE**
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIACONAL MINISTRIES TO THE 60TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Then the righteous will answer Him, saying, "Lord, when did we see You hungry and feed You, or thirsty and give You drink? When did we see You a stranger and take You in, or naked and clothe You? Or when did we see You sick, or in prison, and come to You?" And the King will answer and say to them, "Assuredly, I say to you, inasmuch as you did it to one of the least of these My brethren, you did it to Me" (Matt. 25:37-40).

I THE MINISTRY IN 1992

We urge the church to read the annual TREASURER'S REPORT prayerfully. Our report shows the variety of ministries this Committee carries out in your behalf. The TABLE reproduced below demonstrates how the Lord has prospered the OPC. This year all expenses stayed somewhat the same except emergency relief and foreign aid. We thank the Lord that the major catastrophe due to the Florida hurricane left few major financial needs among OPC constituency and that the regional diaconate (working in consultation with this Committee) was able to meet the needs. Foreign aid decreased due to a rearrangement of matters in Korea.

Again this year, all expenditures for "INFIRM MINISTERS" ($55,479) were given to a single family, the Roger Ramsey family. All involved expected the expenses to go down since Mrs. Ramsey passed away, but the hospitalization went up considerably. This is probably due to the huge expenses incurred during Mrs. Ramsey's illness and the fact that Roger continues to have repeated major expenses. Mr. Ramsey remarried this year. His wife is not working and the situation often requires her nursing Roger so she cannot work. As of February 1, it looks as if Mr. Ramsey will be working as a home missionary in New England. The financial arrangements between the calling agency and the CDM are being worked out. We will continue to supplement his income to insure him adequate hospitalization coverage, medicines and whatever is needed to keep him alive and well.

In 1992, 138 out of 196 churches and chapels contributed to the General Assembly diaconal ministry, while 58 did not. In 1991, there were 193 churches and chapels; 126 contributed and 67 did not. This means there were 12 more contributing congregations in 1992 than in 1991.

Again we are glad to report that the income from all sources covered all the expenditures of this Committee, and we were enabled to meet all the budgeted expenditures, and to provide in some cases of emergency needs.

As in past years, we report that many individuals regularly send contributions to this Committee. It would be inappropriate, of course, to list these generous Christians by name. The Lord will reward them. Many of the members and adherents of our congregations give just as sacrificially. They, too, will go unnamed, but our Lord knows how to reward each one richly.

The following TABLE indicates the approximate percentage of total funds disbursed on the items listed:
II Reasons for rejoicing and concern

We report that there is good reason for great rejoicing in the Lord insofar as the church gave $211,733 to this ministry in 1992 (in 1991 $211,001). For the third straight year the church met the foreign missions diaconal challenge and again we gave the additional $4000 to Kenya, $5000 to Lebanon (through MERF), $4000 to Sudan (through MERF), $3000 to Suriname. In addition, we gave $37,159 to meet the needs of the Aged and Infirm Ministers, Widows, and Orphans Fund.

Giving to foreign causes is down because (1) the Committee on Foreign Missions (CFM) at the request of the Korean mission requested us not to send money to Korea for the support of the mental hospital ($2,000) and the lepers ($1,500), (2) the CFM requested we not send money to Uganda ($4,000) because we have lost our contact in that nation, and (3) we sent only $6,000 to Kenya during 1992 and the remainder of the budgeted amount ($3,000) was sent after January 1, 1993. We are not recommending a decrease in the budget for Korea because there is presently a proposal before us for other work in that nation.


We wish to commend the churches for their giving for the months of April and May which met our budgeted needs. As usual during the months surrounding the Thank Offering giving to this Committee was down quite a bit.

III Challenge

We are recommending (see proposed budget) that we add a line item “Reformed Church of East Africa” for an amount of $1000 for the year 1993. The Reformed Church of East Africa has been recommended by members of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations. This faithful church has left the Reformed Ecumenical Council and is now seeking formal relationships with the OPC. As of January 1993, the members of this Kenyan church are suffering from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1991</th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Administration - includes</td>
<td>$13,847</td>
<td>$16,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all Committee travel expenses</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Emergency and other relief</td>
<td>25,353</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Hosp. premiums</td>
<td>43,034</td>
<td>45,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Work scholarships and</td>
<td>18,530</td>
<td>19,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian school aid USA</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Relief funds foreign</td>
<td>30,654</td>
<td>23,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Temporary loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Pension aid</td>
<td>34,900</td>
<td>34,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Infirm ministers</td>
<td>49,008</td>
<td>55,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$215,326</td>
<td>$194,944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
famine and the effects of intertribal warfare. They desperately need help from outside their own nation.

IV. ADMINISTRATION

The Committee met in Denver twice during the year 1992: Feb. 21 and Oct. 16. All Committee members were present at the spring meeting except Mr. Wilbert Suwyn & Mr. Cyril Nightengale. All members were present at the fall meeting.

The officers of the Committee are: the Rev. David W. King, President, Janesville, WI; Deacon Roy Ingelse, Vice-president, Oostburg, WI; the Rev. Leonard J. Coppes, Th.D., Secretary-Treasurer, Denver, CO. Until the 59th General Assembly the members of the Committee were: Deacon Greg R. Nightengale, Denver, CO; the Rev. Donald J. Duff, Glenside PA; Elder Wilbert J. Suwyn, Pt. Hueneme, CA; Elder Cyril T. Nightengale, Denver, CO. Messrs. Cyril Nightengale and Wilbert Suwyn were replaced by the General Assembly with Messrs. Howard Porter (Elder, Glenside, PA), and Dr. Joe Mark Moody (Elder, San Antonio, TX). Between meetings, business was conducted by majority vote of the executive committee consisting of all the elected officers. Regular monthly reports keep all members informed.

V ELECTIONS

Terms which expire with this Assembly: the Rev. David King; Elder Howard Porter.

Requirements for membership on this Committee: this Committee shall consist of seven members with one minister in each class, two deacons in one class, and one elder in each remaining class.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the General Assembly request the congregations to give at least half of their contributions by the end of May.

2. That the General Assembly remind the presbyteries not to approve a call containing “free from worldly care” if they consider the call under consideration to be inadequate to provide for the minister’s livelihood, and to make certain that the call includes a provision for the payment of hospitalization, surgical, and major medical insurance.

3. That the General Assembly approve a 1994 budget of $163,800 for the General Fund and $91,000 for the Aged and Infirm Ministers’, Widows’ and Orphans’ Fund, for a total budget of $254,800.

4. That for the year 1994 the General Assembly request the churches of the OPC to support the work of this Committee at the suggested per capita rate of $19.00 per communicant member for the General Fund and $7.00 for the Aged and Infirm Ministers’ Fund.
## PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1994

### GENERAL ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 1992</th>
<th>Budget 1993</th>
<th>Budget 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office and Administration</td>
<td>$1,949.41</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Audit</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Expenses of Committee Members</td>
<td>2,733.64</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion: <em>New Horizons</em></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Salary, Sec. Treas.</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Funds (Emergencies)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,283.05</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>19,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diaconal Ministries - Foreign:

#### Relief Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>116.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Center</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Clinic</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>1,766.20</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Ch.of E. Africa</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,882.70</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>38,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diaconal Ministries - USA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Relief</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Relief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phila.</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization Premiums</td>
<td>45,559.68</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred Funds</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>65,349.68</td>
<td>105,700</td>
<td>105,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total General Budget** 105,515.43 163,800 163,800
AGED AND INFIRM MINISTERS', WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND

| Pension Fund | 34,450 | 41,000 | 36,000 |
| Infm'd Minister | 55,479 | 50,000 | 55,000 |
| Total           | 89,929 | 91,000 | 91,000 |

TOTAL ALL FUNDS $195,444.73 $254,800 $254,800

George M. Vogler
Certified Public Accountant
Certified Management Accountant
MSBA

15 February 1993

The Committee on Diaconal Ministries
of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church
c/o Rev. Leonard Coppes
9161 Vine St.
Thornton, Co. 80229

Gentlemen:

I have reviewed the accompanying balance sheets of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as of 31 December 1991 and 1992, along with the related statements of cash receipts and disbursements, statement of changes in fund balances and changes in financial position for the year ended 31 December 1992, in accordance with standards established by the American Association of Certified Public Accountants. All information included in these financial statements is the representation of management of the committee.

A review consists principally of inquiries of company personnel and analytic procedures applied to financial data. It is substantially less in scope than an examination in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion regarding the financial statements taken as a whole. Accordingly, I do not express an opinion.

Due to the nature of the fund (it would be prohibitively difficult), no attempt was made to confirm income from contributions.

Based on my review, I am not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the accompanying financial statements in order for them to be in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Respectfully,

George Vogler
**Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church**

Comparative Balance Sheet (Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12/31/91</th>
<th>12/31/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash on Hand (Note C)</td>
<td>$49,806</td>
<td>$60,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances (Fut. cks.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans Receivable (Note D)</td>
<td>$41,175</td>
<td>$39,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>90,981</td>
<td>100,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance, Unrestr.</td>
<td>$90,981</td>
<td>$100,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Changes to Fund Balance (Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Unrestricted (Undesig.)</th>
<th>Restricted (Desig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance 12/31/91</td>
<td>$90,981</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>167,464</td>
<td>12,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.M.W.O.F.</td>
<td>37,159</td>
<td>37,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>205,885</td>
<td>50,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>296,866</td>
<td>50,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>105,014</td>
<td>12,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.M.W.O.F.</td>
<td>89,929</td>
<td>37,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disbursements</td>
<td>196,443</td>
<td>50,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 12/31/92</td>
<td>$100,423</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement Of Cash Receipts And Disbursements
For The Twelve Months Ended 12/31/92 (Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Unrestricted (Undesig.)</th>
<th>Restricted (Desig.)</th>
<th>AIMWOF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Churches</td>
<td>$188,182</td>
<td>$9,136</td>
<td>$28,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Others</td>
<td>16,311</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>8,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-OP</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>205,885</td>
<td>12,920</td>
<td>37,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Administration (*Schedule 1)</th>
<th>Ministries, For. (*Schedule 2)</th>
<th>Ministries, USA (*Schedule 3)</th>
<th>A.I.M.W.O.F. (*Schedule 4)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>16,283</td>
<td>23,883</td>
<td>64,849</td>
<td>89,929</td>
<td>$196,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries, For.</td>
<td>16,283</td>
<td>17,360</td>
<td>58,452</td>
<td>52,770</td>
<td>$146,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.M.W.O.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Forgiven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,283</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,360</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>$196,444</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Decrease</strong></td>
<td>9,441</td>
<td>9,441</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement Of Sources And Uses Of Funds
For The Twelve Months Ended 12/31/92 (Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Funds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Contributions</td>
<td>$154,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned (Unrestricted)</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Contributions</td>
<td>12,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted A.I.M.W.O.F.</td>
<td>37,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Repayments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in advances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td>205,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Disbursements</td>
<td>105,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.M.W.O.F. Disb. (*Schedule 4)</td>
<td>89,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Advances</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Loans Made</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Increase to Cash on hand</strong></td>
<td>10,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank 12/31/91</td>
<td>49,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash in Bank 12/31/92</strong></td>
<td>$60,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Accompanying Notes Are An Integral Part of These Statements.**

*Supporting schedules (1-4):*

1. Administrative Expenses:
   - Off. Expense $1,949
   - Salary $9,600
   - Travel/Meals $2,734
   - New Horizons $1,500
   - Accounting Fee $500
   - Total $16,283
2. Foreign Ministries-Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Japan</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Korea</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Relief</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $23,883

3. USA Ministries-Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Relief</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerg. Med. Relief</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Premiums</td>
<td>**45,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdirected</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Relief</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship - Phila.</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship - Other</td>
<td>6,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany Chr. Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $64,849

4. A.I.M.W.O.F. Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Pension Aid: 34,450
Infirm Aid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total A.I.M.W.O.F. $89,929

*Notes:

A. Basis of Accounting: the books are kept on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements. Incurred administrative expenses are recorded only when paid and pledged contributions are recognized only when received.

B. Reporting entity: these statements represent the financial position and activity of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. The Committee receives funds primarily from Orthodox Presbyterian Churches to support various domestic and foreign ministries and various retired ministers as directed by the Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Repay</th>
<th>Forgiven</th>
<th>12/31/92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/87</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/87</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/88</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/85</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/86</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.Corp</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$41,175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$39,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The Committee on Pensions, as it seeks to assist the churches in providing for the health, welfare and retirement needs of ordained officers and full-time employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches and committees, is increasingly aware of the complexity of the administration of its various plans.

In addition to the changing needs of its constituency is the multiplicity of governmental regulations both on the national and state levels. The Committee strives to function as good stewards of the work entrusted to it by the Assembly and earnestly covets the prayers of the Church as it labors in its task.
I PENSIONS AND INSURANCE

A. Investment Policies

1. The major portion of the investments of the Retirement Equity Fund continues to be managed by the firm of W. H. Newbold's Son & Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania under guidelines established by the Committee. Those guidelines state in part that the investment manager is to invest for capital appreciation as well as continuing to be cognizant of the need for income, with the restriction of not exceeding 60% in equity investments.

2. During the year 1992, to offset the substantial decrease in the earnings from the money market funds and certificates of deposit, the Committee, through its Executive Committee, determined to transfer the majority of its money market funds into higher yielding mutual funds. At the end of the year the allocation of investments was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Funds, CD</td>
<td>9.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Funds</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Governments &amp; Agencies</td>
<td>26.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Stock</td>
<td>52.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Investment Results

1. The total assets of the Fund at the end of the year amounted to $6,444,130. While the growth was not as substantial as the immediate prior years, it continues to be steady. The growth of the Fund over the years is shown in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1962</td>
<td>8,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1972</td>
<td>505,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1982</td>
<td>1,465,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1992</td>
<td>6,444,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. At the end of 1992, each participant's account was credited with 5.09% income and charged with a .46% decrease in market value, a net increase of 4.63%. The investment results over specific period is shown in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Average annual percentage of gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the last 3 years</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the last 5 years</td>
<td>12.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the last 10 years</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the last 20 years</td>
<td>10.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Term Life Insurance

The term life insurance continues to be carried with the North American Life Assurance Company. The annual premium per individual for $20,000 coverage was $128.60.
D. Participation
1. During the year 1992, three persons enrolled in the plan and seven withdrew from the plan for a net decrease of four.
2. At the end of 1992, the participants in the plan consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants Making Contributions</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Not Making Contributions</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired - Drawing Pension</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving Spouses - Drawing Pension</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired - Receiving Annuity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. During the year 1992, the following retirement payments were made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annuity payments - Insurance Co.</td>
<td>$7,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension payments - Committee</td>
<td>162,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II PENSION SUPPLEMENT FUND

A. Eligibility
Benefits from this fund are available to ministers (and their surviving spouses, unless they remarry) who have at least 20 years of service in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, were at least 65 years of age prior to January 1, 1988, and are receiving regular pension payments. We no longer ask the Church for contributions, and the Fund is designed to liquidate itself as the need for supplemental payments decreases.

B. Benefits
1. During the year 1992, payments were made to eligible participants at the rate of $120 per month, with the exception of those participants whose regular pension accounts have been exhausted or who are receiving commercial annuity payments purchased with their pension account monies. Since they no longer benefit from the investment results of the Retirement Equity Fund, they receive $130 per month.
2. The pension supplement payments made to retired ministers have been designated as housing or rental allowances paid in recognition of, and as compensation for, their past services. These payments are so designated so as not to be subject to federal income tax.

C. Summary Financial Report
1. Income and expense
The summary financial report of the Fund for the year 1992 is as follows:
Appendix

Balance - January 1, 1992  $399,461.67

Receipts
Contributions  4,683.34
Investment income  29,842.85
Total Receipts  34,526.19  433,987.86

Disbursements
Pension supplements  52,800.00
Expenses  80.00
Total Disbursements  52,880.00

Balance - December 31, 1992  $381,107.86

2. Investments
The assets of this Fund are primarily invested in money market funds and various Government securities, in order to preserve liquidity for payments to retirees.

III VOLUNTARY TERM LIFE INSURANCE

A. Premiums
This plan, separate from the pension and hospitalization plans, is open to all full-time church employees and ordained officers and their families. The monthly premium for individual and spouse is based on their ages, but is a fixed cost for all children in a family of $1.50 per month.

B. Coverage
The individual coverage available is as follows:

| Participant | $50,000 |
| Spouse      | 10,000  |
| Children    | 5,000   |

C. Enrollment
The enrollment in the plan has been substantially below expectations, and at the end of 1992 had only 38 participants. Total insurance in force is as follows:

| Participants | $1,765,000 |
| Spouses      | 310,000    |
| Children     | 120,000    |

IV HOSPITALIZATION PLAN

A. Description of the Plan
1. The plan is primarily designed to provide medical benefits to partici-
pants, including hospitalization and prescription drug costs. There is a $250 annual deductible per person with a maximum of $750 annual per family. Of the first $2,000 of charges over the deductible, 80% is reimbursable to the individual. 100% is reimbursable over $2,000. Maximum lifetime benefits under the plan at the end of the year were $500,000. In addition, in April of 1993, the Committee added a prescription drug card program as part of the plan.

2. The plan is structured as a self-funded plan with stop-loss insurance policies carried with an insurance company. The plan is equivalent to what might be considered a medical diaconal fund. All of the participants contribute their quarterly payments, and from these funds the Committee pays a third-party administrator to process, evaluate, and pay the claims submitted. In addition, we pay premiums to an insurance company to insure the fund for all individual claims that exceed a certain level ($75,000) and for all claims in a year that exceed an agreed-upon level ($600,000). All the remaining funds are used to pay claims. In effect, the claims experience of the participants determines the level of premiums that need to be charged to the individuals in the plan.

B. Eligibility and Participation

1. Those eligible for inclusion in the plan are ministers, ruling elders, deacons, licentiates of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and full-time (an average of 30 hours per week) employees of the churches and denominational agencies. Also eligible are full-time teachers in Christian schools that are associated with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

2. Participants and their dependents who enroll within 30 days after becoming eligible will be entitled to immediate coverage. Those who do not enroll within the 30-day eligibility period will be required to submit a statement of health with their application, and may be required to wait 12 months before existing conditions are covered. The 30-day eligibility period begins from the date of employment, licensure, ordination, or installation in a position or office which would entitle a person to participate in the Plan.

3. At the end of 1992, the total enrollment in the Plan was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Individuals</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Groups</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving Spouses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Financial Summary

1. The year 1992 was a continuation of the experience of the prior years—claims costs increasing faster than the increase in premiums collected. Both health care costs and plan utilization by participants continue to increase in excess of the rate of inflation. During the past year, the plan again experienced some very large claims which significantly affected the total for the year.

2. In the beginning of 1993, the Committee approved an increase of $30 per month in the premiums, effective February 1, 1993. The new rates are as follows:
### Category | Monthly Premium
--- | ---
Single Individual | $191.00
Family Group | 419.00
Special 65 - Single | 148.00
Special 65 - Husband and wife | 246.00

3. In the latter part of 1992, the Committee solicited proposals from other third-party administrators to attempt to reduce administrative costs. As a result, on April 1, 1993, the Committee changed the third-party administrator from Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company to National Employee Benefit Administrators of Moorestown, New Jersey. This change in administrators is expected to result in $50,000-60,000 savings the first year alone.

### D. Benefits of Participation in the Plan

The Committee regularly receives requests for information about the plan from those seeking medical coverage. In most cases, the decision about participation is made largely on the current cost factor. The Committee is convinced that there are important benefits to be considered other than immediate cost reduction.

1. **Mobility of Ministers.** Ministers in the plan can move from one church to another in any part of the country without losing coverage. If an individual leaves the plan and obtains coverage under a local or regional plan, he must, when he moves to another area, start anew with another insurer, subject to pre-existing medical conditions; that would apply to ministers leaving and returning to our plan also. In such a case, it could be difficult or even impossible to enter another plan or to re-enter ours.

2. **Many policies, particularly those issued on an individual basis, are cost-rated based on age of the participant.** The denominational plan maintains the same premium cost regardless of the age of the participant.

3. **As more individuals enroll in the plan, particularly younger men, the rates and the benefits in the plan will show more stability because of the nature of the Plan itself.**

4. **As participants in the plan reach retirement, they are able to continue the same benefits they have enjoyed, with a reduced rate, under Special-65 coverage, including the prescription drug card.** This is not available to anyone who has not been covered by the Plan prior to retirement.

### E. Contributions from Churches

One of the additional burdens under which the plan has been functioning is the continuing deficit incurred over the years. To help alleviate the burden, the last three General Assemblies approved the request of the Committee to seek assistance from the churches. The Committee is grateful for the response it has received to date and is submitting the same recommendation for the year 1994.
V ADMINISTRATION

A. Committee Members
   Class of 1995:
   Ministers: William E. Warren, Douglas A. Watson
   Ruling Elder: Gordon H. Singer
   Class of 1994:
   Minister: Marven O. Bowman, Jr.
   Ruling Elders: Roger W. Huibregtse, Earl Voskuil
   Class of 1993:
   Minister: John P. Galbraith
   Ruling Elders: Garret A. Hoogerhyde, Robert M. Meeker

B. Officers:
   President: Garret A. Hoogerhyde
   Vice-President: Marven O. Bowman, Jr.
   Secretary: Gordon H. Singer
   Treasurer: Garret A. Hoogerhyde

C. Executive Committee: Bowman (chairman), Hoogerhyde, Huibregtse, Singer

D. Staff: Administrative Assistant - Kathleen Kline

VI RESPONSE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 59th General Assembly referred to this Committee Overture #7 from the Presbytery of New York and New England. The intent of the overture was “to instruct the Committee on Pensions to present to the 60th General Assembly an amendment to the pensions and Insurance Plan of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church . . . that would give Plan participants the option to elect to receive pension benefits beginning at age 59 1/2.”

The Committee considered the overture and determined to inform the 60th General Assembly that it does not favor the overture and recommends that the Assembly take no action on the following grounds:

1. The purpose of the Pension Plan is to seek to prevent participants and/or their spouses from being a burden to the Church and the Committee on Diaconal Ministries in their old age.

2. Increased longevity and inflation are creating a need for increased annual income; earlier retirement would decrease the annual income.

The Committee would respond further to the General Assembly that the plan does allow for disability payments under the following provisions:

1. The minister is declared disabled by his presbytery and, in the case of those who are enrolled in the Federal Social Security Program, by the Social Security Administration.

2. The payment to the disabled participant shall be no greater than five
percent (5%) of the balance in his account as of the beginning of each year; and in no event shall the withdrawal exceed the amount credited to his account in the previous year.

VII RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the 60th General Assembly request a contribution of $7.00 per communicant member from the churches in 1994 to partially offset the heavy drain on hospitalization funds that has been incurred over the past several years (see IV above).

VIII ELECTIONS

The terms of the above named class of 1993 expire with this Assembly. The Standing Rules of the Assembly provide that each class of the Committee shall include at least one minister and at least one ruling elder.

IX AUDIT REPORT

ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT
PENSION FUND

Committee on Pensions
Orthodox Presbyterian Church

We have audited the accompanying statements of net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Pension Fund as of December 31, 1992 and 1991 and the related statements of changes in net assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Plan's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presby-
The Steward’s Church Pension Fund at December 31, 1992 and 1991 and the changes in net
assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended, in conformity with
generally accepted accounting principles.

Our audits were made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic
financial statements taken as a whole. The schedules of cash receipts and disburse-
ments for the years ended December 31, 1992 and 1991, are presented for purposes
of additional information and are not a required part of the basic financial state-
ments. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in
the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all
material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.


## STATEMENTS OF NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS

### PENSION FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investments at fair value (Note 3):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Funds</td>
<td>$1,006,044</td>
<td>$1,152,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds and debentures</td>
<td>116,719</td>
<td>174,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stocks</td>
<td>3,368,955</td>
<td>3,228,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government securities</td>
<td>1,697,689</td>
<td>1,307,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investment</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,189,407</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,863,405</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued investment income</td>
<td>19,505</td>
<td>22,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in banks</td>
<td>235,063</td>
<td>348,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,444,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,234,686</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities

| Liabilities | | |
| Exchange | 0 | 0 |
| **Total liabilities** | 0 | 0 |

**Net assets available for plan benefits** | **$6,444,130** | **$6,234,686**

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.*
# STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS
## PENSION FUND

### Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized appreciation (depreciation) of investments (Note 3)</td>
<td>$(57,567)</td>
<td>$593,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gain on sale of investments</td>
<td>28,763</td>
<td>57,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of bond discount</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>172,172</td>
<td>199,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>162,714</td>
<td>121,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investment income</td>
<td>306,356</td>
<td>972,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment expenses</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Additions</td>
<td>305,731</td>
<td>972,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>193,383</td>
<td>204,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>12,274</td>
<td>8,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contributions</td>
<td>205,657</td>
<td>213,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premiums on life insurance</td>
<td>17,978</td>
<td>19,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension distributions</td>
<td>162,740</td>
<td>120,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental pension</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump sum withdrawals</td>
<td>96,049</td>
<td>9,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative expenses</td>
<td>25,177</td>
<td>18,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deductions</td>
<td>354,744</td>
<td>219,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>209,444</td>
<td>1,018,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets available for plan benefits-</td>
<td>6,234,686</td>
<td>5,216,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning of year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets available for plan benefits-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of year</td>
<td>$6,444,130</td>
<td>$6,234,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.*
*NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
PENSION FUND

1. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The financial statements of the Orthodox Presbyterian church Pension Fund (the "Pension Fund" or the "Plan") are maintained on the accrual basis of accounting.

 Marketable securities are stated at current market value, as determined by the last reported sales price on the last business day of the year. The change in the difference between current value and the cost of such securities is reflected in the statement of changes in net assets available for Plan benefits as unrealized appreciation or depreciation in the current value of marketable securities.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAN

The following is a brief description of the Pension Fund. Participants should refer to the Plan agreement for a more complete discussion.

The Pension Fund is a Defined Contribution Plan which was created to provide term life insurance during the period of eligibility and retirement benefits at age sixty-five (65) for the Church's ordained ministers, its permanent, full-time employees, and the permanent, full-time employees of a congregation or organization thereof. The normal retirement benefit is based on a participant's equity in the Pension Fund at the time of retirement and on the income option selected. The Pension Fund also provides death benefits. Participants' contributions are limited to a percentage of their annual compensation which is determined by the individual congregations. The current recommended percentage is 6%.

Key provisions of the Plan are:
  a. Eligibility for coverage
     All ordained ministers and all permanent, full-time employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church or of any congregation or organization of the Church are eligible to participate. Ministers are eligible to participate upon ordination. Non-ministerial employees are eligible to participate upon being declared a "permanent employee" by their employers.
  b. Normal retirement date
     The normal retirement date is the first day of the month following the participants' 65th birthday. The retirement date is not mandatory.
  c. Vesting
     The vested interest of participants who leave the Plan after the fifth anniversary of their participation will not be less than the following percentages of the total equity in their account:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and over</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants who leave the Plan before the fifth anniversary of their participation in the Plan receive a percentage of their total equity in the Pension Fund corresponding to a share of the total contributions made to the Pension Fund by them personally.

d. Normal form of pension
The normal form of retirement benefits is a life-time annuity which is guaranteed for at least ten years.

e. Optional forms of pension available
Participants may elect any option acceptable to the Plan Committee.

3. INVESTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dreyfus Liquid Asset Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cortland Trust</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$369,079</td>
<td>$369,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **U.S. Government Fund** | **W.H. Newbold's Son & Company** |
| Bonds | Common stocks | U.S. Government securities | Total Newbold |
| 13,451 | 112,460 | 1,844,769 | 3,568,774 |
| 116,719 | 3,368,955 | 1,672,682 | 5,183,363 |

| **Mutual Funds** | 661,006 | 623,514 |

| **TOTAL** | $4,612,310 | $6,189,407 |

b. Investment securities representing more than 5% of net plan assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dreyfus Liquid Assets</strong></td>
<td>5.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-31-92</td>
<td>12-31-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>$453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stock</td>
<td>(21,865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government securities</td>
<td>3,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual funds</td>
<td>(37,094)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$(55,094)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. During 1992 and 1991, the Plan's investment securities appreciated (or depreciated) in value as follows:
4. INCOME TAX STATUS

The Plan has qualified under the applicable sections of the Internal Revenue Code and is, therefore, not subject to tax under the present income tax laws.

SCHEDULES OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
PENSION FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance - beginning of year</td>
<td>$348,827</td>
<td>$333,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received</td>
<td>205,657</td>
<td>213,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts - trust accounts</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts - pension supplemental plan</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>160,044</td>
<td>160,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges</td>
<td>138,422</td>
<td>66,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of investments</td>
<td>7,323</td>
<td>4,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash receipts</td>
<td>609,246</td>
<td>601,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash disbursements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase - investments</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments - trust accounts</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premiums - life insurance</td>
<td>17,978</td>
<td>19,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension payments</td>
<td>162,740</td>
<td>120,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals - vested interest</td>
<td>96,049</td>
<td>9,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges</td>
<td>138,266</td>
<td>66,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments pension supplemental plan</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash disbursements</td>
<td>697,833</td>
<td>567,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses - general fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fees</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery and printing</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total general fund expenses</td>
<td>25,177</td>
<td>18,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash disbursements</td>
<td>723,010</td>
<td>586,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash balance - end of year</td>
<td>$235,063</td>
<td>$348,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST

Committee on Pensions
Orthodox Presbyterian Church

We have audited the accompanying statements of net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Hospitalization Trust as of December 31, 1992 and 1991 and the related statements of changes in net assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Trust's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Hospitalization Trust at December 31, 1992 and 1991 and the changes in net assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern.

As shown in the financial statements, the Company incurred a net loss of $37,515 for 1992 and has incurred substantial net losses in recent years. At December 31, 1992, total liabilities exceed total assets by $256,741. These factors, and other discussed in Note 5, indicate that the Company may be unable to continue in existence. The financial statements do not include any adjustments relating to the recoverability and classification of recorded assets, or the amount and classification of liabilities that might be necessary in the event the Company cannot continue in existence.

Our audits were made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The schedules of cash receipts and disbursements for the years ended December 31, 1992 and 1991, are presented for purposes of additional information and are not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audits of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

March 20, 1993

Stephen P. Radics & Co.
STATEMENTS OF NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash (Schedule 1)</td>
<td>$4,858</td>
<td>$5,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>5,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities and net assets available for plan benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash overdraft - insurance claims account</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>9,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans payable (Note 4)</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims payable</td>
<td>56,676</td>
<td>64,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premiums collected in advance</td>
<td>33,319</td>
<td>21,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>261,599</td>
<td>224,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities in excess of net assets available for plan benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(256,741)</td>
<td>$(219,226)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.*

STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premiums - members</td>
<td>$616,007</td>
<td>$594,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop - loss reimbursement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service charges</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit reduction fund</td>
<td>31,654</td>
<td>27,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>650,693</td>
<td>673,149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claims paid and incurred</td>
<td>470,818</td>
<td>458,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premiums - insurance companies</td>
<td>106,890</td>
<td>98,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust administration fees</td>
<td>98,823</td>
<td>94,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative expenses</td>
<td>11,677</td>
<td>10,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>688,208</td>
<td>662,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excess (deficiency) of revenue over (under) expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37,515)</td>
<td>10,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net liabilities in excess of assets available for plan benefits at beginning of year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(219,226)</td>
<td>(229,816)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liabilities in excess of assets available
for plan benefits at end of year

$(256,741)  $(219,226)

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

*NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST

1. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The Trust uses the accrual method of accounting.
The Welfare Benefits Funding Plan for Employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Inc. (the Hospitalization Trust) was established on July 1, 1984 when the Church's prior hospitalization account was terminated.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAN

The Trust, which is administered by Trustees elected by the General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, was established as a funding vehicle for designated employee welfare benefit plans maintained by the Church for its employees.

All employees of the Church who meet the eligibility requirements of the Health and Welfare Benefit Plans funded by the Trust are participants in the plan.

Participants should refer to the plan description for a complete description of the plan.

3. TAX STATUS

The Trust is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(9) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code as a voluntary employees' beneficiary association.

4. LOANS PAYABLE

Loan-Grace Dalby; interest is payable
monthly at 8%; principal is due on demand
$39,000  $40,000

Loan-Pension Supplement Fund;
interest at 8%; principal is due on demand
131,000  90,000

Totals
$170,000  $130,000

5. GOING CONCERN

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles, which contemplates continuation of the Company as a going concern. However, the Company has sustained substantial operating losses in recent years. In addition, the Company has used substantial
amounts of working capital in its operations. Further, at December 31, 1992, total liabilities exceed total assets by $256,741.

In view of these matters, realization of a major portion of the assets in the accompanying balance sheet is dependent upon continued operations of the Company, which in turn is dependent upon the Company's ability to meet its financing requirements, and the success of its future operations. Management believes that actions presently being taken to revise the Company's operating and financial requirements provide the opportunity for the Company to continue as a going concern.

SCHEDULES OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash receipts</th>
<th>12-31-92</th>
<th>12-31-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premiums received</td>
<td>$620,509</td>
<td>$570,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service charges</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop loss reimbursement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan proceeds</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit reduction funds</td>
<td>31,654</td>
<td>27,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash receipts</strong></td>
<td>696,195</td>
<td>698,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash disbursements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust administration fees</td>
<td>98,823</td>
<td>94,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance premiums paid</td>
<td>106,890</td>
<td>98,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims paid</td>
<td>478,168</td>
<td>449,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan repayment</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and administrative expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and postage</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting fees</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>10,534</td>
<td>9,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash disbursements</strong></td>
<td>696,558</td>
<td>663,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Decrease) in cash balance            | (363)    | (4,897)  |

Cash balance - beginning of year      | 5,221    | 10,118   |

Cash balance - end of year            | $4,858   | $5,221   |
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MINORITY REPORT

I THE COMMITTEE

A. Meetings

1. The Committee held one four-day meeting since the previous General Assembly. It was held February 1-5, 1993, at the denomination's office in
Horsham, Pa. A meeting had been planned for October 1992 at the site of the NAPARC meeting at Bonclarcken, NC, at which the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church served as host, but for a number of reasons it was deemed necessary to cancel it.

2. For a number of years the Committee has held a meeting at the site of each year's NAPARC meeting. The great advantage has been that it enabled the Committee to meet with the interchurch relations committees of the other churches with which we have reciprocal fellowship; without that arrangement that is seldom possible because of time and expense. It also enabled the whole committee to counsel together on matters before NAPARC. For the reasons of, again, both time and money, the Committee did not meet then but sent only two representatives and, for the first time in many years, held only one meeting between General Assemblies. The Committee believes that this is a great disadvantage for our work, but airfares have risen greatly and we wish not to increase the General Assembly budget more than is necessary. Further, the meetings were using 10 days of the members' time away from their regular duties each year, plus time needed for liaison and subcommittee work. The Committee is seeking ways of getting around these problems. At present the Committee plans to hold only one meeting this year, in January 1994, but with the 1993 NAPARC meeting scheduled to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., it may be feasible for the Committee to meet there and then also. The proposed budget (see section IX below) allows for two meetings. Two subcommittee meetings may have to be held also. These, too, are included in the proposed budget, which is reduced from that of the previous year.

B. Officers
The officers of the Committee are John P. Galbraith, Chairman, and Jack J. Peterson, Secretary.

C. Subcommittees
The Committee has a number of standing subcommittees and also appoints special subcommittees for specific tasks from time to time. Two years ago when the Committee restructured itself it established "Liaisons". Their duty is to represent the Committee in keeping and nurturing contact with churches with which our church has fellowship or with which the Committee has some form of contact; they are to keep the Committee informed about the life of those churches so that the Committee may inform our Church when it believes that significant information is known or appropriate action is needed. As these Liaisons become more familiar with the churches we are becoming better able to report more meaningfully and on more of them to the General Assembly. The standing subcommittees and Liaisons at present are:

1. Standing subcommittees
   a. Appointment of Fraternal Delegates - R. A. Barker
   b. International Conference of Reformed Churches (ICRC) - G. I. Williamson
d. External Relations
   (1) Central and Southern Africa - J. J. Peterson, G. D. Jerrell
   (2) South Africa - R. B. Gaffin, Jr., R. A. Barker
   (3) Europe - Donald J. Duff, John R. Hilbelink
   (4) Asia, Pacific, South and Central America, Mexico - G. I. Williamson, T. E. Tyson
   (5) Ecumenical Organizations: World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF), World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) - J. P. Galbraith

2. Special Committees
   b. History of CRC Developments - R. B. Gaffin, Jr., J. J. Peterson

3. Liaisons
   a. Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (ARPC) - J. P. Galbraith
   b. Bible Presbyterian Church (BPC) - G. D. Jerrell
   d. Christian Reformed Church of North America (CRCNA) - Donald J. Duff
   e. Concerned Laymen (PCUSA) - R. A. Barker
   f. Evangelical Presbyterian Church (EPC) - T. E. Tyson
   g. Free Reformed Churches of North America (FRCNA) - J. J. Peterson
   h. Korean American Presbyterian Church (KAPC) - G. D. Jerrell
   i. National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) - R. A. Barker
   j. Netherlands Reformed Church (NRC) - R. B. Gaffin, Jr.
   k. Orthodox Christian Reformed Church (OCRC) - Donald J. Duff
   l. Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) - John R. Hilbelink
   m. Presbyterian Reformed Church (PRC) - T. E. Tyson
   n. Protestant Reformed Church of North America (PRCNA) - G. I. Williamson
   o. Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS) - G. I. Williamson
   p. Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly (RPCGA) - John R. Hilbelink
   q. Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America (RPCNA) - R. A. Barker

It is taking time for the Committee’s recently-formed “Liaison” program to become established. We hope to make it more productive of information on the several churches in the future.

II  FELLOWSHIP WITH CHURCHES IN NORTH AMERICA

A. Fraternal Delegates
   1. In 1992, Fraternal Delegates were sent to the major assemblies of six churches: the Rev. Edward L. Kellogg to the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Rev. Messrs. Stephen L. Phillips and G. I. Williamson to the Canadian Reformed Churches, the Rev. Messrs. John W. Mahaffy and Jack J. Peterson to the

2. This year the Committee plans to send Fraternal Delegates to the same churches except the ARPC with which we alternate each year in the exchange of delegates. Also, as decided by the 59th (1992) Assembly, a Fraternal Delegate is to be sent to the Free Church of Scotland on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

3. Our 59th Assembly received Fraternal Delegates from the Reformed Churches of Australia, the Christian Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Church in America, and the Reformed Church in the U. S.

4. Our Church has never sent a Fraternal Delegate to either the Reformed Churches of Australia or the Reformed Churches of New Zealand, whereas we have had Fraternal Delegates from both. The Committee believes that we should make every effort to correct this omission especially since we have had many ties with both churches. The Committee is therefore including in its budgetary request the sum of $2,000 for a reserve to send a Fraternal Delegate to at least one of these churches (their triennial synods are not held in the same year) in the period 1994-95 as schedules can be worked out.

B. Churches in “Ecclesiastical Fellowship”

1. During the past year the Free Church of Scotland accepted the invitation of our 58th (1991) General Assembly to enter into Ecclesiastical Fellowship with us.

2. Invitations outstanding at the present time are to the Christian Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (by the 58th (1991) Assembly) and the Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin), the Reformed Church in Japan, the Reformed Church in the U.S., and the Reformed Churches of New Zealand (all issued by our 59th (1992) Assembly).

3. Present Roll

At the present time the churches with which we are in Ecclesiastical Fellowship are the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Christian Reformed Church of North America, the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in America, the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America.

C. Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church

1. The Committee does not have statistics available for the Church, but it does want to note that the Church has expanded into Canada and now has several congregations there.

2. The 1992 Synod approved an agreement of cooperation with the Evangelical Presbyterian Church. The agreement will result in the two denominations pooling some of their resources in church planting, foreign missions, youth camps, women's work, and other areas.

3. The 1992 Synod decided to withdraw from both the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) and the Reformed Ecumenical Council (REC). The ARPC had been a member of WARC for 115 years, but recent trends in it (such as its
commitment to women in all offices in all denominations, controversial study papers, and its close ties with the WCC) finally proved decisive. The decision to terminate its membership in the REC was the result of the latter's unwillingness to terminate the membership of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (GKN) in the organization.

D. Canadian Reformed Churches

1. Since the 59th General Assembly a subcommittee (Gaffin, Hilbelink, Peterson and Tyson) has had a full-day meeting, on April 15, 1993, with their Committee For Contact With the OPC (CCOPC). The agenda for that meeting was largely determined by actions of the General Synod of the CANRC (which meets triennially) in November 1992, and by the Committee's subsequent (February 1993) evaluation of those actions.

2. Despite some strongly expressed opposition within their Churches, Synod acted to continue the work of the CCOPC and expressed its “fervent wish” for a relationship of ecclesiastical fellowship. We truly appreciate this commitment of the CANRC to maintain contact with the OPC.

   a. This means that the OPC and the CANRC continue in a temporary relationship of “Ecclesiastical Contact,” determined by Synod 1977, with a view toward reaching full “Ecclesiastical Fellowship” (a relationship with provisions similar to those established by our own rules for Ecclesiastical Fellowship).

   b. Further, in its mandate to the CCOPC the Synod determined that among the “divergences” between our two churches, three matters remain “impediments” to a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship: the stand of the OPC on confessional membership and supervision of the Lord’s table, and our relationship to the Christian Reformed Church. As we have reported to previous General Assemblies, these matters, especially the first two, have been discussed jointly over the past several years.

   c. In addition, Synod instructed the CCOPC to respond to our unresolved concerns related to ministers and congregations (Laurel, MD and Blue Bell, PA) that have left the OPC for the CANRC.

3. During the past year our relationship with the CANRC has taken on an additional complication that, to us at least, is surprising and troubling. At our full committee meeting in February, we were made aware that Synod 1992, on recommendations from its Committee on Relations with Churches Abroad, established a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship with the Presbyterian Church in Korea, Kosin (PCK) and offered the same relationship to the Free Church of Scotland (FCS).

   These actions have left us thoroughly perplexed, since both these churches, we are reliably informed, have essentially the same positions as the OPC on confessional membership and supervision of the Lord’s table. In other words, we have had to conclude, such views are impediments to ecclesiastical fellowship with the OPC, but not with the PCK or the FCS. Accordingly, the Committee determined that the first matter discussed at the April meeting of our subcommittee with the CCOPC be this apparent double standard of the CANRC in their interchurch relations, particularly in holding the OPC to more rigorous and exacting requirements than other churches for a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship.

4. a. At that meeting the basic response of the CCOPC was one of
surprise at our surprise over Synod's action. They defended that action and believe that such a double standard, requiring more careful scrutiny of us, is appropriate in view of what they perceive to be the unique situation that exists between the CANRC and the OPC. What seems to be in view, at least primarily, is their close geographical proximity to the OPC as well as the past and present circumstances of their associations with us.

b. The subcommittee expressed our dissatisfaction with this explanation, and subsequently agreement was reached that the next joint meeting (the CCOPC wishes to meet with us twice before the next General Synod of the CANRC, scheduled to meet in June, 1995) be focussed on papers from both sides addressing the question:

Does a biblical ecclesiology require that these differences (confessional membership, fencing the Lord's table, third-party relationships) have to be resolved before a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship can be established?

This agreement and plans for future meetings with the CCOPC will be considered for approval at the next meeting of the full committee.

E. Christian Reformed Church of North America

1. As of the end of 1992 the Church had 46 classes, 979 congregations, and 311,202 members (196,678 communicant and 114,524 non-professing). There were 8,743 members added during the year and 9,468 removed, a net loss in membership of 725. There has been a decline in financial support of denominational causes: in 1991 the "quotas" (now renamed "denominational ministry shares") achieved only 72% of their goal, and budgetary cutbacks have had to be made by synodical agencies. Beginning in 1994 the base of quotas is to be changed from the traditional family unit to communicant members. Much of the attention of the Church during the past year has been focused on the questions of women in ruling and teaching office and of churches and individuals leaving the Church.

2. The 1992 Synod decided, by a vote of 109-73, not to ratify the action of the Synod of 1990 which had approved the ordination of women to the offices of minister and ruling elder. It decided also to

a. "Encourage the churches to use the gifts of women members to the fullest extent possible in their local churches, including allowing women to teach, expound the Word of God, and provide pastoral care, under the supervision of the elders."

b. "Remind congregations that diversity in the denomination will result in variations of practice."

c. "Urge churches which have already introduced practices not authorized by the Church Order to bring them into agreement with the above decisions."

d. "Attach the grounds of Report 31 (to the 1992 Synod - Ed.) to the decision of 1990 as a summary of the biblical data gathered from previous synodical study reports on this issue."

The Committee is thankful that the 1990 decision was not ratified.
3. Despite our thankfulness for the rejection of the 1990 decision on women in ruling and teaching office, the Committee is nevertheless concerned about two related matters:

   a. The decision to “encourage . . . women . . . to expound the Word of God and provide pastoral care . . . ” It seems to be, on the one hand, specific—women are to teach and expound the Word, while on the other hand being vague—it does not say what “teach” and “expound” and “provide pastoral care” are, nor where they are to be done. In fact, its vagueness seems to allow to women what it does not permit to men, namely, exhorting or preaching (without using the terms) and shepherding, without being licensed or ordained to do so.

   b. Since the Synod’s decisions a number of churches have nevertheless proceeded to elect and ordain women to be ruling elders.

The Committee will monitor these matters during the coming year and report to the next General Assembly on developments concerning them.

4. A subcommittee of this Committee met with representatives of the CRC in December 1992. The meeting was held at our request. The discussion touched on most of the issues that we see as troubling the CRC and that are of concern to us; the OPC relationship to people who have left, or are considering leaving, the CRC; our consideration adopting the Three Forms of Unity into our standards; the Alliance of Reformed Churches and its proposed Confessional Conference; and CRC membership in NAPARC.

5. The Church is seeking to grapple with, and bring into the open, the disturbing fact that family abuse exists in the church as well as in the world. A synodical committee on Physical, Emotional, and Sexual Abuse reported to the Synod on the matter and the Synod adopted working definitions of abuse. It also urged the Church councils to adopt procedures for dealing immediately with alleged abuse, especially with regard to those in positions of authority or influence in the congregation. The Synod also requested Calvin Seminary to consider providing mandatory pastoral training in the areas of prevention, recognition, and the need for treatment of abuse and to report to the 1993 Synod.

6. In seeking to clarify a statement on Creation and Science adopted by the 1991 Synod, the 1992 Synod adopted the following as a clarification (Acts of Synod, p. 639):

   a. Reaffirmed a previous statement “that the clear teaching of Scripture and our confessions on the uniqueness of human beings as image bearers of God rules out the espousal of all theorizing that posits the reality of evolutionary forbears of the human race.”

   b. Stated that the 1991 statement “does allow for ‘investigation and discussion on the origin of humanity’ provided that there is no ‘espousal of theorizing that posits the reality of evolutionary forbears of the human race.’”

   c. The 1991 statement “does not negate the demands of the form of Subscription.” (Quoted from CRC report to NAPARC 1992, p. 2).

7. In response to an overture requesting the Synod to sever relations with the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (GKN) because of their position on homosexuality the Synod referred it to the Interchurch Relations Committee with instruction to make recommendations to the 1993 Synod whether or not to terminate
the relationship. The matter of membership in the Reformed Ecumenical Council was not before the Synod.

8. The issue of the use of feminine names and pronouns for God has arisen in the Church, and the 1992 Synod adopted the following “Guidelines for Gender Language and Imagery for God (Acts of Synod, pp. 615-16).

1. Make no changes in Scripture or in the scriptural language and imagery for God. When Scripture is being used that contains masculine pronouns or imagery, continue these in the discussion about that Scripture.

2. Reflect the rich range of imagery Scripture uses in speaking of God.

3. In cases where gender descriptions or designations of God arise out of common English usage, prevalent social patterns, or traditional theological language rather than out of Scripture, take care not to offend readers needlessly by using inappropriate images, overusing masculine pronouns, and/or by naming God with feminine nouns or pronouns.

4. Always use language that fully reflects the personal nature of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.” (Quoted from CRC report to NAPARC 1992, p. 1.)

9. The Committee has requested the Committee on Christian Education and the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to prepare, “as a matter of highest priority”, literature that will set forth the history and distinctives of the OPC, important decisions of our General Assemblies over the years, and the necessary steps to be taken in order to join the OPC. This literature would fill a long-term general need for those inquiring about the OPC. Though occasioned by inquiries from former CRC members it is needed for inquirers in general.

10. The Committee has appointed a subcommittee to study the recent history of the Christian Reformed Church with regard to doctrinal/ethical developments in the Church to enable us to review and evaluate better our relationship with them.

11. The Committee is proposing to the Assembly that it send a letter to the Synod of the CRC expressing both our thankfulness that the 1992 Synod determined not to ratify the 1990 decision on women in the teaching and ruling offices, and expressing other concerns. The letter addresses also the matter of former and current members of the CRC seeking membership in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. (See Recommendation 2 below.)

F. Korean American Presbyterian Church

1. The KAPC has 15,000 communicant members, 270 congregations, 301 ministers, and 365 ruling elders. The 16th (1992) General Assembly met in Brazil with 109 ministers and 25 ruling elders present.

2. The Assembly gave endorsement to Regent College, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, allowing its graduates to take ministerial examinations provided that other requirements are met. Also it set up a committee to examine the academic and doctrinal standards of Erskine College, the college of the Associate Reformed
Presbyterian Church, to determine its suitability for study by candidates for the Church's ministry.

3. The Church is contemplating revision of their Constitution.

G. Presbyterian Church in America

1. As of the 20th General Assembly in 1992, the PCA reported a total membership of 233,770 in 1,044 churches, 169 missions, and 54 presbyteries. There are 2,198 ministers. The foreign missions work is in 50 fields, with 500 career missionaries, 102 two-year missionaries, and 1,700 short-term workers (serving for as little as a matter of weeks). There were 1,033 commissioners and 12 alternates at the Assembly.

2. A 124-page report on Divorce and Remarriage was made by a special committee. Its recommendations were adopted, except for a proposal to amend the Westminster Confession of Faith, 24.6, and are as follows:

   a. That according to both the institution of marriage and its regulation in Scripture, marital vows are to be kept until death.
   b. That nevertheless, Scripture does provide for the dissolution of marriage under certain circumstances.
   c. That the innocent spouse is free to divorce and remarry when the other spouse commits sexual immorality (porneia, Matt. 19:9), in the sense understood in the Committee report (Chapter 2, Section II.D.3.f).
   d. That while divorce is permitted to the innocent spouse, divorce is not mandated in the case of porneia, however; and forgiveness is always to be offered to the one who has sinned (cf., e.g., Matt. 6:12,14,25).
   e. That when believers divorce for other than Biblical grounds, they should remain unmarried or else be reconciled (I Cor. 7:11).
   f. That when an unbeliever separates from the marriage relationship with a believer, the believer is free from that marriage and free to remarry but only in the Lord (I Cor. 7:15,39).
   g. That under extreme circumstances, a session may properly judge that such desertion (separation) has occurred, even though the deserting spouse is still physically present in the home ("desertion" being viewed in the sense understood in the Committee report, Chapter 2, Section II.E.4).
   h. That the believer in the aforementioned cases (f,g) is free to make the Biblical divorce a legal divorce in the eyes of the State.
   i. That in matters pertaining to sexual immorality and desertion, the pastor and Ruling Elders are responsible for providing counsel, direction and judgment, according to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America.

The Assembly further determined to present to ruling elders and ministers for their careful consideration the guidelines and resources provided in Chapter 3, "Pastoral Perspective on Divorce and Remarriage", of the report.

3. A special committee is studying the subject of worship to report to a subsequent Assembly.

4. The Interchurch Relations Committee was instructed to prepare documentation with regard to the Christian Reformed Church, for report to the next Assembly, to include such matters as the view of Scripture, the toleration of beliefs
in evolution and homosexuality, and the treatment of brethren who have stood against these modernistic trends.

5. The Assembly appropriated $5,000 toward the estimated expenses of the 1993 commemoration of the 350th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly.

6. The communications from our past two General Assemblies to PCA General Assemblies—1991 and 1992—did not officially reach the PCA General Assemblies of those years although they were cognizant of them.
   a. The response of the PCA 20th (1992) Assembly to our 1991 letter, which had asked the PCA to “reconsider their rejection of organic union by any other process except J & R”, was to reject our plea: “We are convinced by the events since 1982, when the RPCES entered the PCA through J & R, that it is the best route to achieve unity and practice prudent stewardship”. (See Agenda, Communication 3; also Recommendation 1 below.)

   b. Our 1992 letter, concerning the PCA’s endeavor to establish another international body of Presbyterian and Reformed churches will presumably be taken up by the 21st (1993) PCA Assembly. In the meanwhile the PCA Interchurch Relations Committee (IRC) is proceeding to seek to organize, with authorization of the 19th (1991) Assembly, such a body under the aegis of the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF). Their IRC reported to the PCA 1992 General Assembly that invitations had been sent to “around 65 churches throughout the world”. Our 1992 letter urged the PCA to “apply for membership in the ICRC”, and expressed our “regret that the PCA is proceeding to initiate another worldwide Presbyterian and Reformed fellowship.” The IRC reported that it “intends to continue to send observers to the International Conference of Reformed Churches.”

7. The Committee has prepared a letter that it is recommending to be sent to the 21st (1993) General Assembly of the PCA. (See Recommendation 1 below.)

8. The response of the Committee to the directive of the 58th (1991) General Assembly concerning the “Joining and Receiving” method of union is contained in Recommendation 1 below. The Committee is proposing there that a letter be sent by this Assembly to the 21st (1993) General Assembly of the PCA. The impossibility of a response by the Committee before this Assembly is explained in that recommendation. Due to the overlap of the OPC and PCA General Assembly dates this year it is possible that the PCA Assembly may not act on the letter but it should be sent at this time.

H. Reformed Church in the United States
   1. The RCUS now has 36 churches, 21 of which did not exist when the old Eureka Classis broke with Liberalism; 11 did not exist as recently as 1981.
   2. Synod passed the following regarding interchurch relations:
      a. Approved applying for membership in the International Conference of Reformed Churches “to enlarge our ecclesiastical fellowship with other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches worldwide”
      b. To continue to pursue establishing fraternal relations with the Canadian Reformed Churches
      c. To pursue application of membership in NAPARC that we might work more closely with other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches. The 1992
meeting of NAPARC postponed action on the application until the next meeting (see Recommendation 4 below).

d. Decided to send a committee of three to the next scheduled meeting of the Alliance of Reformed Churches

3. At the 1992 Synod an overture designed to expand the 1987 Synodical statement concerning the Law of God was put before the body and then tabled. The proposed addition (in bold) was as follows:

"The moral law, however, has not been abolished as it respects obedience, but only as it respects the curse and constraint. Yet, this should not be construed so as to deny the abiding validity of the general equity of the judicial law (Westminster Confession XIX. iv) nor negate the truth that Scripture is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works (II Tim. 3:16-17). The curse abides upon the unbeliever so long as he is unconverted. As to the believer, the curse is abolished judicially, but he is not free from its effects in this life" (Heid. Cat., Qu. 42).

4. A committee studying the doctrine of Scripture being taught at Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia) is scheduled to report to the 1993 Synod. The Synod currently recommends Mid-America Reformed Seminary for it ministerial students.

5. The Church works closely with the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated) in assisting the Confessing Church of Zaire.

I. Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America

1. The interchurch relations committees of our two churches were not able to meet during the past year.

2. The 1992 Synod was the Church’s 163rd and was combined with their quadrennial family conference, held in Minnesota. It was reported that the Church experienced “modest” growth during the past year and that the total membership was 5,402 at the end of 1991. About 15 of their congregations are without pastors; nevertheless they continue church planting efforts in the United States. They continue also their mission works in Japan and Cyprus. Some budget cutbacks for their “Mission and Ministry” program may be necessary because of a shortage of funds for this work. The Synod faced several substantive issues.

3. One issue was the matter of displaying religious symbols in places of worship. The question, more specifically, was “whether the Scriptures permit the permanent display of a cross where the church gathers for worship. A study committee was appointed to report at a later Synod.

4. Another issue concerned a seminar that was scheduled for the family conference on the role of women in the church. Although the exact content of the seminars was not then known the Synod feared that proposals contrary to the subordinate standards could be presented. Ultimately it was agreed to allow the seminars to be presented and to appoint five members of the Synod “to listen and to make appropriate comments”.

5. A third issue was the matter of a question (#8) asked of candidates for ordination, which requires that they abstain from alcoholic beverages. The matter
has been before previous synods and an impasse seems to exist. Two presbyteries had appealed to the Synod for further guidance in resolving situations in their presbyteries that have arisen in them relative to this question. It was decided to appoint a special committee to endeavor to “resolve the impasse.”

6. The fourth issue concerned the revision of the Directory for Worship which is in progress. The revision committee asked that the scope of its work be broadened to include a rethinking and rewriting of the implications of the regulative principle of worship so as to more positively express our joy and thanksgiving in our worship.


J. The Committee is also seeking to have contact with several other churches by means of our liaisons: the Bible Presbyterian Church (Reformed), the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, the Free Reformed Churches of North America, the Netherlands Reformed Church, The Orthodox Christian Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Reformed Church, the Presbyterian Reformed Church General Assembly, and the Protestant Reformed Church of North America.

III FELLOWSHIP WITH CHURCHES ABROAD

A. The Churches

1. The Committee seeks to maintain for our Church an active fellowship with the following churches abroad: The Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin), the Reformed Churches of Australia, the Reformed Church in Japan, the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated), the Reformed Churches of New Zealand, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland. Most of our contact is by correspondence and, in some cases, by exchange of General Assembly/Synodical minutes; it has proved difficult to establish a pattern for these exchanges, and in the cases of Japan and Korea the language barrier is a difficulty for us. In the two latter cases, however, their Stated Clerks or Interchurch Relations Committees have been kind enough to inform us, in English, of salient events, and reports on these are included below.

2. Australia and New Zealand

a. For many years through our association in the Reformed Ecumenical Synod representatives of our Church have had close fellowship with representatives of the Reformed Churches of New Zealand and Australia. The Committee has also had correspondence with these churches concerning church matters. The Australian Churches generously and faithfully contributed to the support of Miss Anna Strikwerda, one of our nurses until she was murdered, in Eritrea. The New Zealand Churches have, recently made helpful suggestions to improve the concept of “Churches in Ecclesiastics Fellowship” and we expect to take up discussion on it. The New Zealand Churches have another bond with us in that they have the Westminster Confession of Faith as one of their subordinate standards.
b. Both of these churches have sent Fraternal Delegates to our General Assemblies, the Australian Churches twice in the last few years. Some years ago Mr. Galbraith was sent by the Committee on Foreign Missions to visit these churches, and was privileged to visit most of the congregations in both churches. But the General Assembly has never sent a Fraternal Delegate to a synod. The Committee, believing that it is well past the time that we should have sent a Fraternal Delegate to them, hopes to be able to correct this omission within the next two years. To that end we are including funds for it in the Fraternal Delegate budget of the General Assembly Fund this year (see IX.B below). The two churches do not hold their triennial synods in the same year, but the Committee would hope to have a Delegate attend one Synod and to arrange meaningful contacts in the other Church at that same time.

B. Free Church of Scotland
This church is rejoicing this year in the celebration of its 150th anniversary. Our 1992 General Assembly authorized funds for your Committee to send a Fraternal Delegate to their General Assembly to participate for our Church in their celebration.

C. Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin)
1. This report is based upon information concerning the Church’s 1991 and 1992 General Assemblies received from the Church’s Committee on Fraternal Relations. We are informed that (a) the General Assembly Building—the Bruce F. Hunt Memorial Building—is expected to be completed in August 1993, (b) during 1991-92 six new congregations joined the Church, 19 churches were begun, two evangelization posts were opened, and one church was closed and, (3) US$5,000. was donated to Christians in Los Angeles, Calif. and Atlanta, Ga., after the riots in those cities. Additionally, the following decisions, among others, were made at those Assemblies:
2. In 1991
a. Decided to hold a Prayer Meeting of all the ministers and elders of the Church once a year.
b. Approved dividing the East Pusan Presbytery into two presbyteries: East Pusan and West Pusan. The total number of presbyteries is now 23.
c. Appointed a Study Committee on divorce and remarriage.
d. Appointed a Study Committee on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in particular as to the controversial issue of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.
e. Decided that all mission societies must be under the guidance of the Mission Society of the General Assembly.
f. Decided to sell the Seminary building site proposed in Inchon (near Seoul) and to look for a site in the center of Korea, because the shifting of the Seminary to Seoul is regarded as impossible according to Government policy.
g. Decided to grant financial support for the activities of ministers (chaplains) serving in the military—the equivalent of US$300 per month. Presently there are 47 military chaplains from the PCK (Kosin).
h. Received a draft for the revision of the Constitution (Confessional Standards and Church Order) proposed by the Study Committee on the Revision of the Presbyterian Constitution, and decided to send it to the presbyteries for their deliberation and approval. This revision does not mean a substantial change of the contents of the Constitution, which contains Westminster confessional standards and the Form of the Presbyterial Government. It aims at modernization of the language and vocabulary in the confessional standards and a systematic rearrangement of the form of the Presbyterial government.

3. In 1992
   a. Decided that a theological school cannot be instituted locally without the consent of the General Assembly
   b. Decided that graduates of theological seminaries other than the denomination's seminary may apply for a candidate examination when they have completed one year of study (30 credits) at the denomination's seminary
   c. Decided, with regard to divorce, that
      (1) A party may divorce when the other party who is an unbeliever makes his (or her) Christian life impossible and forces him (or her) to divorce (that is, in the case where one party must choose either God or the other party).
      (2) A party may divorce when the other party who is fallen into a sectarian belief hinders proper Christian family life and requests divorce. The question as to what constitutes a sect is to be determined by the General Assembly.
      (3) A party may not divorce for the reason that the other party has had an affair before the marriage.
   d. Requested the Senate of the Theological Seminary to study the doctrine regarding the Holy Spirit baptism and to report to the 1993 Assembly.
   e. Decided that the First Assessor (i.e., Vice-Moderator) of the previous Assembly may take the chair if he obtains a majority of the votes of the Assembly, but that the immediate past Chairman (i.e., Moderator) is ineligible for re-election to the chair.
   f. Decided to send two deputies to the Third Meeting of International Conference of Reformed Churches in the Netherlands in September 1993.
   g. Decided that for the future development of the churches the Assembly set 1992-93 as the year for the study of Reformed Education, 1993-94 as the year for the study of Mission Works, and 1994-95 as the year for the study of Diaconal Works.
   h. Decided to adopt the recommendation of the Assembly's Committee Mission Work for the Communist World that
      (1) Every congregation must choose at least one region in North Korea and pray for evangelization, while looking forward to the day of liberation and union.
      (2) One person must be appointed for the study and collection of information for mission works in Communist China.
   i. Adopted a modernized version of the Constitution of the Church that had been sent to the presbyteries by the previous Assembly for approval (see 2.h. above).
D. Reformed Church in Japan

This report consists in highlights from the Minutes of 1991 General Assembly of the Reformed Church in Japan as reported to your Committee by the RCJ.

1. Report of a Committee to Study the New Joint (Catholic/Protestant) Translation of the Bible into Japanese. Its findings were:
   a. Excellent for use in worship study, education and evangelism
   b. Encourage use in the RCJ and to adopt it in the near future as one of the Church’s officially recognized translations

2. Report of the Committee to Study Female Ministers/Eldership (interim report) by Mr. Koichi Mino
   a. Old Testament consistently teaches the equal position for man and woman
   b. Male domination over females resulted from the fall
   c. The role and position of women in Israel ought to be understood in the light of its tribal community and the institution of male headship in the family
d. Women’s position in later Judaism was lower than what it was in the Old Testament dispensation

3. A proposal was made to restart mission cooperation with the N.G.K.(South Africa) since the N.G.K. now satisfies the conditions that would meet the request by the RCJ to remove the barrier of racial segregation in the N.G.K.’s official position: to receive missionaries from the N.G.K. The proposal was defeated 74 to 54.

4. A proposal to include an internship in the seminary curriculum was referred to the Seminary Committee for further study and reconsideration at the 1993 General Assembly.

E. Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland

We have received from this Church, with which we have entered into Ecclesiastical Fellowship, a copy of “The Testimony of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland” (102 pp.) with the “hope (that) this in some small way helps mutual understanding in building bridges.” The volume will be available in the office of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.

IV INTERCHURCH BODIES

A. International Conference of Reformed Churches


2. The Agenda for the Assembly consists largely in the presentation and discussion of papers. The subjects include Redemptive Historical Preaching, Catechism Preaching, Reformed Mission, Tolerance, Christology and Mission, and Prophecy Today.

3. Our church has applied for membership in the Conference. The
Committee has appointed the Rev. Messrs. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., Th.D., and Jack J. Peterson to serve as Observers until and if our church is received, and as delegates if and when we are received. The Committee appointed the Rev. G. I. Williamson as an Advisor, at no expense to the Church.

4. Also applying for membership are the Free Reformed Church of North America, the Reformed Church of East Africa, and the Reformed Church in the U.S.

5. The present member churches of the ICRC are the Canadian Reformed Churches, the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Free Church in Southern Africa, the Free Reformed Churches of Australia, the Free Reformed Churches in South Africa, the Gereja Gereja Reformasi di Indonesie, the Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin), the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, The Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated), and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland.

B. North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council

1. The eighteenth meeting of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) was held October 29, 1992 at the Bonclarken Assembly Grounds of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Flat Rock, N.C. Representatives of all six of the member churches were present (Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Christian Reformed Church, Korean American Presbyterian Church, Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Presbyterian Church in America, and the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America). Our Church was represented by the Rev. Messrs. Jack J. Peterson and Thomas E. Tyson.

2. The officers for the year 1992-93 are Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Paul R. Gilchrist (PCA); Vice chairman, the Rev. Thomas E. Tyson (OPC); Secretary, the Rev. Donald J. Duff (OPC); Treasurer, Ruling Elder Charles Carlisle (ARPC). The Interim Committee is composed of the officers plus one person appointed by the member churches not represented among the officers.

3. Five churches sent Observers: American Presbyterian Church, Bible Presbyterian Church (Separated and Reformed), Protestant Reformed Church, Presbyterian Reformed Church, and the Reformed Church in the U.S.

4. The Reformed Church in the U.S. was applying for membership. The meeting, voting by units (i.e., one vote per church) determined, against the advice of the Interim Committee, by a roll call vote of four to two, that "the vote on the membership of the (RCUS) be postponed for one year." The OPC delegation and that of the RPCNA voted against postponement. (See Recommendation 4 below.)

5. The 1990 and 1991 NAPARC meetings had written a letter to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church calling on it to reverse the action of the 1990 Synod that would open the offices of minister and ruling elder to women. The 1991 Synod had replied with thanks for NAPARC's concern. The 1992 NAPARC meeting, having been informed that the 1992 CRC Synod had voted not to ratify the 1990 decision, adopted the following statement to be sent to the CRC:

That the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council send a letter to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church expressing our thanksgiving to God that the Synod of the CRC in 1992 refused to ratify
the change in the Church Order, Article 3, that would have opened the office of minister, elder and evangelist to women, and assures the CRC of the continuing prayer of the Churches of NAPARC.

6. 350th Anniversary of the Westminster Assembly
   a. The meeting pursued the plans for a celebration of the 350th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, in London, England, in September 1993 and voted to urge the NAPARC member churches to participate and to have their own celebrations also. Letters to that intent were sent to all OPC presbyteries by our Stated Clerk.
   b. The meeting adopted a budget of $2,500 for its committee working on this project and asked each member church to contribute to it as it thought appropriate. Your Committee is asking the Assembly to contribute $500 for the project. (See Recommendation 7.)

7. The meeting decided to increase the assessments of the various churches for operating expenses to the following: CRC $1,500; PCA $1,500; ARPC $180; KAPC $180; OPC $180; RPCNA $180. (See Recommendation 6.)

8. The meeting requested the Interim Committee “to study the issue of representation in NAPARC, and to report its findings to the next meeting of the Council.” The purpose is to consider giving more votes to the larger churches.

9. The Christian Reformed Church is scheduled to host the next meeting, November 9-10, 1993, in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

V REFERRED MATTERS

A. Bounds of Presbytery of the Midwest
   The Presbytery of the Midwest overtured the 59th (1992) General Assembly to extend the bounds of the presbytery into a certain area of Canada because a church in that area had been received into the presbytery. The overture was referred to this Committee though without giving grounds why it should have been referred, In the absence of such grounds, the Committee does not know any reason why the plea of the overture should not be granted. (See Recommendation 5.)

B. Relation to the Christian Reformed Church
   1. The Presbytery of Ohio asked the 59th General Assembly to “review, through its Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, the propriety of the OPC’s continued fraternal relations with the Christian Reformed Church of North America (CRC). Further, the Committee shall bring its recommendations to the Sixtieth General Assembly (1993)” and gave the following grounds (see Overture 10, Minutes, 59th General Assembly, pp.97f):

      (1) The issues raised by the personal appeal of William Hodgkiss in 1990 and by Overture 86 of the Washington, Pa. CRC council in 1991 indicate CRC Synodical endorsement of denials of confessional integrity. Specifically the Synod has allowed (to) stand the examination of the Rev.
Ronald Spoelman before Classis Lake Erie of the CRC wherein, among other things, he stated that he could easily cite ten errors in the Bible. This exam was witnessed by OPC ministers Dr. Dan Osborne and Mr. Dan Knox.

(2) The acts of deposition sanctioned by Synod 1991 against the Washington, Pa. CRC council indicate a perversion of discipline. Deposed officers were declared eligible for reelection to office without any repentance being required. Right administration of discipline is an essential mark of a true church (Belgic Confession, Article XXIX and Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter 30).

(3) Successive CRC Synods (1990 and 1991) have acted contrary to scripture on the matter of women in office.

(4) CRC Synod 1991 rejected forty overtures from CRC councils and classes and a fraternal letter from the NAPARC church in reasserting its commitment to pursue ratification in 1992 of a change in the Christian Reformed Church Order to open all offices to women. The fact that reversals of the decision of previous synods require "sufficient and new" evidence, the decision of 1992 is, in reality, an accomplished fact in light of the 1990 decision, which is "settled and binding." (Quotations are from the CRC Church Order, Articles 31 and 29 respectively.)

(5) CRC Synod 1991 acted contrary to Scripture on the true matter of creation/evolution.

2. The Assembly did not adopt the overture but determined to "refer Overture 10 to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations"

3. The Committee carefully considered the overture together with other materials that it had before it on the same subject. The Committee determined to do two things: to send a response to the Presbytery of Ohio (see response below) and to recommend to the Assembly that it send a letter to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church. (See Recommendation 2 below.)

The response sent to the Presbytery of Ohio is as follows:

The Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations appreciates the concern of the Presbytery of Ohio and reports to the 60th GA that it has reviewed the grounds of Overture 10. It has also reviewed the OPC’s relationship with the CRC, as it does every year, and, in spite of substantial concerns, believes that the relationship should not be changed at the present time for the following reasons:

1. Our policy statement “Churches in Ecclesiastical Fellowship” expresses a degree of unity with churches with which we have such a relationship. To sever such a relationship requires substantial and specific proof of departure from Reformed standards. This overture does not provide sufficient evidence to warrant such a step.

2. The 1992 Synod determined not to ratify the 1990 decision to permit the opening of ruling and teaching office to women.

3. The 1992 Synod determined to “urge the churches which have
already introduced practices not authorized by the Church Order to bring them into agreement with the 1992 decision not to permit women to be ordained to teaching and ruling office in the church.

4. Grounds (1) and (2) of the Overture do not provide sufficient information to warrant severing of fraternal ties. The Committee can neither substantiate nor dismiss the errors alleged in grounds (1) and (2) of Overture 10 without an investigation that would require a disproportionate amount of time and funds in the light of more far-reaching questions as to the ability and resolve of the CRC to deal faithfully with the disciplinary cases implied by 3. above.

5. Ground (5) makes a statement without any substantiation.

VI THEOLOGICAL TRAINING ASSISTANCE FUND

A. The Adopt-a-Pastor program now is assisting 42 pastors, an increase of just one since last year, all in Africa. Many pastors are being seriously affected by droughts and tribal conflicts and have had to leave their home areas. Adopting churches report blessings in this work and it has been very helpful to the pastors. Those desiring information about the program should contact the Rev. Jack J. Peterson.

B. The Committee continues to seek to build up a fund for scholarships for theological students or pastors to study outside their home areas and to send instructors to theological schools. An amount for this is included in the Committee’s budget.

VII REFORMED CHURCH OF EAST AFRICA

A. Meeting with Representatives

1. In October 1992 the Reformed Church of East Africa, located in Kenya, sent a delegation of two men to visit the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, seeking our cooperation in their theological training program. They were the Rev. Henry Wanjala, General Secretary of the Church, and the Rev. Jonathan Kangogo, Principal of their Reformed Theological College. They had become acquainted with our Church, and we with them, at the 1988 meeting of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod (now Council) when we left that organization and which they left soon after. They came to us for assistance because their Church has a firm commitment to the Scriptures and the Reformed faith and, they told us, because the OPC is the only Church that they knew and could trust for the kind of assistance that they need. Since our experience with the RCEA delegates in 1988 when they so steadfastly sought to uphold truth and righteousness in that body your Committee has come to a like trust in them. They came at this time because they believe that there is an unprecedented opportunity to have a positive influence in the strategic area of central and southern Africa.
2. By gracious providence seven members of our Committee were able to meet with and interview these men without additional expense to the Committee.

3. Space here does not permit the inclusion of the large amount of information given to us by the RCEA delegation, so we have made a copy for the Advisory Committee that considers this matter at the General Assembly.

B. History
1. The RCEA comes out of missionary work of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa which was begun in 1905. Their first ministers were three men trained by the South African missionaries between 1952 and 1956. In 1961, missionaries came from the Netherlands and later an Institute for Evangelists was started. More recently ministers were trained at St. Paul's United Theological College which was operated by Anglican, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches together with the RCEA. That program was phased out in 1989 with St. Paul's becoming a Christian university.

2. The RCEA then began a program to upgrade their Bible School and to provide training for their own ministers. That program bore fruit when the Reformed Theological College of East Africa opened it doors in 1989. The College is operated under a Board of Governors elected by the Church.

3. Due to the very low incomes of the populace the College instituted a program of ministerial training that combines theological studies with training in "tent-making" occupations. The latter helps to support the students while studying at the College and later to help support themselves as pastors.

4. The College is situated in the town of Plateau, about 20 miles from the city of Eldoret, on 61 acres of land, 30 of which are under cultivation for students' support. There are several buildings which include a dormitory, classrooms, dining hall, chapel, and library.

5. Currently there are 20 students. There are two full-time teachers and visiting lectures are invited from time to time. Teaching is in English, the only language bridge for students from different tribal areas. The tuition is US$500 per year per student.

6. The RCEA has a total membership of about 20,000 in 150 to 170 congregations organized in 15 parishes (presbyteries). There are only 25 pastors in the entire Church including those in Synodical departments. In each of the 15 parishes there are only one pastor and one or two evangelists. The Evangelists are trained for three years in Bible School. Each parish consists of from three to fifteen congregations served by one pastor and one or two evangelists. This means that ruling elders of necessity must do much of the preaching.

C. Their Proposal; the Church asks us:
1. To send a missionary-teacher for three years, to be renewed to six years

2. To help them build up and organize their library

3. For diaconal aid to RCEA drought victims, of which there are many

4. Tuition aid for students at the College to provide funds for the College
D. The Committee Response

At the meeting of the Committee February 1-5, 1993, the Committee recognized this situation as an unprecedented opportunity for the ministry of the Reformed faith and one that, considering the trust that the RCEA has put in us, we could hardly refuse. The Committee enthusiastically embraced the idea and took the following actions:

1. "Request the Committee on Foreign Missions to send a missionary/teacher to Kenya to teach in the Theological College of the RCEA as soon as possible, if feasible.

   "Grounds:
   "(1) The RCEA is a church of firm commitment to the Scriptures and the Reformed faith
   "(2) The RCEA looks to the OPC specifically, as the church in our country that they trust and want to work with, going so far as to send a delegation to us on their own initiative and at their own expense
   "(3) This is an unprecedented opportunity to have a positive influence in the strategic area of central and southern Africa"

2. "Request the Committee on Diaconal Ministries to consider seriously the scholarship program of the Reformed Church of East Africa with a view to responding positively.

   "Grounds:
   "(1) The RCEA is a church of firm commitment to the Scriptures and the Reformed faith
   "(2) The RCEA looks to the OPC specifically, as the church in our country that they trust and want to work with, going so far as to send a delegation to us on their own initiative and at their own expense
   "(3) The Committee on Foreign Missions is considering sending a missionary/teacher to Kenya as an instructor in the Theological College of the RCEA
   "(4) This is an unprecedented opportunity to have a positive influence in the strategic area of central and southern Africa
   "(5) The average annual income in the area is US$300 to US$500. The students at the Theological College take courses such as brick-making and carpentry so as to be able to support their families when they become ministers. Poverty is the norm. The scholarship needs are eleemosynary.

3. "Request the Committee on Diaconal Ministries to consider seriously further aid for the drought victims of this Church

   "Grounds:
   "(1) The RCEA is a church of firm commitment to the Scriptures and the Reformed faith
   "(2) The RCEA looks to the OPC specifically, as the church in our country that they trust and want to work with, going so far as to send a delegation to us on their own initiative and at their own expense
   "(3) The drought in central Africa is of epidemic proportions

E. Fulfillment of Response

The Committee cannot but be full of thankfulness to God for the way in
which He has moved our Committees on Foreign Missions and Diaconal Ministries to respond to our pleas. And we thank God for the gifts of His people to make these responses possible.

1. The Committee on Foreign Missions has determined to seek a missionary/teacher to send to the RCEA's Theological College, to begin teaching in September of this year.
2. The committee on Diaconal Ministries has already sent funds to the RCEA
   a. US$1,000 for drought relief
   b. US$6,000 for one year's tuition for 10 students at the Theological College

F. Future
The Committee deeply hopes that our whole Church will give enthusiastic and continuing support to this opportunity and to pray diligently for fruit from the labors of both us and the RCEA in this endeavor of faith. In expressing this hope we thank God for the witness that He has enabled us to bear in international councils that led to this opportunity.

VIII THREE FORMS OF UNITY

A. In pursuance of the directive of the 58th (1991) General Assembly to the Committee "to consider the desirability and feasibility of adding the Three Forms of Unity" to our present secondary standards a subcommittee consisting of the Rev. Messrs. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. and G.I. Williamson is actively considering the matter. A letter has been sent to a number of churches and individuals asking for their reaction, and inviting them to make suggestions. About 15 responses have been received, most of them expressing interest and asking to be kept informed as to the outcome of our study.

B. The Committee hopes to be able to make recommendations to the next General Assembly.

IX BUDGET

A. The proposed budget for the year August 1, 1993- July 31, 1994:
   Meetings and general expenses $13,000
   (Two Committee, two subcommittee meetings)
   Theological Training Assistance Fund 3,000
   Total $16,000

B. General Assembly Fund Budgetary procedure began at the previous General Assembly to remove Fraternal Delegate expense from the Committee budget and to establish it as a separate General Assembly Fund expense (see Minutes, Art. 248, p. 75, item III). The Committee places Fraternal Delegate expense before the Assembly in two categories this year:
Appendix

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/New Zealand (see III.A.2 above)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The following recommendation is the Committee's response to the directive of the 58th (1991) General Assembly that the Committee "either (sic) . . . report to the 59th General Assembly that it has agreed not to pursue efforts at J & R or present justification why it should continue to proceed with J & R." The Committee had been unable to carry out that directive for report to the 59th (1992) Assembly because the letter of the 58th (1991) Assembly to the 19th (1991) Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America did not reach that Assembly and the Committee then had to defer its report until after the action of the 20th (1992) PCA Assembly. (See III.G. above.)

RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly inform the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) as follows:

1. The General Assembly deeply regrets the decision of the 20th (1992) General Assembly declining to consider any method of uniting our two churches other than by a “joining and receiving” (J & R) method that precludes prior resolution of our concerns.

2. The General Assembly observes that hopes that were sincerely held out to us by the Ad Interim Committee and the Eighth (1980) General Assembly before the 1981 OPC General Assembly approved the three-way joining and receiving—that certain practices or conditions in the PCA that appeared to many in all three churches to be questionable would be at least alleviated—have not materialized, such as a moderation of involvement with parachurch organizations in foreign missions, and adoption of a much smaller, deliberative, General Assembly.

3. The PCA General Assembly's decision not to consider with us any avenue to union other than by its J & R method effectively cuts us off from further efforts toward union of our churches at the present time. Although the PCA Interchurch Relations Committee invited the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to present “Stipulations” (reservations) relating to union of the two churches, and responded to them, the PCA 20th GA ignored such matters and said simply that the only method of union had to be by its J & R method.

4. The General Assembly makes the following observations in hopes that the PCA may yet agree to consider with us the possibility of an avenue other than its J & R method:

   a. This J & R method, as stated by the PCA General Assembly, to inform "the OPC that the best way that the PCA can understand the desire of the OPC for union is for the OPC to take their necessary constitutional steps requesting to be received into the PCA, and that the Interchurch Relations Committee continue to be available to the OPC
Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process” restricts, if not eliminates, the possibility of “speaking the truth in love” (Ephesians 4:15). “Speaking the truth in love” is in a passage that deals with the unity of the church in truth and love. The simple applying for membership in the PCA eliminates the possibility of addressing the issues that divide us.  

b. This J & R method ignores the need for reconciliation before union. In reconciliation the two parties must discuss that which needs to be reconciled so that reconciliation can take place. Without speaking the truth in love to one another, without mutual admonition with the resultant reconciliation, without substantial discussion on issues that divide, there comes no unity which must be the basis of union.  
c. The 12-year history of following this method has proved to be divisive and less and less productive of attaining the goal of union.

2. That the following communication be sent to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of North America (See II.E. above):

Our dear brothers,

We greet you in the high and precious name of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of his body the church.  

We write to you as members of the body feeling with you the joys and infirmities of all those who seek to live in him, and to share our love and care for you. And we write because we are brothers who are joined to you in the ties of many years of mutual concerns and endeavors as well as by the ties of official fellowship.  

In the interest of continuing those ties into the future we look back over the past year to share some thoughts with you as brother to brother. For one thing, we want to give thanks. We thank God that your 1992 Synod heeded the plea of your brothers in the churches of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council not to approve the ordination of women to the offices of teaching and ruling elder. This was of great concern to us, and we rejoice. Nevertheless our joy is tempered by concern about the meaning of the further decision that women may “expound” in the Church, and we have apprehensions about how it may come to be practiced in days ahead.  

We are thankful also for your decision to urge that churches that had previously begun practices that are contrary to your Church Order in those matters to bring them into agreement with your decisions. We are aware that since that decision was made some congregations have newly controverted that decision by electing and ordaining women to the office of ruling elder. We pray and hope, however, that the discipline of the Church will quickly restore order in this matter. Responsible members of the Christian Reformed Church have freely acknowledged that the exercise of biblical discipline has declined in the Christian Reformed Church. We have great sympathy for you in this for we ourselves know the difficulty of seeking to maintain it, and the ease with which all of us can follow the path of least resistance. Especially because we know this from experience we pray that God will strengthen your hand to your task not only in these matters but in all the life of your
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Church. In all candor, your handling of this matter may affect our relationship with you in the future.

We should speak to you also of a matter that has disturbed some in your Church: the attitude that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church should have toward persons or groups who have left or are considering leaving the Christian Reformed Church. In our dealing with such persons we should behave as circumspectly as we would expect you to act were our roles reversed. We believe that we should not solicit or initiate contact with such people to induce them to leave the CRC. But rather we believe that people who come to us for information about our church should be given that information. We further believe that neither in giving such information nor in receiving such people into the Orthodox Presbyterian Church should we be charged with causing or fostering the sin of schism (those who leave a church are not necessarily those who are schismatic).

Further, we wish to clarify our attitude toward the Alliance of Reformed Churches. First, we want you to know that up to this point we, in deference to the CRC and in order not to encourage schism, have not sent any representatives to any meetings relative to that body. The Assembly wishes you to know also that it does not approve the ARC decision: "It has now become evident that withdrawal from the CRC should occur." Furthermore, our church does not regard as schismatic all those who have left the CRC or are contemplating doing so, and being mindful of the dangers that this disruption in the lives of Christ's sheep may cause, reserves the right to seek to minister to them. The Assembly therefore believes it proper that representatives may participate in some aspects of the work of the ARC.

We should be remiss if we were to close this letter without expressing to you our empathy in the turmoil that your Church is now experiencing. We also empathize with the many of your members, and those who have left you, whose hearts are burdened over these troubles. We encourage you to help them, and us, with renewed faithfulness in interpreting, preaching, and practicing God's Word and to uphold that mark of the true church, a faithful and just exercise of discipline.

May God's Spirit be with you.
Sincerely yours in Christ's service.

3. That the committee be authorized to appoint two official observers to be sent to the next meeting of the Alliance of Reformed Churches. (See II.E above.)

   Grounds:
   (1) The members of the Alliance are our brothers and sisters in Christ.
   (2) The churches that make up the Alliance are seeking greater unity on a Reformed basis.
   (3) There is great respect for the OPC among these churches.
   (4) These churches are struggling to find a new form of organizational unity and need the help that we can give them.

4. That the General Assembly express to the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) its disappointment with the action at its meeting October 29, 1992, by which it postponed reception of the Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS) into membership of NAPARC, and express the hope that
NAPARC will receive them without further delay, at its next meeting, November 10, 1993. (See IV.B above.)

Ground: The Reformed Church in the United States fulfills, in both its statement of faith and its endeavor to practice that faith diligently and faithfully, the requirements of NAPARC for membership in the body.

5. That Overture 1 to the 59th General Assembly, from the Presbytery of the Midwest (to expand the boundaries of the presbytery into a part of Ontario, Canada), in the absence of any information as to why the overture was referred to this Committee, be adopted. (See V.A above.)

6. That the General Assembly grant the budget request of NAPARC for $180. as the assessment of the OPC for the year. (See IV.B above.)

7. That the General Assembly authorize that $500 from its general funds be sent to NAPARC for the planned 350th anniversary celebration of the Westminster Assembly. (See IV.B above.)

XI ELECTIONS

The terms of the following members of the Committee expire at this Assembly: Ministers—John P. Galbraith, Glenn D. Jerrell, Jack J. Peterson. 

Three are to be elected. Members of the Committee may be ministers and/or ruling elders. There is no required number of one or the other to be elected.

MINORITY REPORT

The undersigned agrees with the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations to the effect that the 60th General Assembly should not sever fraternal relations with the Christian Reformed Church at the present time.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. That if the Christian Reformed Church fails to initiate disciplinary proceedings against those who have ordained women as ruling elders by the time of our 61st (1994) General Assembly, consideration of termination of the fraternal relationship with the CRC be placed on its docket;

2. That the CRC be informed of this action.

Grounds:
(1) According to widely published reports the following churches have women elders, and some have had women elders for several years.

Detroit, Mich. - First CRC
Fort Collins, Colo. - Immanuel
Grand Rapids, Mich.
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Church of the Servant
Eastern Avenue
Grace
Madison Square
Kalamazoo, Mich. - Immanuel
Oak Forest, Ill. - Hope
Toronto, Ont., Canada - First
Washington, D.C.

(2) The ordination of women to ruling and teaching office is clearly forbidden in Scripture. (I Timothy 2:11, 12 "Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence.")

(3) It is also contrary to the clear teaching of the Belgic Confession. (Art. XXX: "everything will be carried on in the Church with good order and decency, when faithful men are chosen according to the rule prescribed by St. Paul in his Epistle to Timothy.")

(4) The undersigned is deeply concerned about what he sees as a pervasive and increasing lack of faithfulness to the Scriptures on the part of the Christian Reformed Church. Prominent among my concerns is the number of CR churches which have ignored or are in the process of ignoring Synod’s recent decision (1992) not to open the ruling and teaching office to women. While the 1992 decision is ambiguous at best it is still clear that the ordination of women to the office of elder has not been approved. It will be extremely significant, therefore, to note the way in which the 1993 Synod of the Christian Reformed Church deals with this matter. If there is not decisive discipline in these cases, such failure would constitute clear evidence that we should consider severing fraternal relationship.

Respectfully submitted,
G. I. Williamson
REPORT OF THE HISTORIAN

The past year has been preoccupied with two current projects and the pressure from two envisioned ones. Of first importance is the OPC video and its related enterprise, the production of a popular history of the OPC. Our hope is that the video will be completed by summer's end and the history, co-written by Dr. Darryl Hart and John Muether, will be available by next assembly.

In order for the assembly to gain better appreciation of our progress, we have made available for view the nearly finished cut of the video's first part which deals with Machen and the movement out of which the OPC arose. Also, we have in hand four chapters from the Hart/Muether book.

As for the other pressing project for 1992-93, it consisted in three academic lectures delivered by the historian at Mid-America Reformed Seminary on the history of the OPC, entitled "Tragedy, Hope, and Ambivalence: The History of the OPC, 1936-1962." These lectures cover three fundamentalists in the '30's, with the evangelicals in the '40's, and with those in the '50's influenced by the Peniel movement and its view on guidance. The terminus of the study is 1962 and the death, that year, of Ned B. Stonehouse. The lectures are available on tape from MARS and will appear in that institution's journal.

Also related and of interest is a speech "Is History Repeating Itself?", delivered by the historian early in '92 in Michigan, that analyzed the 1924 general assembly in the PCUSA. The importance of this assembly is difficult to over-emphasize in light of the conservative collapse it signalled. This speech is available on tape, and there are plans to have it published.

One of the envisioned projects mentioned earlier concerns the completion of research for and the production of an article on the presbyterianism of Edwin H. Rian. The republication of Rian's book, The Presbyterian Conflict, demands some explanation of this man to the many unaware of his personal history. It is hoped that this article will be complemented by a piece by Dr. Hart on the Christian University, a fascinating and disturbing chapter in the history of the OPC and Westminster Seminary and one in which Rian played an important role.

The other projected effort is the archival work that needs to be done. Grace Mullen has kindly helped us in this area in years past. With the arrival of Dr. Hart at Westminster Seminary, Miss Mullen will be able to spend more time with the archives, helping the historian prepare them for greater accessibility and usefulness.

The assembly should also be aware of another effort that will bear fruit soon. John Muether is at work on an index to the GA Minutes that the Committee of the Historian will publish. As yet, we have no date set for its publication.

Dr. John Deliyannides of Coconut Creek, Florida, retires from the Committee of the Historian with this assembly. Here was a tireless and faithful worker whose energies and promptness were a standard for all of us on the committee. We believe that his service has not been ignored in heaven. The committee has unanimously recommended the appointment of Mr. Brian O'Leary of McMurray, Pennsylvania to replace Dr. Deliyannides.

Respectfully submitted,
Charles G. Dennison
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE HISTORIAN

During the past year of 1992-93, the Committee for the Historian of the OPC continued its efforts in advising the Historian in his various activities, in promoting and selling the six books which were published by the Committee, and in planning for future activities. The Committee also cooperated with the Committee on Christian Education on the History Project. The Committee met twice by teleconferencing. The Historian's activities are described in his report. Some of the activities and decisions of the Committee are summarized below.

I COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES AND DECISIONS

A. We continued to sell the books through the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Great Christian Books and directly through the Committee. Numbers of books sold in 1992-93, and totals to date are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>1992-93</th>
<th>Total to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50TH ANNIVERSARY VOLUME</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressing Toward The Mark</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lest We Forget</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>5,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Presbyterian Conflict</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC MINISTERIAL REGISTER</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE OPC</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The first printing of 1000 copies of Edwin Rian's The Presbyterian Conflict, which had been out of print for many years, was released. The book is in paperback and has the same format as the recent second printing of Pressing Toward The Mark. Sales of this book have been very good, and are expected to increase even more as a result of advertising in World magazine. A second printing is planned already.

C. The revision of the OPC Ministerial Register, by Mr. James T. Dennison, librarian of Westminster West, was completed and 1000 copies were printed. About 650 of these were distributed through the General Assembly distribution list. The rest are being sold by the Committee for a nominal price.

D. We also printed and are selling for a nominal price an Annotated Bibliography of the History of the OPC prepared by the Historian.

E. Joint efforts with the Committee on Christian Education on the History Project continued throughout the year. The project includes:

1. Audio recording of interviews with individuals acquainted with the history of the OPC (nearly 50 tapes are available);
2. Production of a video on the history and identity of the OPC, to be available by the time of the 60th General Assembly; and
3. The publication by the end of 1993 of a short history of the OPC, co-
authored by John Muether and Daryl Hart. More details are given in the Historian's report.

II  **STATUS OF BOOK SALES ACCOUNTS (as of 2/27/93)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
<td>$232.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$(68.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lest We Forget</em></td>
<td>2,494.13</td>
<td>434.13</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>1,678.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINISTERIAL REG.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Press. To Mark</em></td>
<td>825.36</td>
<td>493.52</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>(181.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNIV. VOLUME</td>
<td>890.17</td>
<td>367.00</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>1,180.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Presb. Conflict</em></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,515.38</td>
<td>3,594.28</td>
<td>(78.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. ACCOUNT</td>
<td><strong>224.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>267.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>282.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>209.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,434.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,504.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,003.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,934.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III  **1992-93 BUDGET EXPENSES**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Budget:</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative</td>
<td>1,313.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Archival</td>
<td>17.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,424.50 (As of 2/27/93)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Additional expenses of approximately $2,800.00 are anticipated for the remainder of the fiscal year bringing the total to $4,224.50.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> Historian’s Honorarium:</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV  **PROPOSED 1993-94 BUDGET**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Travel:</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> Promotion:</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> Administrative:</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong> Archival:</td>
<td><strong>1,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( Same as for last year)

V  **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That Mr. Charles G. Dennison be appointed as the Historian of the OPC for another three-year term.
2. That the Historian be paid an honorarium of $5,000.00 per year for 1993-94 (same as for last year).

3. That Messrs. James F. Alexander and David K. Thompson be reelected to the Committee for the Historian for another three-year term. The Committee submits the name of Brian O’Leary to replace Dr. John S. Deliyannides.

4. That the proposed budget of the Committee for the Historian, itemized in section IV above, be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,
John S. Deliyannides, Chairman
REPORT OF THE CHAPLAINS COMMISSION

The Commission met once during the year in conjunction with the meeting of the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel (PPJCCMP or the Joint Commission). All three representatives of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church were present. The meeting was held on 23 February 1993, at the Sheraton Inn Hartsfield West, Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Warren was elected as Vice Chairman of the Joint Commission.

We currently have eight chaplains serving on active duty: eight serving in the active Reserves, two retired, one serving as an endorsed hospital chaplain, and one serving as a chaplain with the Civil Air Patrol. The names of our various chaplains are included at the end of the report as appendix 1.

ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM THE JOINT COMMISSION MEETING

1. Joint Commission Executive Director
   
   The Joint Commission has been served well by the Rev. William Leonard as the Executive Director for its entire history. With Mr. Leonard’s increasing maturity, the Joint Commission has sought candidates to succeed Mr. Leonard as the new Director. A search committee was formed two years ago. They have worked with the Presbyterian Church in America’s Mission to North America Committee (MNA) to arrive at a job description and a financial package for the new director. At the time of the meeting in Atlanta three applications for the position had been received, but not acted upon.

   The Joint Commission determined to postpone a decision on a new Executive Director for at least a year to allow time to develop a financial strategy for the support of all (Joint) Commission operations.

2. Joint Commission By-Laws
   
   Related to item 1, the Joint Commission determined to propose to the next stated meeting of the Joint Commission the following change by way of addition as a new paragraph to Article IV of the Joint Commission By-laws: “The Joint Commission is not a division of any one denomination but because of the organizational and administrative support provided by the PCA, the Executive Director normally will be a teaching elder of the PCA with military chaplain experience and he also will represent MNA as appropriate and feasible.” In order for this to become a part of the Joint Commission’s By-laws it must be formally agreed to by the OPC General Assembly.

   This addition to the By-laws is intended to clarify the position of the Executive Director with respect to MNA. The current Director serves as a staff member with MNA but has maintained his residence and office in Colorado. We anticipate the new Director will reside in Atlanta and work more closely with the MNA staff and actively coordinate Chaplain’s ministries for the PCA. This Chaplain’s Committee supports this change. In last year’s report we informed the Assembly of the proposal by the PCA to disband the Commission. This proposed change to the By-laws addresses the concerns which prompted that proposal.
The PCA currently has 106 military chaplains, active and Reserve, compared with 16 for the OPC, 5 for the RPCNA, and two for the Korean-American Presbyterian Church.

3. Budgetary Matters

No changes to the fee structures have been adopted for this year. From last year, the following structure is repeated; Individual chaplains are requested to contribute to the Joint Commission at the following rates: Active Duty grades 01-03 $15.00 per month; 04-06 $25.00/month; non-active duty chaplains in a pay status $10.00/month. The fee for endorsements to be paid by individual chaplains was set in the amount of $25.00 for chaplain candidates; $75.00 for the first endorsement as a chaplain; and $25.00 for each subsequent endorsement. New endorsements are required of chaplains when they are endorsed for active duty, endorsed for indefinite extension, endorsed for Regular status in the services as opposed to Reserve status, and when they depart active duty and desire to remain active in the Reserves. The fees are to assist in the actual paper work and telephone costs associated with processing such endorsements. In addition to the above, our General Assembly is requested to pay $100.00 per Active Duty chaplain to the Joint Commission each year.

The Korean-American Presbyterian Church has been informed that these financial support arrangements apply equally to them despite the fact they have not sought membership in the Joint Commission. Their chaplains are endorsed by previous agreement.

In the “On-Line Chaplains’ Newsletter”, issue #37, February-March 93, “all active duty chaplains and reserves on a pay status are urgently requested to seriously consider designating a minimum of 4% or more of (their) tithe for ‘Chaplain Ministries’ c/o MNA, Atlanta.” This was not a full Joint Commission decision but is a request from the PCA members of the Commission to PCA chaplains and others who desire to respond. The request is an attempt to increase revenues to the PCA to permit the calling of a new Executive Director.

4. Homosexuals in the Military

The Joint Commission adopted the following statement regarding the ability of our chaplains to minister in the event that avowed homosexuals are permitted to openly serve in the Armed Forces. The statement is intended to clarify the policy of our churches based on our primary and secondary standards. It is a guide to interpretation and does not pre-empt or supersede our OPC constitutional documents.

The Bible, which is our infallible rule of faith and practice, commands us to express redemptive love and compassion to all persons. It further commands us to condemn homosexual behavior as sinful and dangerous.

Our chaplains will provide compassionate and caring ministry to all service members and their families regardless of sexual orientation and behavior or the diseases with which they may be afflicted. At the same time we will never condone the destructive behavior of homosexuals.

Therefore, chaplains endorsed by this Commission will continue to preach the whole counsel of God, are not permitted to conduct divine worship with homosexual chaplains, are not permitted to have homo-
sexual ministry assistants, and are not permitted to perform same sex marriages.

Along with the adoption of this statement, the Joint Commission verbally instructed the Executive Director to communicate the statement and the concerns of our Commission regarding the service of avowed homosexuals in our Armed Forces with appropriate officials.

Since the meeting in February, the PCA members of the Commission have slightly modified the statement to identify the chaplains as those endorsed by the Joint Commission and as members of the PCA. Of further note, the statement was reworked by a group of PCA and OPC chaplains who met together in retreat in April. The reworded statement from this meeting is presented below in its entirety (the text contained here is specifically for the OPC. Appropriate changes are made for the PCA.) The Chaplains Commission recommends that this expanded statement be adopted by the General Assembly for guidance from the OPC to the Joint Commission in its overseeing OPC chaplains. Its text is the body of Recommendation 2.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY MATTERS

The Chaplains Commission was requested by the 59th General Assembly to propose to the 60th General Assembly the text of an Instrument to be adopted by the General Assembly pursuant to the suggestion contained in the portion of the Commission's report titled, "Other Items of Note." (Minutes, §126, p. 37).

In response, this Commission proposes a change to the Instruments of the General Assembly contained in Recommendation 3.

The proposed text of the proposed Appendix A is largely the text of the requested modification to the policy statement of the Joint Commission which was rejected by the other members of the Commission in 1992. (see Minutes, 58th General Assembly, §159, p. 54) Modifications have been made to apply it specifically to our denomination. It is proposed as 1. in a new appendix to provide means by which other such policy statements can be added in the future.

By adopting this statement as a part of our OPC standing rules, it will be kept current and available for all present and future chaplains versus being buried in the minutes of a previous Assembly.

Also of note, the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America has been accepted as a member of the Joint Commission. She should be listed as a member of the Commission in Article III of the Constitution in all future printings.

OTHER ITEMS OF NOTE

As was reported last year, the opportunity to serve in the chaplaincy continues to exist. Currently the Navy is looking for 28 liturgical Protestants (we are classified in this group) as soon as possible. Information on how to apply is available from any
Navy chaplain. Cutbacks in defense are still a reality and the overall number of chaplains will be steadily reduced. Some of our chaplains who have served well may be released at some point due to the downsizing of our forces. Please welcome them back into the churches if and when that happens. They will have had a wide variety of experience at that point which will have sharpened their pastoral skills. Please pray earnestly for all our military members in the face of the new proposals and appointments by the Clinton administration. This is a time of great change and we must beseech our Great God to give strength and guidance in bearing up under the strain and for wisdom in speaking the right words to bring glory to the Lord in all circumstances.

ELECTIONS

The term of Mr. Smith expires with this Assembly. In view of his pending assignment overseas, he requests he not be considered for election at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the General Assembly concur with the following statement of the Joint Commission, and so inform the Commission:

   The Bible, which is our infallible rule of faith and practice, commands us to express redemptive love and compassion to all persons. It further commands us to condemn homosexual behavior as sinful and dangerous.

   Our chaplains will provide compassionate and caring ministry to all service members and their families regardless of sexual orientation and behavior or the diseases with which they may be afflicted. At the same time we will never condone the destructive behavior of homosexuals.

   Therefore, chaplains endorsed by this Commission will continue to preach the whole counsel of God, are not permitted to conduct divine worship with homosexual chaplains, are not permitted to have homosexual ministry assistants, and are not permitted to perform same sex marriages.

2. That the General Assembly adopt the following statement to be forwarded to the Commission in overseeing OPC chaplains:

   1) Whereas, the Bible is our infallible rule of faith and practice, and
   2) Whereas the Bible establishes that by creation ordinance the heterosexual, monogamous, and faithful marriage relationship is both God’s ordained basis for an orderly society and God’s chosen vehicle to teach about His relationship with his people, and
   3) Whereas human sexuality has both procreation and mutual love and affection between husband and wife as its true expressions, and
   4) Whereas the Bible condemns the inappropriate use of human sexu-
ality including adultery, fornication, bestiality, pedophilia, incest, homosexuality and any other perversion of God’s gift of sexuality, and

5) Whereas, it is conceivable that chaplains endorsed by the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel could well be asked in the future to compromise their convictions in these matters in carrying out their ministries,

6) Therefore, the 60th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church makes the following declaration:

7) The Bible, which is our infallible rule of faith and practice, commands us to express redemptive love and compassion to all persons. It further commands us to condemn sexual behavior which deviates from God’s revealed standard as sinful and destructive. The Bible calls all who engage in these behaviors to repentance by turning to God and proving their repentance by their deeds. The chaplains of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church are committed to providing a compassionate, redemptive, and caring ministry to military service members, their families, and other groups among whom they are called to minister, regardless of sexual behavior or the diseases with which their constituents may be afflicted. Therefore, Orthodox Presbyterian Church chaplains endorsed by the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel will continue to preach and minister in light of the whole counsel of God on these matters. (Gen. 1:27, 28, 2:18-25, 19:1-29; Lev. 18:6-24, 20:13; Prov. 18:22; Matt. 19:4-6; Jn. 2:1-11; Acts 26:20; Rom. 1:24-27; I Cor. 6:9-11, 7:2-4; Eph. 5:22-33; Rev. 19:6-9.)

3. That the General Assembly add to Paragraph G of the Instruments of the General Assembly as Appendix A the following:

Appendix A: The following are policy guidelines which apply to the ministry of chaplains of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church serving with the military. They are not changes to the Constitution of the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel but serve to explain and codify specific issues considered necessary by this denomination.

1). Since the Orthodox Presbyterian Church holds that the office of minister, or teaching elder, is given only to biblically qualified men, it is impermissible for any minister of this Church serving as a military chaplain to share in the conduct of any service of public worship where those not meeting biblical qualifications take part in the leading of that worship service. This principle does not prohibit such a chaplain from working with chaplains from other denominations in biblically appropriate areas of cooperative ministry.

2). Our chaplains will provide compassionate and caring ministry to all service members and their families regardless of sexual orientation and behavior or the diseases with which they may be afflicted. At the same time we will never condone the destructive behavior of homosexuals. Those Orthodox Presbyterian Church chaplains endorsed by the Commission will continue to preach the whole counsel of God, but are not permitted to conduct divine worship with homosexual chaplains, are not permitted to have homosexual ministry assistants, and are not permitted to perform same sex marriages.
4. That the General Assembly concur with this new paragraph to be added to Article IV of the Joint Commission By-laws:
The Joint Commission is not a division of any one denomination but because of the organizational and administrative support provided by the PCA, the Executive Director normally will be a teaching elder of the PCA with military chaplain experience and he also will represent MNA as appropriate and feasible.

ACTIVE DUTY CHAPLAINS

CH (CPT) Jonathan C. Gibbs, 111 USAR
312 Whipple Tree Lane
Fayetteville, NC 28314

CH (CPT) Chester H. Lanious USAR
323 McFayden Drive
Fayetteville, NC 28314

CH (CPT) Bob Marsh USAR
HHC 1/2 Aviation Regt Unit 15420
APO AP, 96257-0250

LT William A. Miller, Jr. CHC USNR
PSC 468 Box 1215
FPO AP 96506-1215

LCDR Lyman M. Smith CHC USN
MWHS-L, 1st MAW (Wing Chaplain)
Unit 37121
FPO AP 96603-7121

LCDR Bryan J. Weaver CHC USN
1276 Warner Hall Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23454-5862

CH (CPT) Christopher Wisdom USAR
2846 E. Genessee Street
Syracuse, NY 13224-1525

LT Douglas M. Withington CHC USNR
PSC 478A
FPO AP 96313-1800
RESERVES


RETIRED

The Rev. Donald Miller, and The Rev. Robert Needham

HOSPITAL

The Rev. William A. Hard

CIVIL AIR PATROL

The Rev. Donald G. Buchanan, Jr.

(Note: the addresses of non-active duty chaplains have been omitted as they are available in the directory. The active duty addresses are the most recently available)

Respectfully submitted,
William E. Warren
Robert B. Needham
Lyman M. Smith,
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO
STUDY THE METHOD OF ADMISSION TO THE LORD'S SUPPER

I BACKGROUND AND ACTIVITY

The Committee was erected and its members (Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., Robert D. Knudsen, and Thomas E. Tyson) elected by the 58th GA, on recommendation by the Committee On Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations (Minutes, pp. 37-38, 48-49). This recommendation came as a result of challenges to the prevailing method(s) of admission to the Lord's supper in the OPC by the Committee on Contact with the OPC of the Canadian Reformed Churches (CCOPC) and was in the interests of reaching unity on this matter.

From the outset the Committee has been uncertain as to how it ought to proceed, in particular as to how its work might advance and not simply repeat what is already being done by the CEIR in its discussions with the CCOPC. (Two members of the Committee, Gaffin and Tyson, are also members of the subcommittee of the CEIR consulting with the CCOPC.) Eventually we have decided that under the existing circumstances our work would be redundant. In our judgment, OPC responsibility to the Canadian Reformed Churches and their concerns is already being adequately discharged by the CEIR. As our report, then, we offer as information the following brief statement prepared for CEIR discussions with the CCOPC, slightly modified:

THE OPC AND SUPERVISION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER
A BRIEF STATEMENT

1. Pertinent materials in the subordinate standards
   1.1 Confession of Faith. In chapter 29, "Of the Lord's Supper," section 7 refers to "worthy receivers." Such persons are those who partake "inwardly by faith"; they are "true believers" (sec. 1).

   In contrast, section 8 says that "ignorant and wicked men" ("all ignorant and ungodly persons") are "unworthy of the Lord's table" and "cannot, without great sin against Christ, . . . be admitted thereunto."

   Beyond this proviso for exclusion, the only explicit administrative prohibition in this chapter, with respect to recipients, concerns private communion; those who minister the Supper are to do so "to none who are not then present in the congregation" (sec. 3).

   Chapter 30, "Of Church Censures," stipulates among the disciplinary actions at the disposal of church officers, "suspension from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper for a season" (sec. 4).

   1.2 Larger Catechism. Q. & A. 168-177 deal with the meaning of, administration of, and participation in the Lord's Supper. Explicit reference to those "that worthily communicate" is found in A. 168 and in Q. & A. 170, and much of what is found in these nine answers explains what worthy communication involves, particularly the self-examination and discernment requisite for such communication.
Q. 173 asks, “May any who profess the faith, and desire to come to the Lord's supper, be kept from it?” The answer is that “Such as are found to be ignorant or scandalous, notwithstanding their profession of the faith, and desire to come to the Lord's supper, may and ought to be kept from that sacrament, by the power which Christ hath left in his church, . . .”

1.3 Shorter Catechism. Q. and A. 96-97 deal with the Lord's Supper. Q. 97 asks “What is required to the worthy receiving of the Lord's supper?” The answer focuses on the requirement “that they examine themselves of their knowledge to discern the Lord's body, . . .” and then warns against the danger of “coming unworthily, . . .”

1.4 Form of Government. Chapter 13, “The Local Church and Its Session,” section 7 states: “The session is charged with maintaining the government of the congregation. It shall oversee all matters concerning the conduct of public worship; . . .”

1.5 Directory for Public Worship. Chapter 4, “The Celebration of the Sacraments,” section 3 stipulates: “Since the sacraments are ordinances of the visible church, they are not to be administered except under the oversight of the government of the church. Moreover, in ordinary circumstances they are properly administered only in a gathering of the congregation for the public worship of God, . . .”

Section C-2, the form to be read by the minister before the distribution of the elements in administering the Lord's Supper, declares:

It is my solemn duty to warn the uninstructed, the profane, the scandalous, and those who secretly and impenitently live in any sin, not to approach the holy table lest they partake unworthily, not discerning the Lord's body, and so eat and drink condemnation to themselves. (The form then goes on in detail to assure that “this warning is not designed to keep the humble and contrite from the table of the Lord, as if the supper were for those who might be free from sin . . .”, and concludes as follows:)

Let us therefore, in accordance with the admonition of the apostle Paul, examine our minds and hearts to determine whether such discernment is ours, to the end that we may partake to the glory of God and to our own growth in the grace of Christ.

Earlier, Section A-5 states that the minister “is not required to use the exact language of the indented forms, which are suggested as appropriate. He may employ these or similar forms, using his own liberty and godly wisdom as the edification of the people shall require.”

2. Observations and Commentary

2.1 Our subordinate standards have a manifest and sustained concern for worthy participation in the Lord’s Supper, a concern defined, in part, by antithesis to unworthy participation. This two-sided, antithetical concern—to promote worthy and to prevent unworthy receiving, that is, to “fence” the Supper—is evidently based on the apostolic/covenantal concern expressed most explicitly in I Corinthians 11:27-34.

2.2 Administering the Supper, including fencing, is ordinarily the responsibility of the local session.
2.3 The most explicit directive concerning fencing, on its negative side, appears to be LC, A.173, which states that the "ignorant or scandalous, . . ., may and ought to be kept from that sacrament, by the power which Christ hath left in his church, . . ."

Crucial is the notion of ecclesiastical power expressed here. What is such authority? In brief, it is the exercise of "the keys of the kingdom," entrusted by the risen Christ to the church through his apostles, and ministered subsequently by those set apart to ruling office. Specifically—as the Reformation has made perennially clear, especially in opposing the clericalism of Rome—the authority of office is the authority of the (inscripturated) Word, no more, no less; church authority, in that sense, is ministerial or declarative.

Fencing the Supper, then, is a particular exercise of this declarative power.

2.4 How, specifically, is that power to be exercised? Notably, our standards do not stipulate a set procedure to be followed by the session. It seems fair to say that, so far as good order and spiritual welfare are concerned, the Supper is adequately fenced by using the form quoted above (DW 4.C.2), or an equivalent. That the Supper is to be fenced is mandatory. How that is to take place is, in large part, an adiaphoron; not even the form provided need be used verbatim. Each session has a measure of discretionary freedom and flexibility.

2.4.1 In fact, there is no uniform procedure for fencing the Supper in the OPC. A very few congregations may practice a form of "closed" communion, requiring visitors who wish to participate to be examined by the session in advance. Fairly typical is the practice where the minister supplements the reading of the form (1) by inviting to the Table those who (a) have been baptized, (b) have publicly professed their faith before the church, and (c) are currently members in good standing of an "evangelical" church, and (2) by warning those who do not meet these requirements not to participate. (There is a growing perception in some quarters of the church that (c) is less and less useful in view of the devaluation of the term evangelical in recent years.)

2.4.2 The OPC practice falls within the spectrum of fencing procedure that, historically, has been present in the mainstreams of the Reformed tradition; in both Continental and British-American churches, some have followed a more regulated (e.g., use of tokens, attestation letters, consistorial/sessional examination of visitors), others a less regulated policy (instruction and warning from the pulpit to both congregation and visitors). This spectrum, we believe, is legitimate and reflects the latitude allowed by Scripture. Again, that the Supper must be fenced is plain; how that is to be done is a matter of (biblically informed) judgment with room for differences.

2.5 What are the wider implications of the OPC position and practice for the doctrine of the church?

2.5.1 Does this approach reflect an "individualism," presumably bound up somehow with the invisible-visible church distinction? We think not. Admittedly, an unbiblical individualism is a real and pervasive threat to the life and integrity of the church, particularly in North America, and is not to be dismissed lightly. But, at the same time, it needs to be appreciated that in the most directly pertinent biblical passage (I Cor. 11:27ff.)—a passage, it should be noted, marked by
the apostle’s concern to provide quite specific directives—the focus, so far as worthy participation is concerned, is not on those who administer and their responsibility to safeguard the Supper, but on the recipients and their need, individually, for self-examination; the accent here is on “individual” responsibility.

On a more general note, surely we must guard against polarizing or forcing a choice between the individual and the corporate (an unbiblical “corporatism,” by the way, is by no means an imaginary danger, as church history makes plain). In God’s covenant, surely, that choice represents a false dichotomy; only covenantal religion is able to hold the two considerations in balance and give each its due.

2.5.2 It is the conviction of the OPC that there are other churches, including non-Reformed churches, that are true churches, and that members in good standing in such churches do, however defectively, make a credible profession of faith in Christ and so ought to be welcomed to his Table in OPC congregations. There is, after all, only one Christian church (I Cor. 1:13; Eph. 4:4), and to that one church, by implication, comes the command to partake of the Lord’s Supper (I Cor. 11:26). A controlling conviction of the OPC is that while the Supper must be rigorously exclusive so far as the world is concerned, for the church—subject to the provisions already noted—it must be as inclusive as possible.

II Recommendation: That the committee be dissolved.
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS

SYNOPSIS

I SAVING TIME AT THE GA ON APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS

II CASES BEFORE THIS ASSEMBLY

(Report at the time of the publication of the Agenda)

III THE FIVE COMPLAINTS BEFORE THIS ASSEMBLY

(After publication of the Agenda)

1. Complaint 1 (Thornton)
2. Complaint 2 (Trinity, Denver; appealed by Thornton)
3. Complaint 3 (Bahnsen)
4. Complaint 4 (Manring)
5. Complaint 5 (Laurie)

IV ELECTION

I SAVING TIME AT THE GA ON APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS

A. Introduction

The 59th General Assembly passed the following motion:

The Committee on Appeals and Complaints was instructed to consider how appeals and complaints to the General Assembly can be dealt with adequately and properly without requiring an abnormally burdensome amount of time during the General Assembly such as experienced at this Assembly, and to report on this matter, with recommendations, to the 60th General Assembly. (Minutes, Journal, §240, p. 69)

This motion reflects the 59th Assembly’s experience. There were six complaints, involving complex problems of fact, law, and the preservation of rights; as a result, the work of the Advisory Committee and the Assembly was delayed. Moreover, appeals and complaints have taken increasing time in the last five assemblies.

This report presents proposals to increase the efficiency of the whole appeals process, in the General Assembly and its committees, and also in the lower courts. Procedures in the lower courts have a direct bearing upon the work of the General Assembly. The lower courts may be able to settle a case in such a way that there will be no appeal to the General Assembly. As for those cases that are appealed, better preparation of the cases in the lower courts will enable the GA to deal with the appeals more promptly.

Before introducing the recommendations of this report, mention may be made of some available measures in the operation of our present three-fold structure (CAC, Advisory Committee, and full GA; see Minutes of the 59th General Assem-
bly, pp. 284-290). These measures are possibilities, calling for practical wisdom. They are not listed as specific recommendations for adoption by the GA, because their use varies with circumstances.

Some examples:
1. If the necessity for appeals to the GA arises only after presbytery meetings in late spring, it may be too late to deal with them at the GA that year. Or, there may be too many appeals for one Assembly to handle. In such circumstances, the Advisory Committee may recommend that certain appeals be deferred.
2. As far as time allows, the CAC (Committee on Appeals and Complaints) should send out to all Advisory Committee members, in advance of the Assembly, documentation to use in preparation for their work.
3. The Advisory Committee might be reduced in size; with too many members it can become unwieldy.
4. The GA should refuse to hear, as out of order, appeals against the decisions of the lower courts that, strictly as appeals, fail to accord with basic principles of the Book of Discipline.

Recommendation #1 (see below) would amend the Book of Discipline so as to recognize the power of a higher judicatory to remand a complaint to a lower judicatory. This amendment would strengthen the hand of a presbytery, as well as of the General Assembly.

Recommendations #2 through #7 suggest policies or procedures in the lower courts, to seek to settle problems in the lower courts as much as possible, even without complaints; to emphasize the responsibilities undertaken by a complainant, through a change in the suggested form for a complaint; and to provide better preparation of the factual basis of a case, especially through chronologies. By these means we may hope to reduce the number of appeals coming to the GA, and, as for those appeals that do come, to urge the lower courts, and the various parties, to provide the GA with specific and cogent grounds for, or against, the decisions that are appealed.

B. Recommendations

There are two types of recommendations: those that propose amendments to the Book of Discipline, according to the prescribed procedure for amending the Constitution; and others that may be adopted by the 60th Assembly.

Recommendations of the first type are numbers 1, 6, and 7. Those recommendations which may be adopted by the 60th GA are numbers 2, 3, 4 and 5.

The change in the suggested form for a complaint (Recommendation #3) may be made by the 60th Assembly apart from the full amendment process, inasmuch as the “Suggested Forms” are not part of the Constitution.

The other recommendations would be “advice” from the 60th Assembly to the presbyteries and sessions, in line with the advice that the 59th Assembly gave to the lower judicatories when it “determined to inform” them that the “plea of a complaint or appeal, as well as the supporting argumentation,” should be stated “clearly and succinctly” so as not “to risk the complaint or appeal being returned. . .with consequent delay.” (Minutes, Journal, §242, p. 69). Recommendations 2, 4 and 5 are comparable with this advice from the 59th Assembly.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That this General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following amendment to the Book of Discipline: in Chapter IX to renumber the present Section 6 as 7 and to insert a new Section 6 as follows:

   "6. A complaint, carried by appeal to a higher judicatory, may be sustained; or, denied; or, remanded, with grounds, to the next lower judicatory. A decision to remand shall state whether jurisdiction in the matter is being returned to the lower judicatory, or retained by the higher judicatory."

   Grounds:
   (1) In stating these options open to an appellate judicatory, this amendment recognizes the option to remand a complaint, or to send a complaint back to a lower judicatory for further consideration (cf. Book of Discipline VII.6 for a similar provision in a judicial case.)
   (2) If jurisdiction has been transferred to a lower court, the decision of the court may be appealed, with jurisdiction then returning to the higher court.
   (3) The question when to remand a complaint, rather than to sustain it, or deny it, should be considered carefully by the appellate judicatory. A decision to remand a complaint should be accompanied by the grounds for doing so.
   (4) A complaint should be sustained when it proves that an action or delinquency of the judicatory complained against is in violation of the Constitution of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. If a complaint does not prove such a violation, it should be denied. A complaint that is unnecessary or trifling should also be denied. A complaint should be found out of order, and therefore not properly before the appellate court, if the procedures followed by the complainant are contrary to the procedures required in the Book of Discipline.
   (5) A complaint that alleges serious delinquency or error, but with an essential element of its factual background still in dispute, may be remanded for further inquiry into the facts.
   (6) There may be other circumstances under which an appellate court may choose to remand a complaint.
   (7) A complaint that is remanded to a lower judicatory may, after further inquiry by that judicatory, be sustained or denied; or it may be withdrawn by mutual consent, in such a way that the problem on which the complaint centers is settled in the lower judicatory.
   (8) The lower judicatory should notify the higher judicatory, or the next following General Assembly, of the action it has taken. If jurisdiction had been returned to the lower judicatory, and no appeal is entered, the case is concluded.

2. That this General Assembly advise the presbyteries and sessions that in their general pastoral oversight they have power to exercise administrative discipline, and to inquire into, and to settle, administrative problems that might lead to a complaint, without waiting for a complaint to be filed.

   Grounds:
   (1) A judicatory's responsibility of pastoral oversight includes looking into all problems brought to its attention.
   (2) Many a problem can be solved at the outset by recognizing it as a
problem that needs to be considered; and many an action can be reconsidered if cogent reasons are advanced for doing so.

(3) A complaint should not be necessary to initiate an inquiry, and a complaint is not necessarily a good thing in itself. A complaint is a last resort. A complaint means that a judicatory, and a complainant, have not succeeded in resolving a difficulty by ordinary means but have to submit to a process of litigation that could extend to an appellate court or courts. In this sense a complaint is a confession of failure on the part of the judicatory and/or the complainant.

(4) If there has to be a formal complaint, a judicatory is much better prepared to deal with it if a preliminary inquiry has already been undertaken.

(5) Frequent reliance upon complaints is litigious.

3. That this General Assembly amend the suggested form for a complaint (Book of Church Order, p. 268) as follows: on the seventh line place a period instead of a comma after the words "of which complaint is made)," and drop the rest of the sentence on present lines 7 and 8, for re-statement at a later point. Insert two new paragraphs:

In bringing this complaint I affirm that I believe that the session (or presbytery) has erred (or has been delinquent) and that this error (or delinquency) is serious; that I have tried to understand the session's (presbytery's) point of view; and that I have made a serious effort to correct the error (or delinquency) short of entering a complaint.

In support of this complaint I set forth the following grounds: (here set forth concisely in numbered paragraphs the grounds of fact, circumstance, and law in support of the complaint)

Date: __________________________, Complainant

Grounds:

(1) A complainant should understand that in bringing a complaint he bears a responsibility to avoid frivolous or personal objectives and to show that the problem he presents is serious; and that he has already done everything he can to clear up the problem by way of a protest, reconsideration, personal conferences, and/or attempt to rescind, before engaging a session or presbytery, or ultimately the whole church, in a legal battle.

(2) A complainant should also realize that it is up to him to present a cogent argument, based on the facts and the law, in support of his complaint.

(3) This amendment may serve as a deterrent to those who might think of a complaint as the initial way, or as the only appropriate way, to deal with a problem posed by a judicatory’s actions.

4. That this General Assembly advise the presbyteries and sessions that when a complaint is presented to a judicatory it is the responsibility of that judicatory to ascertain, and to verify, all the facts. The judicatory should institute a preliminary investigation of the facts. This task belongs to the judicatory of original jurisdiction and should not be referred, by default, to an appellate judicatory or judicatories.
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**Grounds:**

1. The words “after considering a complaint” in Book of Discipline IX.3 ought to be understood to refer to a necessary step in handling complaints, similar to the “preliminary investigation” before a judicial case (III.7).

2. In a judicatory’s consideration of a complaint against its own action, the judicatory ought to take stock of the whole situation to see whether, after all, its action was in error in the light of the facts, so that the complaint should be sustained and the error corrected. If so, the Book of Discipline is justified in providing for complaints, and for their consideration, first, by judicatories complained against.

3. Upon objective consideration of the facts a judicatory may come to the realization that the problem underlying the complaint should have been dealt with in a different way, rather than by the action complained against. The judicatory can then go back, correct the actions, and resolve the problem in mutual agreement. Again the Book of Discipline is justified.

4. To verify the facts is the duty of the judicatory of original jurisdiction, that is, the judicatory complained against; but appellate judicatories may correct the record. At times the CAC or the Advisory Committee, from a study of the documents of a case, may discover facts not previously noted but which are found by the General Assembly to determine the case.

5. That this General Assembly advise the presbyteries that a presbytery, to which a complaint against a session has been carried by appeal, should not ordinarily content itself with the facts as brought to it by the session, but should itself institute a further inquiry into both the facts and the law in the case.

**Grounds:**

1. At one remove from the session, a presbytery may be able to reach a more objective evaluation or to correct a chronology.

2. If the presbytery itself, or a committee of the presbytery, has already become involved with matters related to the complaint, that involvement itself brings in additional facts or actions which the presbytery has to evaluate prior to its decision.

3. The great aim of the presbytery’s inquiry should be to bring cases to resolution in such a way that appeal to the General Assembly will not be necessary.

6. That this General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following amendments to the Book of Discipline: in Chapter III, Section 7.b, at the end of the first paragraph; and in Section 8.b, at the end of the first paragraph, to add the sentence: “It shall also prepare a statement of the facts of the case, arranged by date in the form of a chronology.”

In Chapter VII, Section 5, after the words “the entire record of the case,” to insert the words: “including the chronology” so that Section 5 will read:

“5. The clerk of the judicatory from whose judgment the appeal is taken shall submit the entire record of the case, including the chronology, to the clerk of the appellate judicatory.”

**Grounds:**

1. A chronology exhibits the facts of a case and shows that there has
been a serious effort to ascertain those facts. It is most desirable that a chronology be agreed upon, if possible, by both parties.

(2) A chronology, as a statement of facts, lists the events which have occurred, including the documents of the case. It shows how and when the problem arose, and what has been done to try to rectify it, and by whom; it shows the temporal relationship of events; and it shows whether the provisions of the Book of Discipline have been followed.

(3) Actions that take place during a controversy may be actions of the moment, without consideration of their relationship to past or prospective actions in the case. An objective chronology of all the facts can remind a judicatory of what all the parties, including the judicatory itself, have done or allowed, and can lead to a more accurate perspective.

(4) If there is an appeal to the General Assembly, the chronology should be reviewed by the presbytery and brought up to date, and sent to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly with the other documents of the case. As an exhibition of the facts it can be indispensable, in complicated cases, in assisting the Committee on Appeals and Complaints, the General Assembly’s Advisory Committee, and the full Assembly, in the determination of the case.

(5) A chronology may be imperfect; it may not include all the pertinent facts as evidenced by the other documents. In such an event the facts are to be determined by the other documents and the chronology corrected.

7. That this General Assembly propose to the presbyteries the following amendment to the Book of Discipline: in Chapter IX, Section 4, first sentence, after the words “the relevant papers, including” to insert the words

a statement of the facts of the case arranged by date in the form of a chronology, and

Grounds: see the Grounds for Recommendation #6. Recommendation #6 provides for a chronology in judicial cases. Recommendation #7 provides for a chronology in complaints.

II CASES BEFORE THIS ASSEMBLY
(Report at the time of the publication of the Agenda)

A. Appeal Withdrawn
There was an appeal of a judicial case which had been filed with the Stated Clerk of the Assembly. This case engaged the attention of a presbytery for many months and produced extensive documentation. The Committee also spent many months, and perhaps hundreds of man hours, in its work on this case. Just before the time that the Agenda was to be printed, the appellant withdrew his appeal. Thus it will not appear in the docket of this Assembly.

B. Complaints Before This Assembly
A number of complaints are also expected, but they have been activated too late to allow the Committee to prepare a balanced documentation or summary
before the publication deadline for the Agenda. The Committee hopes to present its report on these complaints in time for the Assembly.

III THE FIVE COMPLAINTS BEFORE THIS ASSEMBLY

A. Preface to Complaints 1 and 2:
These two complaints, carried to this General Assembly on appeal by the session of Immanuel Church, Thornton, Colorado, have a common background in the division/schism of a church and its consequences.

The documents of the complaints are interrelated and are therefore numbered together in one chronological sequence. The summaries (Chronologies) for the two complaints, however, are separate.

The particular events with which these two complaints are concerned are part of a serious disturbance in the Presbytery of the Dakotas, relating to the Park Hill Church of Denver and its departure from the OPC in 1990. The conflict has not yet been resolved. For an account of the larger background, the most recent report of the Committee on Reconciliation (see p. 332) should be consulted. That Committee was set up by the 1991 General Assembly and was at first called the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church. As a part of its mandate, it was to seek reconciliation of the parties in the presbytery and to seek to restore Park Hill to the OPC (Minutes of the 1991 Assembly, p. 51; see also Minutes of the 1992 Assembly, pp. 323-329).

On July 14, 1990, judicial charges were brought against three elders of the Park Hill Church (Cyril Nightengale, LeRoy Petrie, and Arthur Samiran) arising out of differences with their pastor (the Rev. Jack Unangst). They were found guilty on all charges by the presbytery, and the presbytery proposed to pronounce the censures of suspension from the Lord’s Supper, and of deposition. But on appeal to the 1991 Assembly the judgment of the presbytery was reversed except for one charge, on which the censure was modified to a rebuke. (Minutes of the 1991 Assembly, pp. 329-361, 49-53, 55).

Meanwhile, on December 16, 1990, after the presbytery had refused the congregation’s request to dissolve the pastoral relationship with Mr. Unangst, the Park Hill Church had voted to leave the OPC. In September 1991, the presbytery declared this to be an act of schism. There was a complaint against this declaration; it was brought to the 1992 Assembly, and the complaint was denied for the reason that “the complainants have failed to demonstrate that the Presbytery of the Dakotas exceeded its prerogative when it exercised its judgment in declaring Park Hill Church to be guilty of the sin of schism.” The minority of the former Park Hill Church stayed with Mr. Unangst in the OPC and became the Trinity Church of Denver. The majority became Park Hill Church, Independent.

B. The Complaints:

1. Complaint 1 — from the session of Immanuel OPC, Thornton, CO (December 5, 1992) against the action of the Presbytery of the Dakotas in appointing a Committee of Six to meet with any members of the Park Hill Presbyterian
Church who may desire to become members of the OPC and to approve their reception only on the following conditions . . .

a. CHRONOLOGY of events and documents

(1) September 26, 1991—see Documents #8 and #26
The Rev. Jonathan D. Male was received by the presbytery, in order to serve “outside the bounds of the presbytery,” to work as pastor of the Park Hill (Independent) group, to seek to bring them back into the OPC. (Document #26 is found on pages 110-113.)

(2) March 1992—see Documents #9 and #26
Presbytery approved a call to Mr. Male to serve as associate pastor of Immanuel Church, Thornton. Park Hill had been designated a mission work by the Thornton session.

(3) March 28, 1992—see Documents #24 (item 66) and #26
Thornton session Minutes. Mr. Male and Elder Arthur F. Johnson “were appointed to begin conducting interviews with members of the Park Hill Church who are desirous of making a reaffirmation of faith and rejoining the OPC.” They started to examine such people, as to a credible profession of faith, with a view to receiving them on reaffirmation of faith, and response to the four questions prescribed by the Directory for Worship V.5.

(4) September 24, 1992—Documents #13, #26, and #28
(Communication 8, see p. 93)
Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. Presbytery’s Church Visitation Committee for Immanuel Church, Thornton (from Trinity Church, Denver) reported to the presbytery Thornton’s plan to receive Park Hill people under the conditions noted above. The presbytery adopted the following motion, that: the presbytery erect a committee of six composed of three teaching and three ruling elders to meet with any members of the Park Hill Presbyterian Church who may desire to become members of the OPC, that the members of the committee be drawn from the three OPC churches in the Denver area, and that the committee be instructed to approve the reception of the former members of the Park Hill church only on the following conditions: (a) that there be satisfactory evidence of repentance for the sin of schism, (b) that the persons who wish to be received agree to regularly attend worship services in whichever OPC church they wish to join . . . (Minutes, 92-50-89)

(5) December 5, 1992—Document #14
The Complaint. This is Complaint 1, before this Assembly (see p. 110). (Note: Reason IV has now been “abandoned” by the complainants, and the second Amends has been altered to the form as stated on page 111. Comment: Book of Discipline IX.3 says, “The complaint carried to the higher judicatory must be the
same complaint presented to the lower judicatory.” Only the first paragraph of the Complaint is “the complaint;” these changes leave the Complaint unchanged.)

The three Reasons for the Complaint should be evaluated by the Assembly. If the Complaint is sustained, it would then be up to the Assembly to “determine what amends are to be made” (IX.6).

The Reasons appeal to the following places in the Book of Church Order:

Reason 1 argues from Form of Government XIII.7 and 9 that receiving members shall be “only by order of the session” and that the presbytery’s action intrudes into the exclusive prerogative of sessions.

Reason 2 argues from Form of Government XIII.10 that augmentation of a session by a presbytery must be “with the consent of the congregation,” but the Thornton congregation has not given this consent.

Reason 3 argues that, contrary to Form of Government XXIX.a.1, “presbytery’s mandate to its Committee of 6 disallows Thornton to designate Park Hill a mission work.”

(6) March 2-4, 1993—Document #24

Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. The Complaint was denied by the presbytery (item 84).

(7) March 27, 1993—Document #26

The Thornton session carries the Complaint to the General Assembly by way of appeal. This is the document entered on page 110.

The appeal gives additional argumentation (pp. 111-113) for Reasons I-III of the Complaint, “amplifying” those reasons.

(end of chronology)

b. RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly find the Complaint to be in order and properly before the Assembly.

2. Complaint 2 — the complaint of Trinity Church, Denver, CO against Immanuel Church, Thornton, CO (denied by the Thornton session and sustained by the Presbytery of the Dakotas and now appealed by Thornton to the General Assembly) for rejecting the charge of schism against Messrs. Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran.

a. CHRONOLOGY of events and documents:

(1) September 6, 1991—Document #6

Letter from Messrs. Nightengale, Samiran and Petrie to the Rev. Jack Unangst (pastor of Trinity Church and former pastor of Park Hill Church). The General Assembly has found them guilty of the offense of circulating a document to certain members of Park Hill Church without first having had that document approved by the session; for this they are to be rebuked by the presbytery. For this
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sin they repent and ask Mr. Unangst’s forgiveness and the forgiveness of any other member of Trinity OPC who has been offended by their conduct. They “do earnestly seek and desire reconciliation.”

(2) September 9, 1991—Document #7
Letter from Mr. Unangst to (Mr. Petrie) et. al. extending forgiveness for their confessed sin, and stating initial steps which must be taken for reconciliation: (1) acknowledgment, confession and repentance for the sin of causing division in Park Hill, by the elders who led the congregation out of the OPC, and by the congregation who followed their leading; (2) the restoration of the former pastor (the Rev. Jack K. Unangst) to his charge over the Park Hill congregation; (3) the union of both congregations (Trinity and Park Hill) under the oversight of the OPC.

(3) July 18, 1992—Document #11
Action of the session of Immanuel OPC, Thornton concerning Park Hill Presbyterian Church as a mission of Immanuel Church, Thornton:
By motion the session authorized Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran to attend services at Park Hill Presbyterian Church as a part of Immanuel Church’s mission outreach to the Park Hill congregation and neighborhood.

(4) August 10, 1992—Document #12
Letter from Messrs. Nightengale, Samiran and Petrie to the presbytery, saying that at the Spring Stated Meeting of the presbytery they demitted their office of elder; and further acknowledging the sin of lack of total honesty toward the presbytery, for which they now come and seek forgiveness. They conclude, that if they have sinned against any of the presbytery in any matter, “we now ask you to set our offense or sin before us so that we may now talk about such matters and be reconciled.”

(5) September 22-24, 1992—Document #13, and #25
Stated Meeting of presbytery, Minutes. The Judicial Advisory Committee reported that “the Book of Discipline is clear that the Thornton session has jurisdiction over Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie, and Samiran” (see Document #25, which is the Report of the Committee on Reconciliation, p. 332). Reference is made to charges pending against the three men: “the presbytery also instructs the Stated Clerk to inform that session that they are now the court of original jurisdiction” (p. 334). [Note: at first, the three men, as of December 16, 1990, not voting when Park Hill voted to leave the OPC, had had their names placed on the roll of the regional church, because other charges (not dealt with in this Chronology) were then pending against them].

(6) December 16, 1992—Documents #15, #16, and #17
Charges against Mr. Petrie (Document #15) Mr. C. Nightengale (Document #16) and Mr. Samiran (Document #17) by Roy Van Zweden, Samuel Bridgeman, and Vincent Lewis (of the Trinity Church): “with the sin of schism
leading to the splitting of the congregation at Park Hill OPC into two groups . . . Specifications: all the actions below, leading up to a division at Park Hill OPC, are a course of events supporting the offense, the division occurring on 16 December, 1990." [Note: the charge, and the introductory statement about the Specifications, as first quoted, are the same for each of the men charged. The Specifications, numbered 1-4, are also the same, except for the names of the men charged.]

Specification 1 deals with the events from July 16, 1990 to and including December 16, 1990. Specification 2 concerns a meeting at Mr. Nightengale’s home on October 19, 1990. Specification 3 concerns a petition, “on or about October 19, 1990,” requesting a congregational meeting on whether to remain in the OPC. Specification 4 says that “on or about Dec. 16, 1990” the accused remained in attendance with the group that withdrew from the OPC, “aiding and abetting their division/schism.”

(7) January 9, 1993—Document #18

The Thornton session rules out of order the charges of schism against Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie, and Samiran. A motion was passed “to reject the charges of schism, among the reasons: 1) The statute of limitations of two years has been exceeded; and 2) The session has no judicial authority over the actions of the 1991 General Assembly which has already acted on this matter.”

(8) January 20, 1993—Document #19

Complaint by the session of Trinity Church against the action of the session of Immanuel Church, Thornton for rejecting the charge of December 16, 1992, regarding the sin of schism against Messrs. Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran. This is Complaint 2 before this Assembly. See the complete text found on pp. 114-116.

There are 10 reasons attached to the Complaint. Reason 1 states, “the sin charged is the act of schism on 16 Dec. 1990.” Other reasons emphasized “the final act of December 16, 1990(4) and the December 16, 1990 vote “as the culmination of the events orchestrated by Messrs. Petrie, Samiran, Nightengale” (7). In reasons 3,4,5,7,8,9 it is argued that the three men were guilty of schism.

(9) No date given—Document #22

Response of the session of Immanuel Church, Thornton to the Complaint of the session of Trinity Church. The Complaint is denied. (See the complete text of this document, p. 116-118.) Under five points, Thornton replies to the ten reasons of the Complaint, emphasizing “the two year statute of limitations.” It is pointed out (1) that the charge plainly accuses of “the sin of schism LEADING TO the splitting of the congregation” (emphasis by the Response). The Response also promises to inquire further (4) in respect to the withdrawal of Park Hill from the OPC.

(10) February 9, 1993—Document #20

Letter from Messrs. Nightengale, Samiran, and Petrie to the session of Immanuel Church, Thornton, as their explanation and defense regarding the withdrawal of Park Hill from the OPC.
Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. Trinity session carries its Complaint to presbytery, and presbytery sustains it, giving grounds (item 118):

**Grounds:**

1. "The Thornton session is correct in its observation that several of the specifications in the charges have to do with events which occurred before December 16, 1990 (see Thornton’s response to the complaint of the session of Trinity OPC). This necessarily means that these alleged offenses fall outside the two year statute of limitations (BD III.2). Therefore, such specifications cannot be relied upon to support the charge of schism."

2. "The Thornton session, however, is incorrect when it says, ‘The session finds that it cannot detect even a trace of an accusation of sin committed by the accused on December 16, 1990. That concern is simply not written into the charge document.’ . . . It is clear from the documents presented to our presbytery that the accusers are in fact bringing charges of schism which occurred on December 16, 1990 (which date falls within the two year statute of limitations, since the charges of schism were filed on December 16, 1992. Consider in the first place, the language of the fourth specification in each of the charges of schism against Messrs. Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran: ‘On or about 16 Dec. ‘90 the Park Hill OPC voted to withdraw from the OPC and Mr. (Petrie, Nightengale, or Samiran) remained in attendance with that group aiding and abetting their division/schism.’ It is clear from this fourth specification that the charge of schism relates to the actions of the elders on December 16, 1990 . . .”

3. "It is true that the language of the charges against Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran lacks clarity. The charges accuse of ‘the sin of schism leading to the splitting of the congregation’ (emphasis the presbytery’s). The expression ‘leading to’ indicates that the sins alleged in the charge were committed prior to December 16, 1990. Even the Trinity session seems to concede that the charge lacks clarity (see the first specification in the Trinity session complaint against the Thornton session). This ambiguity in the charges though is clarified in the Trinity session complaint against the Thornton session. The first specification in the complaint states as follows: ‘The sin charged is the act of schism on 16 Dec. ‘90.’ It is unconstitutional for the Thornton session to dismiss the case simply because the form of the charge lacks clarity: ‘The judicatory . . . shall not dismiss the case on technical grounds but shall require that the charge and specifications be put in proper form. If the person bringing the charge fails to do this, it shall become the responsibility of the judicatory’ (Book of Discipline III.7.b).

The presbytery, at this same stated meeting of March 2-4, 1993 also, as amends, reinstated “the charge of schism which occurred on December 16, 1990” (118).

Appeal of the Thornton session to the General Assembly. This is the document which appears on page 113 .

*(end of chronology)*
b. RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly find the complaint of Trinity Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Denver, brought on appeal by Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Thornton, to be in order and properly before the Assembly.

3. Complaint 3 — from David L. Bahnsen (November 18, 1991) against the delinquency of the session of Covenant Community Church of Orange County (hereafter CCCOC), Santa Ana, California in its failure to actively pursue discipline and lodge charges in a timely and just manner against a man who courted an illicit relationship with his mother and who aided her in abandoning her husband and family.

a. CHRONOLOGY of events and documents

(1) June 13, 1989—"Session Chronology," Document #54
A tragedy overtook the family of Dr. Greg Bahnsen when Mrs. Bahnsen left her home in the company of David Arnold, a member of the congregation and a teacher in the Christian School.

(2) June 19, 1989—Document #54 and Mr. Curto’s Statement, Document #57
The session met and recorded the event in its Minutes. In the words of Mr. Curto, the other pastor: "The matter of Mr. Arnold aiding and abetting Cathie Bahnsen in her sin was of serious and immediate concern to the session... Immediately after Mr. Arnold and Cathie Bahnsen’s departure on June 13, 1989, the session appointed a special committee consisting of Mr. Jones and Mr. Curto to work with the Bahnsens in locating the whereabouts of Cathie Bahnsen and Mr. Arnold and in assisting the Bahnsen family in every way it could."

(It was learned later that Mr. Arnold had driven Mrs. Bahnsen to Florida where she stayed with his aunt. In July 1989 she returned to California to live with her mother. She refused to speak with the session. Mr. Arnold stayed in Florida for almost a year.—Mr. Winslow's Chronology, Document #61)

(3) July, 1989 to July, 1990—Documents #54, #57, #61, and #63
Over this period the session dealt pastorally with Mr. Arnold, by letter and in person, with incomplete success, seeking his repentance. There were, in all, at least five letters from Mr. Arnold to the session (see additional file in possession of the Appeals and Complaints Committee and available for perusal by the Advisory Committee or any GA commissioner). He wrote a letter to the session in July, 1989, "in which it is clear he knew he had made some poor decisions." After locating him in Florida, the session’s committee of Curto and Jones flew to Florida and confronted him, encouraging him to repent (August 30, 1989). Letters and telephone conversations followed, until his July 18, 1990 letter (see below); after which the session heard no more from him and his address became unknown.
The session wrote a very firm letter to Mr. Arnold calling upon him to "make a fuller repentance than the inadequate expressions he made either by phone or in the August 30 meeting."

There was some correspondence between the clerk of session and Mr. Arnold, "but nothing substantial."

The session sent another long and firm letter to Mr. Arnold.

During this period the session was compelled to deal with other grave emergencies, as well as the David Arnold matter. These included the closing of the Christian School; the relocation of the Church; working with the presbytery's Augmented Visitation Committee for the CCCOC; Dr. Bahnsen's letter of November 29, 1990, offering his resignation, and other documents related thereto; the congregational meeting of December 16, 1990, which accepted his resignation; various complaints arising therefrom, which were later carried to the presbytery and to the General Assembly of 1992; the loss of 22 members of the congregation; Dr. Bahnsen's divorce; and Dr. Bahnsen's removal to the associate pastorate of the church at Chula Vista)

After trial in absentia (she had continued to refuse to communicate with the session) Mrs. Bahnsen was excommunicated by the session. (It is added, here, that she obtained a divorce, which Dr. Bahnsen did not contest. She later married Mr. Arnold.)

The session received a long letter from Mr. Arnold in which he again tried to apologize for the things he had done and promised repayment of moneys owed to the Christian School run by the CCCOC.

The session (Minutes) reviews the David Arnold matter.

Mr. Arnold writes to the session, "emphatically requesting that he no longer be considered a member of the CCCOC." He gave reasons for his request.

Session Meeting, Minutes. The session, after considering Mr. Arnold's letter of July 18, 1990 approved a letter attempting to dissuade him from his announced course. The session, not being sure of Mr. Arnold's address, sent the
letter to his Florida address and to his mother’s address.

(13) September and October, 1990—Documents #54 and #57
Not having heard further from Mr. Arnold, Mr. Curto called Mr. Arnold’s mother, but she refused to talk with him. While awaiting a response from David Arnold, session sought advice from three ministers of the presbytery about erasing Mr. Arnold’s name, but none urged immediate action.

(14) November, 1990 to February, 1991—Documents #54 and #57
Session, engrossed in matters relating to Dr. Bahnsen’s ministry, the dissolution of his pastoral relationship (February 2, 1991) and a threatening division of the congregation, suspended active efforts in the Arnold matter until the first of the year, believing this to be in accord with Book of Discipline V.2.a.(2) and III.2.

(15) February 5, 1991—Documents #54 and #57
Special committee of Curto and Jones begins to prepare formal charges against Mr. Arnold.

(16) Late March, 1991—Document #54
“Dr. Bahnsen called Mr. Coie to ask advice on how he could proceed to bring complaint against session for not proceeding to trial against David Arnold.”

(17) April 16, 1991—Document #1
Session Meeting, Minutes. Session renewed the committee of Messrs. Curto and Jones to prepare charges and specifications against David Arnold for preliminary investigations at the May meeting.

(18) May 21, 1991—Document #6A; Document #9, item 91:121; and Document #11
Charges and Specifications filed by the session against Mr. Arnold. The four Charges are as follows:

I. Publicly dishonoring Christ’s name by rejecting Christ’s wisdom for reconciliation found at I Corinthians 10:13 (i.e., always a righteous option) and Matthew 18:15-17 which brought public reproach upon Mr. Arnold’s church . . . employer . . . and an elder and his family (Dr. Greg Bahnsen)

II. Maintaining an unholy relationship with Cathie Bahnsen, thus usurping the nurturing duties which belong to her husband alone

III. Transgressing the Word of God by violating an express and solemn oath (to Dr. Bahnsen)

IV. Transgressing the Word of God by failing to make full financial restitution for violating his employment contract (with Newport Christian School)

(Note on the date of the charges: The Date of May 21, 1991 is about three weeks before the end of the limit stated in the Book of Discipline III.2, if the two years are understood as beginning with the assisted desertion of June 13, 1989. The charges do not focus, however, upon that event but on various other matters, and the evidence for the second and third charges lies outside the two-year limit)

(19) June 11, 1991—Document #3 (two pages)
Session Meeting, Minutes. First meeting of the trial judicatory in the case of the session vs. David Arnold. Mr. Arnold not present. The session noted that the letter citing the accused to appear for this meeting (which was mailed to two separate addresses) was returned unopened. . . . The clerk was instructed to mail copies of the charges to the accused. . . . If needful, the session agreed to try the accused in absentia according to the Book of Discipline IV.C.4; the session [therefore] appointed the Rev. William Warren as counsel for the accused with Elder David Winslow and the Rev. George Scipione as potential alternates.

(20) July 16, 1991—Document #4 (two pages)
Session Meeting, Minutes. Second session of the first meeting of the trial judicatory. Mr. Arnold not present. Elder David Winslow seated as counsel for the accused.

(21) August 21, 1991—Document #6 (six pages)
Session Meeting, Minutes. Second meeting of the trial judicatory. Mr. Arnold not present.
It was added to the record that David Arnold is now also known as David Clayton Byron.
As counsel for Mr. Arnold, Mr. Winslow entered objections. He objected (91:79) "to the regularity of the case; namely, urging the session not to try Mr. Arnold but to proceed to erase his name. Mr. Curto responded on behalf of the session." The objection was denied.
Various changes were made in the charges. Witnesses were called; some testified by telephone.

(22) August 24, 1991—Documents #7 (three pages), #8 (two pages) and #9 (two pages)
Session Meeting, Minutes. Second session of the second meeting of the trial judicatory. Mr. Winslow objected (91:111) to the testimony given by four witnesses because their evidence lay outside the two-year limit of Book of Discipline III.2 (This objection was later denied by the session, 91:118 and 91:127.)
Mr. Curto "rehearsed his endeavors and directives to convince Mr. Arnold to repent and help Cathie Bahnsen to return to her family."
Mr. Curto summarized and concluded the case for the prosecution (see his "Closing Arguments," Document #8).

(23) August 27, 1991—Documents #10 (one page) and #11 (eight pages)
Session meeting, Minutes. The session authorized an investigation to verify whether or not David Arnold and Cathie Bahnsen have been married.
The trial, continued. Mr. Winslow presented the case for the defense. He did not call any witnesses but read his arguments from a prepared text (a copy of which, eight pages, is attached to the Minutes; this is Document #11).
In defense against Charge I (Rejecting Reconciliation) Mr. Winslow argued that the Charge was not clarified and had not been proved; that I Cor. 10:13 does not have to do with reconciliation directly and that it was not clear how Matt.
18:15-17 would apply in what Mr. Arnold viewed as an extreme situation. In reply to the Specification that Mr. Arnold had stated "that he had no other option but to aid Cathie Bahnsen in her willful desertion of her family," Mr. Winslow said that Mr. Arnold had not used these words, but in a letter of July 1989 had written:

Finally, I recognize that my departing in Cathie's company was an act which did not avoid the appearance of evil. At the time, we believed that the necessity of leaving took precedence over this consideration.

And, that in a letter of April 7, 1990 Mr. Arnold had written:
First and above all, I wish to reiterate that I am truly and deeply sorry for the suffering that others experienced as a result of my own choices and actions. I recognize that my sinful deeds have had the consequence of hurting others, and this grieves me. To our God I have offered my repentance and continually express to him my hope for and dependence upon his enabling grace.

I do confess to having helped Cathie to leave California. I have explained to you the explanation, not excusing the choices and deeds, that I had reason to take seriously both her contemplation of suicide and her claim that she was going to depart. It was precisely because she was prepared to go off on her own, and was self-destructive in attitude, that I opted to provide her with a place to go, and easier passage. I regret the lack of wisdom behind this way of dealing with the situation, and am sorry for the suffering that it caused to all concerned.

These words, said Mr. Winslow, were Mr. Arnold's last words of reconciliation. The session took almost four months to respond and then "rejected these words (7-28-90)."

In defense against Charge 2 (an Unholy Relationship) Mr. Winslow argued that the Specifications are outside the two-year limit and are unsubstantiated; further, that the Specification that Mr. Arnold's repentance is false does not reckon with our duty to forgive.

In defense against Charge 3 (Violating an Oath) Mr. Winslow acknowledged that Mr. Arnold did break a promise to Dr. Bahnsen made over two and a half years ago. Mr. Winslow therefore could not ask that Mr. Arnold be found not guilty of this charge, but that the court should judge, because of lack of careful formulation of the Charge and Specifications, whether Mr. Arnold is guilty as charged.

In defense against Charge 4 (Failing to Make Full Financial Restitution) Mr. Winslow objected to the application by the session of Leviticus 6:5 ("shall add the fifth part more"), so as to add to the amount owed by Mr. Arnold to the Christian School for services not rendered after he went away on June 13, 1989. Mr. Winslow held that this application of Leviticus 6:5 was contrary to the Confession of Faith XIX.4 and to Galatians 3 and 4.

(24) September 12, 1991—Document #12
Session Meeting, Minutes. The trial concluded. The session determined, unanimously, that the Specifications of each Charge had been proved; and
that on each of the four Charges Mr. Arnold be found guilty; and that the censure of excommunication should be imposed upon him. Mr. Arnold was cited to appear for censure on October 6, 1991.

(25) September 17, 1991—Document #13
Session Meeting, Minutes: It was noted that Mr. Winslow will appeal the judgment of the session to the presbytery.

(26) October 18-19, 1991—Documents #14 and #14A
Stated Meeting of the Presbytery of Southern California, Minutes.
The presbytery dealt with the Appeal of Mr. Winslow (Document #14A) and sustained “Part A,” but did not sustain another part of the Appeal (this was later considered to be “a contradictory vote;” see the Complaint of the Rev. Donald Duff, which was dealt with at the Adjourned Meeting in November, leading to a correction in November of the presbytery’s October decision on Mr. Winslow’s Appeal—Document #15, Minutes of the Adjourned Meeting in November).

[It is not clear that the Minutes of the October Meeting (pp. 89-91) properly identify “Part A” (which was sustained) and the part which was not sustained. This Chronology assumes that Mr. Duff’s Complaint, and the revised decision of the presbytery in November, are correct in saying that the part sustained in October was the Specification that the trial should not have been held, on the basis of the Book of Discipline II.B.3.d.(2); and that the part of the Appeal not sustained was that the judgment of guilty and the censure of excommunication should be overturned.]

(27) November 16, 1991—Document #15
Adjourned Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes.
The Complaint of Mr. Duff, leading to a revision of the presbytery’s decision on the Appeal of Mr. Winslow.
The revised decision of the presbytery is given on page 91 of the Minutes, Document #15, as follows:
In the light of the action of the presbytery (Fourth Stated Meeting of 1991, October 19, 1991) sustaining Part A of the Appeal of David Arnold in the case of the Covenant Community Church of Orange County versus David Arnold, the presbytery has declared that the trial should not have been held and thus the judgment of the CCCOC session in this case is null and void; and the session is instructed to erase Mr. Arnold’s name from the roll, in accordance with the Book of Discipline II.B.3.d.(2), Book of Church Order, p. 167.

[Here this Chronology summarizes the significance of this decision as follows:
1. The presbytery in October declared that the trial should not have been held, on the basis of II.B.3.d.(2). Therefore the presbytery, in November, declared the judgment of the trial to be null and void. And therefore, still on the basis of II.B.3.d.(2), the presbytery in November instructed the session to erase Mr. Arnold’s
name.

2. II.B.3.d.(2), p. 167, reads as follows:
When a member of a particular church, whether or not he be charged
with an offense, informs the session that he does not desire to remain in
the fellowship of the OPC, and the efforts of the session to dissuade him
from his course have failed, it shall erase his name from the roll and
record the circumstances in its minutes, unless the session institutes or
continues other disciplinary action against him.

The last clause, “unless the session institutes or continues other disciplin-
ary action against him” presents another option to the session. Either it erases, or it
starts or continues other disciplinary action. The word “other” has the word “erase”
in mind; erasure is itself a disciplinary action according to V.2.

3. At what point, according to II.B.3.d.(2), shall the session either erase or
start other disciplinary action? It is when “the efforts of the session to dissuade him
from his course have failed.” It is not when the member “informs the session that
he does not desire to remain in the fellowship of the OPC.” It is after that. And it
is not only after the session’s efforts to dissuade him from his course, but also after
those efforts “have failed.”

4. It is not clear that this distinction was before the presbytery. The session
of CCCOC could not ascertain the whereabouts of Mr. Arnold. The session could
not be sure whether he had received their letter of dissuasion of August 10, 1990. In
the absence of any word from him, was the session free to erase his name; or, for that
matter, to institute other disciplinary action against him?

5. The presbytery’s revised decision of November 16, 1991 became the
ground for Mr. David Bahnsen’s Complaint against the session, which is before this
Assembly. The session’s disciplinary judgment upon Mr. Arnold had been declared
null and void by the presbytery for the reason, as Mr. Bahnsen understood, that the
session had been guilty of “inordinate delay,” and was thus responsible for the
failure of appropriate disciplinary censure upon Mr. Arnold.

6. The concept of an inordinate delay was first used, it appears, in the Appeal
brought by Mr. Winslow (Document #14, p. 81): “an inordinate delay of ten months
after Mr. Arnold had requested his name be dropped from the rolls.” These exact
words were quoted from the Appeal in Mr. Duff’s Complaint (Document #15, p. 90).
So understood, the concept of such a delay by the session appeared to be endorsed
by the presbytery when it sustained Mr. Duff’s Complaint. When David Bahnsen’s
Complaint of November 18, 1991 then used the words “inordinate delay” (Reason
7), that Complaint was further linked together with the actions of the session
respecting David Arnold, with Mr. Arnold’s trial and judgment, and with the
overturning of that judgment by the presbytery, so that all these events are relevant
to this Assembly’s adjudication of Mr. Bahnsen’s Complaint.

(28) November 18, 1991—Document #17
The Complaint of David L. Bahnsen. This is the Complaint that is
before this Assembly. See the entire text of the Complaint (see p. 120).

And now, this 18th day of November, 1991, comes David L. Bahnsen
and complains against the delinquency of the session of Covenant Community
Church in its failure to actively pursue discipline and lodge charges in a timely and just manner against a man who had courted an illicit relationship with my mother and who aided her in abandoning me, my brothers and sister, and my father . . .

(There follow seven Reasons in support of the Complaint)

Three Amends are asked:
1. The session should repent publicly before the congregation . . .
2. The session should specifically apologize to my family . . .
3. Each member of the session should publicly acknowledge that this inability to do justice in a notorious case of open sin constitutes a severe failing in his calling, work and qualification as an elder of the church, for which there is no moral excuse.

(The contention of the Complaint has two aspects: the delay, and the seriousness of the offense left without appropriate censure. A delay in punishing a very minor offense might not justify a complaint; this complainant properly views the offense as heinous; and his concern is the delay in punishing this offense.)

(29) December 16, 1991—Document #18 (six pages)

Session Meeting, Minutes. Actions of the session pursuant to the presbytery’s decision of November 16, 1991:

The session, having received a request from Mr. David Arnold to erase his name from the rolls of the CCCOC, believed at the time that circumstances of congregational turmoil and its understanding of the Book of Discipline permitted the postponement of filing disciplinary charges against Mr. Arnold to a later date.

The session now acknowledges (in accordance with the presbytery’s judgment of October 19, 1991) that it mistakenly delayed filing formal disciplinary action against Mr. Arnold.

The following statement was jointly agreed upon by the session and Mr. David Winslow (Mr. Arnold’s counsel):

The session, in keeping with the presbytery’s instruction of November 16, 1991, voted by motion to erase Mr. David Arnold (a.k.a. David Clayton Byron) from the rolls of the church, noting the extensive circumstances contained in the minutes, June 1989 through November 1991 (Book of Discipline III.B.3.d.(2)). In conjunction with this action the session, in consultation with Mr. Arnold’s defense counsel, adopted the following Censure of Rebuke (as the strongest censure that may be pronounced without a trial, Book of Discipline III.6.):

Mr. Arnold, we, the session of CCCOC and your appointed counsel, Mr. David Winslow, believe that you have offended Christ our Lord by these three actions:
1. Aiding Cathie Bahnsen in leaving her husband and family on June 13, 1989
2. Breaking a promise made to Greg Bahnsen of a most serious nature
3. Failing to make good on your promise to repay Newport
Christian Schools for breaking your contractual obligations in June of 1989 (This rebuke focuses only on the failure to make restitution of the June salary, not the 20% penalty)

Mr. Arnold, we urge you to see the serious character of these offenses against the Lord Jesus Christ. Getting right with God and his people must include appropriate words and deeds with respect to those you have injured. Therefore we urge you to see that:

A. Your letter of April 1990 to the session was not adequate as an expression of repentance for the offense involved in helping Cathie Bahnsen leave her family in June of 1989 and that Greg and his children ought to receive from you genuine expression of your repentance.

B. You ought to repent to Greg Bahnsen for breaking your promise to him and failing to advise him that you were refusing to live by your word in that matter.

C. You ought to repent of failing to follow through on your promise to repay NCS and make full restitution as agreed.

May God impress upon you the need for more perfect fidelity to the Lord Jesus Christ and enable you to respond with grace to this rebuke from those who have for a time endeavored to keep watch over your soul . . .

(Also, the session alone, and not Mr. Winslow, further rebuked Mr. Arnold for the following two reasons):

1. Marrying Cathie Bahnsen
2. For failure to make restitution on the paying back of the 20% penalty ($248.53)

(Also, at this meeting, the session denied the Complaint of November 18, 1991 from David Bahnsen—91:177, p. 400)

(30) December 18, 1991—Document #19
Letter to David L. Bahnsen from Robert M. Coie, Moderator of the session of CCCOC, explaining that after much consideration and prayer the session has denied his Complaint of Nov. 18, 1991, and responding sympathetically to his concerns.

(31) January 1, 1992—Document #20
Letter of David Bahnsen to Robert M. Coie, in response to Mr. Coie's letter above, saying that the session has acted "despite both the apparent accuracy and serious character" of the Complaint "against the session's delinquency."

(32) January 17, 1992—Document #21
Letter of David Bahnsen to the Clerk of the presbytery, carrying his Complaint to the presbytery, and reiterating that the session had been delinquent in its inordinate delay in lodging charges against the man who ran off with his mother.
in June, 1989.

(32) January 24, 1992—Document #22
Letter from Robert M. Coie to the Clerk of the presbytery, submitting the papers relevant to Mr. Bahnsen’s Complaint, and stating the actions taken by the session on November 16, 1991.

(33) March 27, 1992—Document #24 (two pages)
Letter from Robert M. Coie to the Clerk of the presbytery, raising the question whether the appeal of Mr. Bahnsen’s Complaint against the session is now valid, inasmuch as Mr. Bahnsen, since filing his Complaint, has now been transferred to the OPC at Chula Vista.

(34) June 19, 1992—Document #26 (16 pages)
Third Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. The presbytery did not approve a motion to sustain Mr. Bahnsen’s Complaint (p. 145).

(35) August 9, 1992—Document #28
Letter from Mr. Bahnsen to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly. He will carry his Complaint to the General Assembly.

(36) October 16, 1992—Document #34 (10 pages)
Fourth stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. In response to a letter from Mr. Bahnsen of August 9, 1992 (Document #27) protesting that he was not notified that the presbytery would deal with his Complaint on June 19, and also in response to a Complaint of October 15 to the same effect from David Winslow (Document #33) the presbytery determined:
that the presbytery apologize to Mr. David Bahnsen for its unintentional oversight and offer to rehear his Complaint at the First Stated Meeting on Friday, Feb. 5, 1993 . . . contingent upon his withdrawal, without prejudice, of his appeal to the General Assembly of the Complaint . . .

(37) January 12, 1993—Document #40
Letter of Mr. Bahnsen to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, withdrawing the appeal of his Complaint, in order that it might be heard by the presbytery.

(38) February 5-6, 1993—Document #42 (17 pages)
First Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. Mr. Bahnsen was present. After due discussion, the motion to sustain the Complaint was lost.

(39) March 4, 1993—Document #46
David Bahnsen to the Presbytery of Southern California, renewing the appeal of his Complaint to the General Assembly.

(40) March 4, 1993—Document #47
David Bahnsen to the General Assembly, appealing his Complaint to
the General Assembly, reviewing the history of events, and also requesting the General Assembly to rebuke the presbytery in three matters. The second of these is as follows:

The Presbytery of Southern California agreed with the man’s appeal that the session was guilty of inordinate delay in bringing charges. However, when I complained against the session’s delinquency for this inordinate delay, the presbytery would not uphold the Complaint. I would request the General Assembly to rebuke the presbytery for this inconsistency.

(41) March 23, 1993—Document #48 (three pages)
Mr. Duff, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints. A Chronology of events with regard to the David Bahnsen Complaint.

(42) April 3, 1993—Document #51 (four pages)
Mr. Coie, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Southern California, to Mr. Duff. A list of documents, as described in the Minutes of the presbytery.

(43) April 10, 1993—Document #54 (six pages)
Mr. Coie, as Clerk of session of CCCOC, to Mr. Duff, providing a “session Chronology” for the Bahnsen Complaint.

(44) April 10, 1993—Document #55 (three pages)
Mr. Coie to Mr. Duff, listing “inconsistencies between statements made in the papers before the Assembly.”

(45) April 13, 1993—Document #57 (two pages)
Mr. Curto, Moderator of the session of CCCOC, stating significant facts in the history of the case.

(46) April 20, 1993—Document #59 (this is Communication 11)
Mr. Coie, Stated Clerk of the presbytery, to Mr. Duff. The presbytery has heard that Mr. Bahnsen, in his letter of March 4 to the General Assembly, requests that the General Assembly rebuke the presbytery three times. The presbytery authorized the Moderator to appoint a deputy to defend presbytery should the requests to rebuke presbytery come before the General Assembly. The presbytery also determined:

that presbytery, through its Clerk, communicate to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly our hope that the Assembly will not consider items #2 through #4 of Mr. David Bahnsen’s letter (of March 4, 1993) as they constitute new complaints against the presbytery.

(47) May 2, 1991—Document #61 (four pages)
Mr. David Winslow to the Committee on Appeals and Complaints and to the General Assembly’s Advisory Committee. Since he will not be coming to the General Assembly, he has made his viewpoint known through this letter. After a chronology of basic events, there is also a section concerning viewpoints.
(end of chronology)

b. RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly find the complaint to be in order and properly before the Assembly.

4. Complaint 4 — from Ben and Sandra Manring (March 24, 1992) against the action of the session of Spencer Mills Church, Gowen, Michigan and its steering committee for the oversight of Grace Community Church, Lansing, Michigan in connection with the following worship practice condoned and conducted at Grace Community Church and at Spencer Mills Church . . .

a. CHRONOLOGY of events and documents:

(1) March 24, 1992—Document #1 (10 pages)
The Complaint (see the entire text p. 122).
"The following worship practice" is identified as A:
A. The introduction of "special music" into Sabbath Day worship services.
Definition: by "special music" . . . we mean vocal song performances in which a part, usually the majority, of the congregation is not expected to be involved vocally. This definition, however, does not intend to address situations where the congregation is engaged in antiphonal or responsive singing, or metrical singing by parts. Neither does it regard a person or persons who lead the congregation in its singing to be engaged in performing special music.

Thus, condoning and conducting the worship practice of "special music" is the practice complained against. But the Complaint then adds, to A, the following sentence, followed by B and C:
This practice engenders two further offenses about which we also complain:
B. Females being allowed to teach and admonish the congregation during worship services through singing by means of special music performances.
C. Institution of the above listed practice (A) and its correlate (B) in spite of the fact that 1) they are not necessary to the proper worship of God, and 2) they are offensive to the consciences of some of the worshipers.

"Preamble to Reasons for the Complaint": here there is a quotation from R. L. Dabney's review in The Presbyterian Quarterly, July, 1889 of a book by John L. Girardeau, in which Dabney pleads for serious discussion of views held by minorities.

"Reasons for Complaint: I. Scriptural and Confessional Reasons." Here there are 18 numbered paragraphs dealing especially with the regulative principle of worship, quoting Confession of Faith XXI.1 and Larger Catechism Q. 109, and relevant Scripture passages. (The complainants are correct in thinking that
the regulative principle is firmly embedded in the Constitution of the OPC.) They then go on to say (paragraph 6): "Since there is no positive Scriptural command, either by example or injunction, for the church to engage in the worship practice of special music it is disallowed on the basis of the regulative principle." They then take up other Scripture passages which might be alleged to provide for special music, but reject that conclusion.

"Historical Reasons." Four numbered paragraphs. The Calvinistic churches of the Reformation, and their Presbyterian successors, provided only for congregational singing, and so did the Presbyterian Church in the USA’s Directory for Public Worship, at least up through 1914. Choirs were repudiated by Calvin, Knox, and their Puritan heirs. Contemporary special music, although similar to the choir, contains more pronounced elements of entertainment and personal elevation of the singer than does the choir.

The OPC Directory for Worship (III.6), without transition, devotes the last sentence in its discussion of congregational singing to special music, by saying:

No person shall take a special part in the musical service unless he is a professing Christian and adorns his profession with a godly walk.

The complainants say of this sentence in the Directory:

No attempt whatever is made to clarify what is means, whether it be referring to the piano player, the precentor, the choir, the orchestra, the soloist, the band director, the minstrel, the harpist or the studio technician. If it is possible to justify the soloist and the choir by this ambiguous allusion then why not the others? This only demonstrates that present justification for special music in the OPC is resting not so much on principle as it is on custom.

"Practical Reasons." Ten numbered paragraphs.

1. We would finally mention a few practical reasons why special music ought not to be condoned in our churches. The first is enunciated in part B of our complaint proper. Here we point out that women are taking a teaching role in the church by engaging in special music performances. This is particularly offensive when the special music is composed of a woman soloist. The Scriptures are clear that women are not to teach in the congregation: “And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence” (I Tim. 2:12).

2. Singing involves teaching: “teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Col. 3:16). Therefore, women soloists are teaching and admonishing, and that publicly . . .

3. If soloists are not teaching and admonishing, what are they doing? “We can think of only three other things that might be happening:”

First, personal worship is being offered on the part of the soloist while the congregation looks on. If so, where is the warrant for excluding the congregation from a part of the worship?

Second, the soloist is leading the congregation in worship similar to the way the pastor leads the congregation in prayer during the congregation’s prayer. If so, how can it be lawful for a woman to lead the congregation in worship? I Cor. 14:34-35 forbids a woman to speak at all in church.

Third, the soloist is entertaining the congregation. If so, God forbid
that any of us should defend a practice based on entertainment.

9. Finally... the practice of conducting special music during public worship is offensive to the consciences of some of the worshipers. ... When we offend others by an unnecessary practice, it should be immediately abandoned (1 Cor. 8:13, 10:32). This is true in day to day living. How much more is it true when the practice concerns a matter of public worship?

10. If the elders of the church insist upon clinging to an unnecessary practice, and force the church to abide it, they are walking in the footsteps of the Pharisees whom Jesus chastised by saying, "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:9).

"Conclusion" (amends). . . We request that our complaint be sustained and that:

A. Special music performances be eliminated from the worship services conducted by Spencer Mills Church... and Grace Community Church...

B. The session... petition the General Assembly to propose to the Presbyteries the following amendments to the Directory for Worship:
   1. Strike the last sentence of III.6 and in its place say: "that the whole congregation may join in the singing, everyone that can read is to have a hymn book."

   2. Strike the words "in this" in II.7 and in their place say: "in the circumstances of this"

   3. Insert the following sentence between the present second and third sentences of II.7:

      Substantial elements of the worship of the church are limited to those prescribed in the Scriptures, none of which are to be neglected, neither are they to be augmented.

(2) May 18, 1992—Document #2

Recommendation of the Committee appointed (by the session) to deal with the Complaint: that session deny the complaint on the following grounds: (1) "There are multiplied commands in Scripture to sing praise to God. The particular manner in which this is to be done is a matter that comes under the circumstances of worship." (It is held that these circumstances fall into the category of the "circumstances" mentioned in Confession of Faith I.6). "Special music is not a separate and distinct element of worship but a manner of singing of psalms with grace in the heart as part of the ordinary religious worship of God (Confession XXI.5)."

(2) II Chronicles 29:28 (NIV) speaks of three things taking place simultaneously: "The whole assembly bowed in worship, while the singers sang and the trumpeters played." It is noteworthy that the entire congregation did not sing but only the singers. "To use the regulative principle as a straitjacket restricting a worship practice used in the Bible with divine approval is unwarranted and illegitimate."

(3) "At Grace Community Church special music by female vocalists is offered prior to the call to worship (following the instrumental prelude and announcements) to prepare the hearts of the people for worship. A
deliberate and self-conscious break is made by the use of the call to worship. Special music by female vocalists is not used during the actual worship service itself as a substantive element of worship.”

(3) May 18, 1992—Document “3
Letter from Jonas Chupp, Clerk of session, to Dr. and Mrs. Manring, informing them that the Complaint was denied on May 18 after approval by the session of the report enclosed (see Document #2).

(4) June 3, 1992—Document #4 (three pages)
Response of Dr. and Mrs. Manring to the session.
They will “pursue the complaint to the presbytery.” They give a vigorous rebuttal to the arguments used in the committee report (Document #2). They attack the mistaken assumption that the manner in which worship is offered is not governed by the regulative principle, but is left up to our own discretion. Your interpretation seems to be that the regulative principle is used only to delineate the broadly defined categories you are calling elements of worship. In this case the broad category is singing. Since the Scriptures command us to sing we must sing, but we can do it any way we like. This is a mistake. The regulative principle does not only define what the general categories of the elements of worship are, but also applies to how they are carried out.

They also observe that the report’s interpretation of “circumstances” (Confession I.6) is not that of the Assembly:
The freedom ascribed to circumstance in the Westminster Confession is not a license regarding substantial matters of worship or the manner in which they are executed. It has to do with truly circumstantial matters, “common to human actions and societies,” such as what kind of building to meet in, what time on the Sabbath Day should the church come together, whether or not to have bulletins stating the order of service, etc. They note that the singing of the Levites in I1 Chron. 29:28 was a part of the ceremonial law.

They insist that the report has not addressed the real issue: which is “the relationship of special music offered by women, to the teaching and speaking of females in the church.”

They point out that even if the practice at Grace Community Church, of placing the ministry of singing women before the call to worship, were valid (which the complainants do not admit) the Spencer Mills Church does not place it before the call to worship.

They say that the report has ignored the offense to the conscience.

(5) June 18, 1992—Document #5 (10 pages)
The same Complaint as Document #1, except that the date is changed to June 18, 1992, and it is addressed to the Rev. Douglas Clawson, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of the Midwest.

(6) June 19, 1992—Document #6 (two pages)
Letter from Dr. Manring to Mr. Clawson, saying that he has not been
able to have a satisfactory exchange of views with the session; alleging that at one
meeting none of the elders could give a definition of the regulative principle; and
asking that the entire presbytery review the case and hear it at the stated meeting in
the fall.

(7) September 18-19, 1992—Document #7 (15 pages)
Fall Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. The Church visita-
tion committee reported on the Complaint (item 66). The Complaint was found in
order and properly before the presbytery (68). A new committee was erected to
address the Complaint, to bring their report to the Spring, 1993 Stated meeting (69)
and to give their report to the Stated Clerk for distribution no later than February 15,
1993 (130).

(8) December 29, 1992—Document #8 (eight pages)
Report of the Committee to Consider the Complaint. There is an
“Introduction” on the regulative principle of worship. The Committee concludes:
that the appellants have limited the regulative principle so as to miss the
obvious teaching of God’s Word. We agree that worship should be
conducted only as God has prescribed and in that manner only. Any-
thing that is to be included in worship must be there by divine command
or example with God’s approval. If there appears to be a contradiction
in the application of the regulative principle, then the clearest examples
dictate practice.

The Committee quotes Thornwell on the regulative principles, as follows:
The notion of Calvin and our Confession of Faith, in other words, is
briefly this: In public worship, indeed in all commanded external
actions, there are two elements—a fixed and a variable. The fixed
element, involving the essence of the thing, is beyond the discretion of the
church. The variable, involving only the circumstances of the actions, its
separate accidents, may be changed, modified, altered, according to the
exigencies of the case.

The Committee then goes on to say:
The regulative principle addresses the what we are to do, not particularly
the how. For example, prayer is a commanded part of public worship;
frequency is a variable as is its place in the order of worship. . . . Churches
are commanded to celebrate the Lord’s Supper “often” but the exact
frequency is a subject of debate. So it is with music and the regulative
principle. We are commanded to make a joyful noise to the Lord. How?
The weight of Scripture demands a variable. Some make music to the
Lord with cymbals, with trumpets, harps; others use an organ or piano.
Others make music to the Lord with a guitar or keyboard. What about
singing? The Bible is full or choirs, soloists, soloists with musical
accompaniment, and a cappella singers. All are obeying the command
to make music to the Lord. This is our understanding of the regulative
principle as conditioned by God's Word.

Following the Introduction is the recommendation that the three parts of the Complaint be denied (Part A, page two; Part B, page four; Part C, page six). Grounds are given:

(1) "Special music" is found in the Scriptures (illustrations are cited from the Old Testament and from the book of Revelation).

(2) "Special music" is consistent with the Directory for worship (the whole of Section 6, chapter III, is quoted).

"Summary"... The New Testament demonstrates that believers are priests. We perform functions that Levites did. With Christ's accomplished work, the priesthood has been expanded to include all the congregation.

The Committee is of the opinion that the appellants' terminology "special" music" is a misnomer. As music is commanded by the Lord in worship, in whatever manner it is practiced (congregational choir groups, soloists, instrumental) it is nowhere designated in Scripture as unique or "special."

Taking up Part B, the Committee asserts that "Women singing, either as a choir or as individuals, does not constitute a teaching function." In reply to the argument that women should remain silent (I Cor. 14:34-35) and therefore not sing, it is held that this would prevent women from singing with the congregation, and from audibly joining in prayer or in confession of the faith.

Taking up Part C, the Committee believes "that the musical service, with all its variations, is commanded by the Lord. It is a Biblical practice which must be maintained and defended..."

The Committee recognizes that presbytery cannot, and ought not, tell the session to stop all variations of the musical service nor can it tell the offended parties to change their views, as both of these would go beyond the mandate of Scripture. Our admonition to the Manrings as well as Grace Church is to seek peace with one another and live peacefully together.

The report ends with "Concluding Remarks:"
The Committee expresses disappointment that the session's written response to the Complaint (Document #2) did not isolate the specifications of the Complaint and failed to state the grounds for denying some of the specific concerns of the Complaint (namely, women soloists and unnecessary practices)... Finally, the Committee questions the intent of the practice of Grace Community using female vocalists before the call to worship. Two observations: first, it implies that Grace Community wants to maintain the practice of women vocalists while endeavoring to pacify the appellants. Secondly, it appears that the Church acquiesces to the appellants that the musical service is indeed a sin and unnecessary in worship. Brothers, if a practice is Scriptural, then under the command of God, we must maintain it.

(9) (No date)—Document #9 (10 pages)
"Reasons Appended to the Appeal of Dr. and Mrs. Manring." The
Manrings reply to the report above (Document #9) with a vigorous and detailed rebuttal. (Presumably, this written statement was before the presbytery at its Spring, 1993 meeting.) It concludes with the question: "Is special music enjoined by command, is it an optional circumstance, or is it forbidden for lack of warrant?"

To this the complainants reply:

(The committee report answered this question) one way one time and another way the next. When it appeared doubtful whether the committee could muster a command, special music was an optional circumstance. When it was an unnecessary burden on the consciences of dissenters, the committee said it's commanded. "How long halt ye between two opinions?" Presbytery must answer this question with only one of these mutually exclusive options.

And they declare:

We have no doubt as to the correct answer to this question. Congregational singing is commanded (Psalm 32:11; 35:18; 42:4; 66:1-4; 95:1-2; 100: 107:31-32; 111:1; 149:1; Jer. 17:26; Matt. 26:30; Heb. 2:12). Special music has no warrant and is therefore forbidden.

(10) March 11, 1993—Document #10 (14 pages)

Spring Stated Meeting of the presbytery, Minutes. The following were heard: the Committee to Consider the Appeal; the Manrings; the session. Questions were asked; there was extensive debate; there were closing arguments. The presbytery denied the Complaint, by denying Parts A, B, and C separately.

(11) March 25, 1993—Document #11 (two pages)

A letter from Dr. Manring to Mr. Clawson, asking him to pass on the Complaint to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, and observing that the presbytery stated no grounds for denying the Complaint; and also continuing to press the argument from the regulative principle.

(12) April 16, 1993—Document #13

The Manrings give notice to the Rev. Donald Duff, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, that they intend to carry the Complaint to the General Assembly by appeal.

(There are ten other documents securing the technical links in bringing the Complaint to the Assembly, but they do not deal with the substance of the Complaint)

(13) May 18, 1993—Documents #22 (one page) and #23 (six pages)

With a covering letter (Document #22) to the members of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints, the Rev. Stephen A. Pribble, pastor of Grace Community Church, enclosed a six-page Answer to the Complaint of Mr. and Mrs. Manring (Document #23). Mr. Pribble has been appointed by the Spencer Mills session to defend the session's position at the General Assembly. He requests that the Answer be considered.
The Answer is a further, considered document in this debate taken seriously by both parties and by the presbytery. It sums up, and repeats, arguments previously made, and also becomes more specific.

It affirms adherence to the regulative principle.

It says that "the OPC Directory for Worship specifies two types of singing: congregational singing and special music," and cites III.6.

It makes a distinction between the position of "covenant theology" and that of "dispensationalists" as to the relevance of worship examples from the O. T. for the N. T. Church. The view of the former is said to be:

If singing by a part of the congregation was a legitimate part of public worship under the Old Covenant, and is never forbidden by later revelation, then it remains a legitimate part of public worship... This is the historic understanding of covenant theology and the hermeneutic underlying our confessional standards; in opposition to this, dispensationalists assert that men are not obligated to observe commandments that are not repeated in the N. T.

It acknowledges the binding nature of the apostle's authoritative directive: "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (I Tim. 2:12). In the dialogue or worship Christ speaks to his church through his ordained ministers. This speech is authoritative; therefore the office of elder is restricted to men. Only men may teach as the official representatives of Christ in his church. There is a sense, however, in which all the members of the church of Jesus Christ are involved in teaching. This is established in Paul's letter to the Colossian Christians: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord" (Col. 3:16). The content of this teaching is restricted to the church's hymnody approved by her elders. In the dialogue of worship between Christ and his church, a woman is not permitted to teach through spoken speech as a representative of Christ in the authoritative teaching of an ordained elder (proclamation), but according to the Directory for Worship is permitted (III.6) to teach through song as a representative of the congregation offering praise to God (response)... (Hebrews 2:12). The primary audience of the church's worship is God himself. Though singing is offered directly to God it has an indirect effect in teaching and admonishing the congregation. Women are properly involved in teaching in this limited way.

When a professing Christian woman who adorns her profession with a godly walk takes a special part in the music service, singing words which have been approved as theologically sound and edifying for the church by the elders, her worship is offered on behalf of the congregation as part of the church's response to God, not as the authoritative proclamation of Christ speaking to his church through the preached Word. The church is edified and admonished indirectly, while the primary audience is God. She gives thanks to God in the great congregation, praising him
among the people, praising the Lord with her whole heart in the assembly of the upright. It is appropriate for the woman to offer her song only, and not to give any spoken remarks either before or after.

(14) June 5, 1993—Document 27 (four pages)

The Manring’s final statement and rebuttal entitled “A Response to the second answer of Pastor Pribble and the Spencer Mills’ session.” It contains a two-page chart of quote “Misrepresented Scripture Passages,” and further emphasizes an offense to the conscience.

(end of chronology)

b. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly determine that, insofar as the complaint seeks to amend the Book of Church Order (Amends B), it is out of order and not properly before the Assembly

   **Grounds:**
   
   (1) The Complaint complains against an action of a session which, by the complainants’ own admission, is not out of accord with the Directory For Worship.
   
   (2) A complaint is neither the proper vehicle for amendment to the Directory For Worship nor can its disciplinary functions effect such amendment; in other words, the GA cannot amend the constitution of the OPC through a decision on a complaint.

2. That the General Assembly not decide the issues of this case, but refer the issues raised in the documents of this case to the GA’s Committee on Revisions to the Directory For Worship for consideration

   **Grounds:**
   
   (1) The debate has been a serious one and requires serious consideration by the Church. The two sides have centered attention not only on specific worship practices, but on how certain underlying principles (such as the regulative principle, and the relevance of O. T. music examples to the practice of the N. T. church) should be interpreted, in order to resolve the questions about the specific practices. But the underlying principles themselves need to be clarified. It is right to clarify the principles, in order to settle the specifics. But is this General Assembly prepared to do so?

   (2) There is a further problem. This debate has not brought all the basic principles into consideration. There are other underlying Scriptural principles as to the nature of worship itself, which would have much bearing on the specific worship practices. They would affect not only our attitude toward worship, but also the manner of the worship that we give to God.

   (3) With this Complaint and its accompanying documents, we enter the area of worship where the guidelines are disputed and not all the determinants are grasped. It is a critical area for the Church.

5. **Complaint 5 — from A. M. Laurie (March 23, 1993) against the**
action of the Presbytery of Southern California in approving the minutes of the session of Calvary Church of La Mirada without exception, when those minutes contained the declaration that “the Roman Catholic Church is no true church of Jesus Christ.”

a. CHRONOLOGY of events and documents:

(1) November 6, 1992—Document #1
Session Meeting, Calvary Church of La Mirada, Minutes (1st page only). On motion, session voted to baptize Nicole Marie and Tracy Lynn Molinar, who had previously been baptized in the Roman Catholic Church.

On motion, the grounds for the previous action were determined as follows:
  1. The Roman Catholic Church is no true church of Jesus Christ.
  2. The Roman Catholic rite is so defective that it is not Biblical baptism at all.
  3. The parents of children presented for baptism in the Roman Catholic Church are not required to make a credible profession of faith.

(2) February 5-6, 1993—Document #2
The Report to the presbytery of the presbytery’s Visitation Committee, recommending that the session Minutes of Calvary Church be approved but with an exception. After quoting the actions stated above, it calls attention to the declaration that “the RCC is no true church of Jesus Christ”; and says, as a reason for the exception:

The declaration by a single session that another ecclesiastical body is “no true church of Jesus Christ” would, unless challenged, put the Orthodox Presbyterian Church on record as adopting the same view. (See Form of Government XII.2, “these assemblies are not separate and independent, but they have a mutual relation and every act of jurisdiction is the act of the whole church performed by it through the appropriate body.”) While it may be true that the ecclesiastical body in question is not a true church of Jesus Christ, a local session is not “the appropriate body” to make this determination.

(3) February 5-6, 1993—Document #3 (21 pages)
Presbytery Meeting, Minutes. Mr. Fluck reported for the Visitation Committee (Document #2, above); pp. 171-172.

On substitute motion presbytery approved the Minutes of the session of Calvary Church with no exceptions and no notations; p. 172.

Messrs. Fluck and Gault recorded their negative votes.

(4) March 23, 1993—Document #4
The Complaint of A. M. Laurie. (See the complete text, p. 136.) The reasons set forth are:

  1. Judgment of whether a Christ-professing body is a true church is
properly the business of the general assembly, since:
- such judgment concerns the whole church (Form of Government XII.2.)
- such judgment is part of its mandate to "seek to promote the unity of the church through correspondence with other churches (Form of Government XV.6.)

Note: an obvious "first" step in fulfilling this mandate is coming to a judgment whether a professing body is a true church.

2. Judgment of whether a Christ-professing body is a true church is not listed in our Standards among the responsibilities of the session (Form of Government XIII.7, 8, and 9).

The following Amends are requested: That the presbytery reverse its action of approving the minutes of Calvary Church without exception or notation and rather take action to approve them with the exception set forth in presbytery minutes, February 5-6, 1993 and with no notations.

(5) April 16-17, 1993—Document #5 (two pages)
Report to the presbytery of the Judicial Committee, recommending the procedure in hearing Mr. Laurie's Complaint.

(6) April 16-17, 1993—Document #6 (17 pages)
Presbytery Meeting, Draft Minutes. Presbytery hears the Complaint (p. 186) and the motion to sustain it is lost (p. 187).

(7) April 20, 1993—Document #7
Letter from Robert M. Coie, Stated Clerk of the presbytery, to Mr. Laurie, informing him that his Complaint was denied; and stating that if he appeals, papers must be in the hands of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly by April 28, 1993.

(8) April 21, 1993—Document #8
Letter from Mr. Coie to the Rev. Donald J. Duff, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly; a covering letter, listing eight documents relevant to the Complaint, which he is sending to Mr. Duff.

(9) April 22, 1993—Document #9
Mr. Laurie to Mr. Coie; notice of intention to appeal to the General Assembly, and enclosing copies of Documents #1, #3, and #4.

(10) April 23, 1993—Document #10 (two pages)
The Appeal of Mr. Laurie, sent to Mr. Duff, with reasons in support of the Appeal; and enclosing copies of these same three documents. Reasons:
1. The appellant believes that the presbytery erred by not sustaining his complaint and making the requested (or other appropriate) amends.
2. The appellant has the right, under the constitution of the church, to remove his complaint, which was not sustained by the presbytery, to the
General Assembly for adjudication.
3. The reasons for not sustaining the complaint which were offered in debate in the presbytery have increased the appellant’s conviction that the complaint should be sustained for the good of the church.

(11) April 28, 1993—Document #11
Mr. Duff to Mr. Laurie, informing him, in accord with Book of Discipline IX.4, of the time, date, and place fixed for the hearing of the Complaint.

(12) April 29, 1993—Document #12
Mr. Duff to Mr. Coie, giving him the same information.

(end of chronology)

(Concluding observations, by the Appeals and Complaints Committee, in this summary of documents and data:

1. The Complaint’s point of concern is not whether the judgment that “the RCC is no true church of Jesus Christ” is a true judgment, but that this judgment, if made, ought to be made by the General Assembly rather than by a session; the Assembly will need to determine whether a session is competent to make such a judgment, in the light of the Scriptures and the Confession and Catechisms of the OPC.

2. The Complaint does not mention the question of the validity of Roman Catholic baptism.)

b. RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly find the complaint to be in order and properly before the Assembly

IV ELECTION

The term of Mr. Thomas E. Tyson expires with this Assembly. Mr. Tyson does not desire reelection to the Committee. Messrs. Arthur W. Kuschke ('94) and Alan D. Strange ('95) are the continuing members.
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RECONCILIATION

The Committee on Reconciliation (formerly called the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church) is composed of the Rev. Thomas E. Tyson, Chairman and the Rev. Jack J. Peterson, Secretary.

I The MANDATE given to the Committee by the 59th (1992) General Assembly is as follows: "...the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church... [was] continued for another year,... that its mandate be expanded to include working with the Thornton session regarding matters pertaining to Park Hill Church and that with urgency it continue to impress upon the parties involved the need to take all necessary steps to pursue reconciliation, calling upon each party to demonstrate a mutual submission to the demands of God's Word and the requirements of the Confession of Faith, Form of Government, and Book of Discipline. 

In particular that the committee

1. encourage Messrs. C. Nightengale, Petrie, and Samiran to initiate and complete the work of seeking personal reconciliations with those they have offended;
2. encourage the presbytery of the Dakotas to exercise all due effort to conduct its judicial affairs and items germane in conformity with the Form of Government and Book of Discipline of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, taking into account the number of sustained complaints against the presbytery in recent years;
3. encourage the Presbytery of the Dakotas to complete its study of the subject of "shunning" and to consider this mandate to be satisfied when its report is sent to its sessions for study;
4. encourage the Presbytery of the Dakotas for the sake of reconciliation, to admit to the Park Hill congregation its error in augmenting the Park Hill session in the fall of 1990 without the consent of the governed.

Ground for 4: Making this admission would remove a major obstacle standing in the way of Park Hill asking for re-admission to the OPC.
5. and to continue to encourage and comfort the people of Trinity Chapel.

Recommendation 2 added Mr. C. Kenneth Sande to the Committee to Visit Park Hill Church with Mr. Peterson as first alternate and Mr. Hilbelink as second alternate to replace Mr. Kiester who resigned from the Committee. Mr. Sande was unable to serve and Mr. Peterson therefore became a member of the Committee.

II ACTIONS OF THE 59th (1992) GA

A. The Presbytery of the Dakotas (POD) reported (Communication 1) that it had complied with the directives of the General Assembly (GA) 1991.
B. The POD overtured GA 1992 (Overture 5) to "acknowledge that the 1991 Assembly seriously erred in not adhering to its own instruments to advisory committees, in not restraining a committee from moving beyond the rules of the
Assembly, in not adhering to the BD, and in allowing a grievous situation to go uncorrected.” The Assembly declared the overture out of order on the ground that “When a General Assembly makes a final decision in a judicial case the judicial process is completed. The 58th (1991) General Assembly made a decision of the complaint referred to in Overture 5 which completed the judicial process.”

A protest (#2) was entered against this action signed by five members, and one former member, of the POD. An answer to the protest was entered into the record.

C. A Complaint (#2) was lodged by Messrs. T. J. Taylor, et. al., regarding the fact that the POD “denied the accused persons the right to participate in the Lord’s supper or of performing the functions of their office until the case is concluded.” The GA sustained the complaint “only with respect to the suspension of the accused from the Lord’s Supper.” The POD was directed to rescind the denial of the Supper to the accused.

D. A Complaint (#3) from the same men objected to the action of the POD in declaring the Park Hill Church “guilty of the sin of schism.” The GA denied the complaint “for the reason that the complainants have failed to demonstrate that the presbytery ... exceeded its prerogatives when it exercised its judgment in declaring Park Hill Church to be guilty of the sin of schism.”

III AUGUST 1992

The Committee met August 21-22, and September 22-24, 1992 (both meetings in Denver) and March 2-4, 1993 in Caney, Kansas. The September and March meetings were meetings of the Presbytery of the Dakotas.

The meeting of August 21-22 was called by the Committee for the “principals” in the litigation in the presbytery and the pastors involved. Several others also attended.

The Chairman opened the floor for words from the people in which they could state their grievances.

The Thornton session, which had been given the responsibility of oversight for the three men involved, requested that unresolved matters be made known to the session. The session requested a list to work on for reconciliation.

The chairman suggested that those present try to pare the list by covering offenses with love, not raising them again, informing the Thornton session. Several matters were closed with confession and forgiveness and others were covered over with love and forgotten.

A list of offenses that had been resolved, of offenses that had not yet been resolved and of offenses that were in process of being resolved, was sent to the participants in the meeting and to the Thornton session.

IV SEPTEMBER 1992 POD

The Judicial Advisory Committee reported that “the Book of Discipline is clear
that the Thornton session has jurisdiction over Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie, and Samiran.”

The final action taken in response to the recommendations of the Committee was:

that the presbytery ask the Thornton session to honor the spirit and intent of minutes (92-22-152, 153) by taking the necessary steps to effect the transfer of the membership of Messrs. Samiran, Nightengale, and Petrie (with their consent) back to the regional church until the completion of the trial; to demonstrate the willingness of the Thornton session to honor its own commitment in principle. It would show the sincerity of the stated repentance of Messrs. Samiran, Nightengale, and Petrie as stated in their letter of 2/10/92 (92-47-65). Subsequently events showed that the Thornton session chose not to accede to this request.

A further action noted that “The Presbytery of the Dakotas[,] in recognition that Messrs. Petrie, Samiran, and Nightengale are members under the oversight of the Thornton session, informs the session in (by means of) the presbytery’s minutes (of the charges pending against them); the charges have been given in writing to the defendants, and the presbytery also instructs the stated clerk to inform that session that they are now the court of original jurisdiction, and that Mr. Coppes has withdrawn his name from those bringing charges.”

The following action was also taken: “The presbytery erected a committee of six composed of 3 teaching and 3 ruling elders to meet with any members of the Park Hill Presbyterian Church who may desire to become members of the OPC, that the members of the committee be drawn equally from the 3 OPC churches in the Denver area, that the committee be instructed to approve the reception of the former members of the Park Hill church only on the following conditions: a) that there be satisfactory evidence of repentance for the sin of schism, b) that the persons who wish to be received agree to regularly attend worship services in whichever OPC church they wish to join, c) that the committee bring a full report of its activities to the March 1993 stated meeting of the presbytery.” Three negative votes recorded. The moderator ruled that each session would appoint one ruling and one teaching elder to the Committee of Six and that the convener would be the teaching elder of each church, to rotate alphabetically each year.

The call to Mr. Male was found in order, its terms approved and placed in his hands. Presbytery appointed the Thornton session a committee to install Mr. Male.

V CHARGES ADJUDICATED

In February the Thornton session adjudicated the charges against Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran, finding them not guilty of all charges. Further, the session has docketed for consideration the list of grievances compiled at the August meeting.
A. The following proposal was read to the presbytery by the Committee:

1. that the Presbytery of the Dakotas determine to
   a. treat PHPC as a mission work of the Thornton Church,
   b. allow Mr. Male and the Thornton session to exercise discipline and government over the Park Hill Presbyterian Church, with the ultimate goal of reconstituting the Park Hill Church as a congregation of the presbytery. When PHPC is so reconstituted they must confess their part in the sin of schism in the rending of the body of Christ that resulted in the formation of Trinity Church and the continued existence of the Park Hill Church.
2. that the Committee on Reconciliation of the General Assembly be requested to call a meeting of six representatives of the presbytery, six representatives of the Park Hill Church and Messrs. Male and Wynja for the purpose of pursuing reconciliation.

   The representatives of presbytery shall be chosen by the presbytery and the representatives of the PHPC shall be appointed by the Thornton session but will include including Messrs. Nightengale, Petrie and Samiran.

   The Committee on Reconciliation shall arrange the venue, time and agenda in a way similar to the August 1992 meeting between the representatives of Park Hill, Trinity and Providence Churches.
3. that the Presbytery of the Dakotas invite the Park Hill Church to apply for reconstitution as a congregation of the Presbytery of the Dakotas with the sole requirement being that the Park Hill Presbyterian Church confess their part in the sin of schism in the rending of the body of Christ that resulted in the formation of Trinity Church and the continued existence of the Park Hill Church.
4. that the Presbytery of the Dakotas confess its culpability in connection with the schism.

B. A Complaint was lodged by the Thornton session against the presbytery’s erection of the Committee of Six “... to meet with any members of the Park Hill Presbyterian Church who may desire to become members of the OPC ... (and) ... to approve the reception of the former members of the Park Hill Church only on the following conditions ...”

   The POD denied the complaint “because that while there is a general moral obligation for the Thornton session to work with the Committee of Six, this mandate (92-50-89) neither requires the Thornton session to send applicants through the Committee nor requires them to heed the advice of that Committee.”

   The presbytery directed “the Rev. Male to inform all members of the Park Hill church that there are two options to them with respect to reentry into the OPC: 1. They can join one of the existing OPC congregations if it is their intention to faithfully attend same, but they cannot use the first avenue while continuing to adhere to the Park Hill congregation; or 2. They can come in as a church or group under the terms of the FG XXIX.”

   Mr. Male declared that the Thornton session would likely file a complaint.

C. A complaint of Trinity session regarding jurisdiction was denied for the
following reason: "the presbytery decided at its September 1992 stated meeting that since Messrs. Petrie, Samiran, and Nightengale are members of the Thornton congregation and are under the oversight of the Thornton session, the Thornton session is now the court of original jurisdiction (92-50-86)."

D. A complaint of Trinity session denied by the Thornton session was carried to presbytery. The complaint was against the action of Immanuel session in connection with rejecting the charge of 16 December 1992 regarding the sin of schism against Messrs. Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran.

Presbytery voted to uphold this complaint, but only with reference to the charge that the sin of schism was committed by the three elders (Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran) on December 16, 1990 (the date when the Park Hill Church voted to withdraw from the OPC).

E. The session of Thornton overture the POD to rescind presbytery's declaration that the Park Hill Presbyterian Church is guilty of the sin of schism, on the grounds of the defense given by the Messrs. Petrie, Nightengale, and Samiran.

Presbytery determined to deny the overture.

F. The Committee on Shunning has distributed its papers, and was dissolved.

G. Nine hours after the presentation of the proposal (see A. above) Mr. Peterson asked the moderator if any action on the Committee's proposal was expected, and indicated that he would like to speak to the presbytery if no action was forthcoming.

H. After supper, as business was drawing to a close, miscellaneous business having come and gone, Mr. Peterson was given the floor. His approximate words were: "This has been a devastating day. The rupture within the POD, though less numerically, is as great as ever. I have heard belligerence, bitterness and antagonism - all roadblocks to reconciliation. There is no trust. There is need to restore confidence in each other. Last night as Tom and I worked on the proposal you heard this morning, I expressed an eschatological hope: that the proposal would be adopted, that we would have a meeting for reconciliation in April, that brothers and sisters would embrace in reconciliation and that we would report to the General Assembly in June that it's over, reconciliation has taken place. Since I read the proposal this morning, there has been deadly silence. Nothing. And I am devastated. Don't be surprised if at GA you hear a recommendation from this Committee that the POD be directed to do what we propose to you now. And it may well be that it will be necessary to file charges against some of you . . ."

I. Shortly after the speech a modified version of the proposal (see C. above) was moved and adopted in the following form:

1. that the Presbytery of the Dakotas determine:
   a. to invite PHPC to apply to be a mission work of the POD and upon application the POD treat PHPC as a mission work of the presbytery,
b. allow Mr. Male and a special committee appointed by the moderator (in consultation with Messrs. Williamson and Peterson) of the presbytery to exercise oversight of the mission work, (later appointed were Mark Larson, Lew LaBriola and Sam Bridgeman)

   c. and to specify that the ultimate goal of the work is to reconstitute the Park Hill Church as a congregation of the presbytery.

2. that the Committee on Reconciliation of the General Assembly be requested to call a meeting of six representatives of the presbytery, six representatives of the Park Hill Church and Mr. Male for the purpose of reconciliation.

   The representatives of presbytery shall be appointed by the moderator and the representatives of the PHPC shall be appointed by Mr. Male.

   The Committee on Reconciliation shall arrange the venue, time and agenda in a way similar to the August 1992 meeting between the representatives of Park Hill, Trinity and Providence Churches.

3. that the Presbytery of the Dakotas invite the Park Hill Church to apply for reconstitution as a congregation of the POD with the sole requirement being that PHPC confess their part in the sin of schism in the rending of the body of Christ that resulted in the formation of Trinity Church and the continued existence of the Park Hill Church.

4. that the POD once again acknowledge its error in augmenting the PHOPC session without the permission of the congregation.

VII SO, WHERE ARE WE?

Because of two complaints from the Thornton session (now pending before this GA) the Committee is not seeking to set up a meeting for reconciliation at this time.

Mr. Male is pleading for that presbytery trust him and the Thornton session to carry out a ministry of reconciliation with regard to the Park Hill Congregation and the OPC through the auspices of Thornton OPC.

VIII Budget

For three meetings (one for reconciliation, two presbytery meetings) $3,000.

IX RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee be continued with the same mandate.
INTRODUCTION

The 59th General Assembly adopted the following recommendation of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records on substitute motion: "[R]egarding the minute of the Presbytery of New Jersey (p. 241, items 16 and 17) concerning the lawsuit against the state of New Jersey, the Assembly requests the Presbytery of New Jersey to present to the 60th GA the biblical and confessional rationale for taking such an action..."

Most of the concern with the Presbytery of New Jersey's (PNJ) action as expressed in the minority report of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records and in the debate on the floor of General Assembly centered on the question of the legitimate exercise of church power. Curiously, the minority of the Records Committee recommended that the Assembly take exception to the PNJ's action on grounds that are in diametric opposition to one another. Ground 1 alleges that by coming as plaintiff in a lawsuit, the church makes an illegitimate concession of church power, giving to the state power that the church must always retain. Ground 2 alleges that by the very same act of coming as plaintiff, the church exceeds its power as church, taking from the state the power that the state must always retain. Thus, the allegation is that by the precisely same act, the church both gives up the keys that belong to it and takes from the state the sword that never belongs to the church. The minority's position violates the basic rule of logic that a proposition cannot be one thing and at the same time its opposite. Apparently, the minority wishes to provide a choice for those disturbed with the PNJ's position. But such a choice cannot be one that violates the law of non-contradiction.

The PNJ nonetheless understands that the opposition is concerned with the true nature of church power. This response accordingly addresses the question of church power from the Bible, the Standards [including The Form of Government (FG)], and the history of the church. The response addresses both the nature of church power from these three perspectives and the province of the church, i.e., the scope and the limits of the power of the church. The Bible, the Standards, and the history of the church also yield a full witness to the nature of state power and the province of state power, i.e., the scope and limits of the power of the state. One can properly consider the action of the PNJ only by examining the extent and limit of church power and also the extent and limit of state power, because the issue before us involves the intersection of these two. The major failing of the minority report, aside from the egregious logical fallacy (see paragraph 2, supra), is its failure to address the nature of state power as if that were inconsequential to the issue at hand. A full consideration of both church and state power is in order in addressing the action of the PNJ in its entering into a lawsuit against the State of New Jersey.
I THE NATURE OF CHURCH POWER

A. The Biblical Witness

Precisely what power it is that the church possesses has been ably dealt
with from a biblical perspective by Douglas5 and James Bannerman6, James Candlish7,
and John Macpherson8, to cite several prominent nineteenth-century Scottish theo-
logians. All agree that Jesus Christ is the sole head of the church (Colossians 1:15-
20). Christ’s headship in the old economy was exercised through types and
shadows. The Lord’s rule in the new economy brings the details of the nature of
church power into its sharpest focus. It is in the teaching and ministries of Christ and
his apostles that the spiritual nature of church power comes to expression. To say
that church power is spiritual is to recognize that the proper dominion or sphere of
its authority is in matters spiritual. In the Great Commission that our Lord gave to
the church, his marching orders are explicit: All authority belongs to him and on that
basis he empowers the church to “go therefore and make disciples of all the nations,
baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,
teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with
you always, even to the end of the age” (Matthew 28:18-20).

The power that our Lord gives to his church is not fictional but real. It is
to confessing Peter, as representative of all the apostles, that our Lord promises the
eventual complete success of the church (Matthew 16:18-19). Such victory is assured
because to the church our Lord gives the “keys of the kingdom,” with the result that
whatever the church binds or looses on earth will correspondingly be bound or
loosed in heaven. Our Lord gives this authority to bind or loose very specific content
in Matthew 18:15-20: Obstreperous sinners are, after all else fails, to be declared to
be outside the church. Thus, the promise that heaven will regard the biblical
censures of a court of the church as the censure of heaven itself (vv. 19-20). Paul
speaks of the act of excommunication as done “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ
. . . with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Corinthians 5:4).

This power which belongs to the church—the proclamation of the gospel,
the administration of the sacraments, the exercise of discipline—resides in the hands
of the church’s governors. Our Lord gifts and calls men to serve in His church (I Tim.
3:1-7; Titus 1:6-9). It is through the corporate activity of those church governors that
Jesus Christ reigns and rules in His church. Even as civil government or voluntary
societies have office-holders who carry out the legitimate duties appropriate to such
organizations, so the church has men recognized by the people of God as fitted by
the Holy Spirit to exercise church power. Church members are to obey their
governors in the biblical exercise of their office (Hebrews 13:7,17). And the power
wielded by church officers is not one of domination, but of humble servanthood (I
Peter 5:3; cf. Mark 10:42). Even as the power of the church is real, so the exercise of
such power is equally real, being carried out by the governors of the church.

This power that our Lord gives to his church and that resides in the hands
of her officers is inviolable. No individual officer nor any court of the church has the
right to cede any of her God-given power to another agency. It is to the church that
Christ gave the Great Commission. The church is bound to carry out that commis-
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sion. The Lord then, by his Spirit, calls and equips the church to perform a unique
task, a task that, in his providence, he allows the church alone to perform. If, for
example, the state commands the church to yield some of her spiritual power to the state, the church must resolutely refuse to do so. When the Jewish religious and civil court, the Sanhedrin, forbade the early church to proclaim the gospel, the apostles with one voice resisted the command, declaring, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). By their example the apostles demonstrated that the church is assiduously to resist all encroachments on its legitimate task. The church simply cannot allow the state or any other agency to dictate to it the terms of its heaven-indited mandate. The PNJ submits itself entirely to the example of the apostles. It firmly believes that to submit the "content of the church's preaching and discipline" to the state is to obey man rather than God and is, in short, to deny the sole headship of the Lord Jesus Christ over His church.

Opponents of the PNJ's position allege that it has "in effect conceded jurisdiction to the civil government to adjudicate the content of the church's preaching and discipline." To do so would indeed be a violation of the Scripture's teaching. If the PNJ cedes authority to the state that the church must retain, then the church's action is unbiblical. It is not alleged, of course, that the PNJ deliberately or willfully concedes to the state in this matter. Rather, it is by the "act of coming as plaintiff before a court of civil law" that the PNJ supposedly concedes jurisdiction, albeit unintentionally.

The distinction that opponents of the PNJ's actions seek to maintain between plaintiff and defendant is fatuous. This is not to say that there is no difference in current legal theory and judicial procedures between the two. It is to say that to seek to press such differences in terms of the biblical text—maintaining, for example, that it was proper for Paul to be a defendant, but that he would never have come as a plaintiff—clearly exceeds the bounds of all responsible exegesis, because such distinctions are ahistorical. No one in the Bible had opportunity to enter into a civil suit against the state as a plaintiff. There are, however, biblical analogs to coming as a plaintiff, as is argued below. It is enough for now to say that Paul appeared in court and presented his case. To make one's case is to make one's case, whether as plaintiff or defendant. To argue that the plaintiff concedes jurisdiction in a way that the defendant does not is a completely extrabiblical argument, a highly debatable point of legal theory that no church court is competent definitively to answer without exceeding the proper bounds of church power.

The argument to be made against coming as plaintiff is an argument from silence, since the text itself, of course, does not forbid such an action. Not every argument from silence is invalid. Many such arguments are not only valid but quite necessary. The difficulty with the opposition's argument from silence is that the opposition views the absence of any explicit warrant to act as a plaintiff in a court of law as prohibiting such an action or at least as establishing a presumption against it. The PNJ believes that the argument from silence runs in precisely the opposite direction: since there is no essential clear biblical distinction between presenting one's case as defendant or plaintiff, and since there are analogs in both the Old and New Testament to coming as plaintiff, the silence of the text on plaintiffs provides the PNJ's case with a presumptive validity.

In the book of Esther, an angry Haman had said to King Ahasuerus, "There is a certain people scattered and dispersed among the people an all the provinces of your kingdom; their laws are different from all other people's, and they
do not keep the king’s laws. Therefore it is not fitting for the king to let them remain” (3:8). Ahasuerus consented to the extirpation of the Jews in his realm and the date for the execution of his decree was set. Thus Ahasuerus promulgated a law that when enacted would destroy God’s people. A clear parallel exists then with the situation in New Jersey. Mordecai persuades Esther to approach the king to sue for the freedom of her people (see especially 4:13-14). Esther approaches the king and humbly petitions him to restore her life and the lives of her people (7:3-4). Esther comes to the king representing God’s people and is granted official access and a hearing on her petition (5:1-3). The PNJ comes to the civil magistrate and asks for injunctive relief so that the church is no longer under condemnation of this unjust law.

When Porcius Festus, the successor of Felix, sought to remove Paul from Caesarea to Jerusalem, an act calculated to ingratiate the new governor with the Jewish leaders (Acts 25:9), Paul appealed to Caesar (Acts 25:11). It is vital to understand that Paul’s appeal differs from appeals in our civil and criminal courts. This is why we must not approach the Bible with our modern legal categories in mind. A modern legal appeal can be taken only after there has been a trial in the court of original jurisdiction that has proven unsatisfactory. But Paul had had no trial at the lower court level. Nor was his appeal to Caesar an appeal merely of the procedure suggested by Festus. Paul’s appeal had the effect of taking the entire case completely out of Festus’s hands and moving it directly to Caesar’s court. Paul did not like the suggestions of this magistrate and appealed to a higher magistrate to try him. This is not at all unlike asking a Federal judge to strike down a state law, which is what the PNJ has done.

The PNJ views its coming as plaintiff completely in line with Paul’s actions. Perhaps the facts of the case are unclear. A magistrate (the legislature of New Jersey) passed a law restricting the church in its preaching of the gospel, administration of the sacraments, and exercise of church discipline. The church simply appealed from one magistrate who had passed laws restricting the church to a higher magistrate whose laws appeared to protect the church. Rather than submit the content of the gospel message to the state of New Jersey, the PNJ has asked the Federal Court to declare that what the state of New Jersey has done in terms of the church is contrary to the law of the land.

Some opponents of the PNJ’s action aver that Paul acted as a private individual in appealing to Caesar, and as such his actions are not instructive for a court of the church. The PNJ believes, however, that Paul’s actions as God’s apostle are far closer to it as a court of the church than to any one of us as individuals. What individual could command the church of Jesus Christ to turn someone over to Satan (1 Cor. 5:5)? The actions that Paul took as an individual in his proclamation of the gospel were not the actions of one who held ordinary office in the church. Paul’s words and actions as the holder of extraordinary office are foundational to the church (Ephesians 2:20). This does not mean that his actions are inimitable, but it does mean that certain actions are inimitable (e.g., speaking and writing divine revelation) and that other actions are imitable only by a church court (e.g., pronouncing excommunication).

The legal charge against Paul was not that he had committed an offense as an individual but that he had committed an offense as a preacher of Jesus Christ
against the Jewish law (Acts 24:5-6). Similarly, the PNJ as a church suffers under the law as written and it is in its ecclesiastical capacity that the PNJ seeks relief even as Paul sought relief to proclaim the gospel freely. Surely no one would argue that by his appeal to Caesar, Paul submitted the church unto the civil magistrate. The PNJ does not submit the church to the state any more than did Paul. The PNJ, as did Paul, will carry out the Great Commission regardless of the court’s ruling.

But did not Paul appeal to Caesar merely to accomplish the Lord’s prediction that he would preach the gospel in Rome? Surely Paul did not appeal merely for the sake of expediency. Since Paul was acting in defense of the gospel, the course of action that he adopted was one of righteousness. All of the charges levied against Paul were essentially religious and were calculated to silence his preaching of the gospel. Paul appealed to Caesar because Festus was more interested in appeasing the Jews than in giving Paul justice. Paul maintained that he had broken no laws—neither the Jews’ nor Caesar’s—and made his final appeal to the law of Caesar (Acts 25:8-11). Festus had no choice under the law but to send Paul to Caesar (Acts 25:12). Did Paul not coerce Festus? Since he compelled Festus to act under a higher law, was he not exceeding his power as a representative of the entire church in its God-given task to proclaim the gospel? According to the logic of the PNJ’s opponents, did not Paul in appealing to Caesar “use the coercive power of civil government to enforce the church’s interests by changing the secular legal and governmental situation?”

It is quite interesting that opponents of the PNJ’s action adduce the actions of our Lord Jesus Christ in his conference with Pilate shortly before his death. Christ did not defend himself before Pilate (Matthew 27:12-14). This was in fulfillment of prophecy (Isaiah 53:7) and occurred because, though our Lord was sinless, he was constituted guilty on our behalf. It is strange indeed to turn the unique atonement of our Lord into an exemplary lesson of how one is to conduct himself before a magistrate. Since Paul made his case, the church is not forbidden from doing the same. To imitate the humble spirit of our Lord before the magistrate is appropriate; to maintain the judicial silence that he did in giving himself as a ransom for our souls is not required.

Our Lord and Paul were both charged with defiling the temple. One was silent before the magistrate on our behalf; the other defended his ministry before the magistrate. One magistrate has already proscribed legitimate church activity; the PNJ makes a defense before a higher one who has the power to reverse the lower. It has gone into court as a plaintiff only to defend itself from a law that restricts it. Those who would call upon the church to imitate Christ’s passiveness before Pilate, confuse that which is unique in the life and ministry of our Lord with that which is exemplary. Those who have argued that the New Testament calls upon Christians to “give up their rights,” and not to “press their case,” are, in one sense, correct. This is the genius of our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7) and the teaching of Paul (Phil. 2: 1-8; I Corinthians 8:7-13, 10:23-33; Romans 14:1-23). In these Bible passages, it is individuals who are called to give up their “rights” and to esteem others better than themselves. Why did not Paul do so? Because he was not acting as an aggrieved individual but as the apostle set for the defense of the faith. Church, state, and family are never called upon to “give up” any of the responsibilities given to them by the Lord. Remember, church power is inviolable. The church as a church
is not called upon to "turn the other cheek" in the face of oppression. It is the individual Christian who is called upon to do this. To adopt any other exegesis is to depart from a Reformed hermeneutic.

The witness of the Book of the Acts is unmistakably clear: Paul invoked the privileges of his Roman citizenship in every circumstance in which his citizenship afforded him more freedom to preach the gospel. In Acts 16:37, Paul demanded that the magistrate personally escort Silas and him out of prison in Philippi. Paul had the legal right to make such a demand because he had been imprisoned without a trial for preaching the gospel, a violation of his rights as a Roman citizen. Paul was not interested merely in standing on ceremony, but in putting the city officials on notice that they could not cavalierly violate the rights of a Roman citizen. Likewise in Acts 22:25, Paul asked Lysias, the commander of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem, if it was permissible to flog a Roman citizen who had not been found guilty of a crime. In the gracious providence of our Lord, Paul was a Roman citizen. Paul was able to use his citizenship to maintain freedom to preach the gospel.

We enjoy the privileges granted by the U.S. Constitution. To fail to use these privileges to maintain freedom to preach the gospel would be negligent. We should not despise what God in his sovereign providence has given us. If we were in a land in which the church was outlawed, we would have to work and survive under those conditions. Some argue that the church should be the same in all lands. The PNJ agrees that in every land the church should be fully engaged in its divine mandate. But to imagine that all the circumstances of the church (e.g., whether its meetings are open or secret) will be the same everywhere is absurd. In a nation whose constitution affords protection to the church, albeit imperfectly, Christians ignore such protection to their peril. Paul certainly used the privileges that the Roman Empire afforded him. Why is it wrong for the PNJ to do essentially the same thing that the divine apostle did? Taking the action that the PNJ has is the best way to demonstrate that it does not intend to yield church power to the State of New Jersey. By its action, the PNJ has not ceded church power to the state but has attempted to reverse an encroachment upon that power by the state.

B. The Confessional and Historical Witness

The Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF) XXX,1 reads: "The Lord Jesus, as king and head of his church, hath therein appointed a government, in the hand of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate." Section 2 tells us that it is "to these officers [that] the keys of the kingdom are committed." Thus the power that belongs to the church is retained by the church's officers and cannot be handed over to the civil magistrate. The Report of the Minority of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records alleges that by conceding power to the state that belongs only to the church, the PNJ has violated WCF XXV.6 and FG I. The former reads, "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the pope of Rome, in any sense be head thereof." The latter deals more fully with the kingship and headship of Christ over His church, informing us that Christ exercises through men his own authority and enforces his own law (FG I.2). One is left to guess precisely what it is in FG I that the PNJ violates by its actions. It is insufficient to argue that since FG I teaches the absolute headship of Christ (major premise) and that since coming as plaintiff violates that headship (minor premise), coming as a plaintiff
violates FG I (conclusion). Such a conclusion is maintainable only if the minor premise is true. The minor premise, however, cannot be assumed to be true but must be proven true. The PNJ, as has been argued above, does not accept that coming as a plaintiff violates Christ’s headship. Thus the PNJ rejects the minor premise of its opponents and regards the conclusion that coming as a plaintiff violates FG I as a non sequitur.

Even more interesting is the allegation that the PNJ violates WCF XXV.6. Presumably, the opposition does not imagine that the PNJ acknowledges the Pope of Rome as its head. The clear historical context of this section indicates that there is no other temporal or religious head of the church, not the Queen of England, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and, particularly, not the Pope of Rome, who lays claim to rule as the Vicar of Christ. The PNJ does not acknowledge the legislature nor the Governor of New Jersey as the head of the church in this State. The opposition apparently argues that to go into court is ipso facto to displace Jesus as head and make the state the ruler of the church. The PNJ is resisting the state’s encroachment on the power of the church as Calvin resisted the 1538 attempts of the Genevan magistracy to wield the keys, as Knox disputed the claim of Mary Queen of Scots to handle ecclesiastical matters, as Samuel Davies (acting under the authority of the Synod of New York) protested the nullification of the Toleration Act in colonial Virginia, and as the soon-to-be Free Church of Scotland instituted a civil case in the disruption of 1843.

Many may say “Do nothing until called into court.” The legal dictum “silence gives assent” suggests otherwise. The PNJ does not want its silence to be interpreted as assent to this monstrous law. Earlier attempts to dissuade the legislature and governor having failed, the PNJ now addresses the third branch of government. Especially in a republican form of government, silence gives assent, because the governing authorities presume that all individuals and bodies in opposition to a measure will use the forums available for the expression of dissent if they oppose the measures strongly enough. The PNJ does not want to be dragged into a New Jersey Court in the future and told that by its inaction it has given tacit assent to a law that has been on the books for years. The PNJ wants the perverse law nullified.

The opposition maintains that the PNJ exceeds church power by attempting to “use the coercive power of civil government to enforce the church’s interests by changing the secular legal and governmental situation.” Cited in this regard is FG III.3-4. The burden of these two sections is the nature of church power. That power is said to be “ministerial and declarative,” and “wholly moral or spiritual.” Section 4 forbids church officers or judicatories from possessing civil jurisdiction or from seeking to inflict civil penalties as part of the church’s discipline. To imagine that by coming into court the church has in some manner seized the sword that belongs to the state is to mistake completely what has been done. The PNJ has no power whatsoever to compel the court to render a favorable verdict. Yet the opposition somehow assumes that the action of the PNJ tends to the “possessing of civil jurisdiction” on its part. Such an argument recalls the earlier logical fallacy that a single action, i.e., coming as plaintiff, both goes beyond the church’s power and gives away that same power.

FG III.4 (last sentence) makes it clear that it is within the bounds of proper
church power to "seek the aid of the civil power . . . [when] necessary for civil protection and security." This statement makes it clear that one is permitted to appeal to the civil power for the sake of protection or security. This means that a session or presbytery may initiate such action. One may call the police if someone proved uncontrollably disruptive during a worship service. Why not then appeal to one magistrate to restrain another magistrate when the magistrate in need of restraint has made law that imperils the security of the church? The magistrate has made a law that jeopardizes the church. The PNJ has asked a higher magistrate to protect it from him. If the constitutionality of such an action is not clear from these words in the FG, the PNJ despairs of ever making its action clear. The PNJ has not exceeded church power by appealing to the magistrate. It will continue to do everything that our Lord has called it to do regardless of what the magistrate does. It would do the same if the police failed to come after being notified that property were being destroyed by vandals. One can only call the authorities. One obviously has no final power to compel the state to act to protect the church. But why should the church be forbidden from even calling the authorities? The PNJ's action cannot be forbidden apart from amending FG III.4.

Doubtless the rejoinder to the argument immediately above is that calling the police for protection is different than going into court for protection. The reason that it is assumed to be different is because it is assumed that the PNJ is submitting to the court the content of its preaching and discipline and asking them for permission to teach what the PNJ already teaches. The PNJ is doing nothing of the sort. For the opposition to argue that the PNJ is doing this "in effect," though unintentionally, is simply to assume what they purport to prove. What the PNJ does by its action is go into court and say, "Here's what we believe. The Lord Jesus Christ commands us to believe this and we cannot do otherwise. Does not the law of the land allow us to hold such beliefs without the imposition of civil penalties? If so, nullify the State of New Jersey's unconstitutional law. If not, we are willing to suffer the consequences for preaching what we believe."

Some on the floor of GA made comments to the effect that one could not come into court as a plaintiff and tell the court one's beliefs without laying oneself open to the court's control over those beliefs. This is simply not true. The court sits in the PNJ's case as a court of equity. The PNJ has petitioned the court to grant it relief from the application of this law to the church. Either the court grants a waiver from the law, by granting "injunctive relief" or it rules that the law applies to the church. It is then up to the church to decide what to do if the equity court rules that the law applies to it. And what the PNJ would do is precisely what its been doing all along: preaching the whole counsel of God. The PNJ intends to continue that regardless of the outcome, and the court, by repeated acknowledgments on its part, understands full well that the church will continue to preach what it preaches. The court has made it quite clear that they have no problem with the PNJ's stating its position and simply asking the court to rule that the civil authority cannot, in keeping with the U.S. Constitution, impose penalties on the church. How anyone can construe this as seeking the permission of the court to teach the truth is baffling. If it is the court's opinion that the PNJ is in violation of the law then the church can do nothing about that other than continue faithful to the commands of our Lord.

The opposition also alleges that the PNJ violates WCF XXXI.4. This
section restricts the exercise of church power to matters ecclesiastical. The PNJ responds that by taking the action that it has it has handled or concluded nothing but that which is ecclesiastical. Nothing could be more ecclesiastical than determining that the state was set to assume to themselves the administration of the Word and sacraments and the power of the keys (contrary to WCF XXIII.3) and, in response to such usurpation, humbly to petition the court to nullify such an action on the part of the state. WCF XXXI.4 clearly means that a church is not to conclude what the speed limit on the local freeway should be or who the next Congressman should be. These are matters that a church court is not competent to decide because they lie outside of the church’s domain. Furthermore, for the General Assembly to rule that a plaintiff in a lawsuit bears a wholly different posture before a court of law than does a defendant, especially when such matters are highly debatable in secular legal theory, would be another example of a church court concluding something other than what is ecclesiastical. Indeed, to conclude that the state has no right to take from the church the task that heaven has given the church is very much to conclude something ecclesiastical.

WCF XXXI.4 goes beyond prohibiting a synod or council from determining anything but that which is ecclesiastical. It stipulates that even in matters ecclesiastical, the church is not ordinarily permitted to interfere with civil affairs. This means that the church does not necessarily have a right to intermeddle with actions taken by the magistrate for the good of the whole commonwealth simply because the church is impacted by such an action. It is a matter ecclesiastical and thus within the legitimate power of a congregation for a particular congregation to determine that it will construct its physical plant in a certain way. It would be intermeddling for the congregation as a congregation to resist the zoning and safety ordinances of its community and seek to have them overturned because such laws violate the church’s right to decide how it and it alone wants its physical plant constructed. But it would not be a violation of this section of the FG for the local congregation to seek a variance to the relevant regulations. The church is not supposed to intermeddle in affairs pertaining to the whole commonwealth for its own interests to the hurt of the commonwealth.

The church may, “in cases extraordinary,” by “humble petition” intermeddle in civil affairs even though they concern the whole commonwealth. The Presbyterian church in the past has done this by petitioning the state to enforce the fourth commandment, prohibit abortion on demand, and enforce biblical standards in the laws pertaining to marriage and divorce. In all of these cases, the church concluded that these matters ecclesiastical were important enough for it to urge the state to enforce them upon the entire commonwealth. What the PNJ is doing is actually less than this traditional understanding of “humble petition.” It is not asking the court to set aside the Law against Discrimination (on the basis of “sexual orientation or affection”) for the entire commonwealth. Instead, it is only asking for a waiver from the Federal Court stating that the law does not apply to us. Though the church has a right in cases extraordinary to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, the PNJ does not, in this case, do anything of the sort.

Any number of persons have responded that a lawsuit is not a humble petition. A lawsuit is indeed a humble petition. The word “petition” was regularly
used in the 17th century when the Confession was drafted to describe the method for bringing matters before courts of equity. The English system, unlike the American that incorporates all courts primarily into one at the Federal level, divides law courts from chancery or equity courts. "Courts of Equity in England can deal with certain injustices, or inequities created by a rigorous application of the law. Relief from those strict applications is sought in this court." Since American courts sit as both law and equity courts, "when an individual or group petitions the court for relief from the strict application of the law in their circumstance, the court sits in equity." The remedy sought by the PNJ in the Federal Court sitting as a court of equity is "injunctive relief." The effect of such relief would not be to change the law but to grant to the church an exemption from the force and penalties of the law.

Those filing a lawsuit and seeking injunctive relief from a court sitting as an equity court are explicitly called "petitioners." Black's Law Dictionary defines a petitioner in such a setting as "soliciting some mercy or redress of some wrong or grievance." A petition in such a situation is by its very nature "humble." The petitioner addresses the court in the most respectful manner, and "prays" that the court will grant relief. The PNJ contends that the phrase "humble petition" itself is a tautology. A petition to the government must be humble or it is not a petition. In a petition, one does not tell the legislature or the executive or the judiciary what to do. There is no coercion whatsoever involved. One merely asks the party petitioned to take or refrain from a certain action. The idea that by coming into court as a plaintiff the PNJ is "coercing" the state is simply unfounded and mistakes what a petition is.

All parties agree that it is perfectly appropriate to petition the legislature while a bill is under consideration or the executive when a bill is on his desk. Attempts were made by various parties to dissuade the legislature from passing and the governor from signing into law the legislation under question. The bill was rushed through the legislature and hurriedly signed by the governor, so full appeal could be made only to the judiciary. How can one argue from the WCF that one is allowed to petition the first two branches of government and not allowed to petition the third branch? While one may simply send a letter to or have a meeting with parties of either of the first two branches, the only thing that brings the matter before the courts is a lawsuit. The only way to come before a judge is to come as the PNJ has, initiating a lawsuit so that it can humbly petition the court to administer justice, having been denied it in the first two branches of government. "The language of the Standards does not restrict the church as to which branches of government may be addressed by a humble petition. The legal proceeding initiated by the PNJ is in the form of a lawsuit because that is the only vehicle by which the Presbytery can humbly petition the judicial branch of government for equity relief from an oppressive law."22

II THE LIMITS OF THE POWER OF THE CHURCH

A. The Biblical Witness

Our Lord Jesus Christ made it clear that the church was not the only
agency upon the earth to which he had given power. That bodies other than the church wield an authority appropriate to them is readily acknowledged by all: there is a realm in which the state has authority (Romans 13:1-7) and a realm in which the family has authority (Ephesians 5:22-6:9). The PNJ maintains that each realm has its own authority, but that these authorities occasionally overlap. The words of our Lord in Matthew 22:21 teach that there are powers retained and duties owed that are peculiar to each in their respective spheres: “Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” We have no authority, then, in the name of church power to annul the proper power and rule of the state. While we cannot give the things that belong to the church over to the state, i.e., we cannot give to Caesar the things that belong and must, of necessity, belong to God, we also cannot withhold the things that properly belong to the state by invoking God’s name, because God has ordained the state as much as he has the church.

Our Lord also made it clear that power in his kingdom was wielded differently from power in the kingdoms of this world. In his conference with Pontius Pilate, Jesus Christ testified: “My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now my kingdom is not from here” (John 18:36). Thus our Lord rules out the use of force of arms in the cause and advance of his kingdom, teaching that its dynamic is the power of the Holy Spirit (John 16:7-14). One may infer from John 18:36 that the Lord teaches the “spirituality” of his kingdom. Jesus wants Pilate to understand that the Christ is not merely a local potentate (“the King of the Jews”) bent on overthrowing Rome and reestablishing the Davidic reign and the golden era of the Jewish monarchy. Rather, he is the King of kings, who empowers earthly kings. He chose not to resort to arms (he could have asked his Father for twelve legions of angels, Matthew 26:53) because of his purpose to die for his people and save them from their sins: force of arms was not the way that he chose for the operation of his kingdom, but the Spirit ministering the Word, an agency more powerful than any sword (John 17:17; Hebrews 4:12). By the example of our Lord, the church is not to resort to force of arms in the carrying out of her commission.

We have seen in some detail what the power of the church is. The limits to that power are not positively set forth in Scripture but may be deduced from the power given to family and state, i.e., the positive empowerment of other spheres limits the church’s power to its own sphere. The power given to the family is not at issue here. The power given to the state is that of the sword, which is developed in the next section. It is enough to say here that the church does not bear the sword in any sense. The severest censure of the church, for example, is excommunication. When Paul instructs the church in Corinth to discipline a man who had carried on an adulterous relationship with his father’s wife, he does not instruct the church to put the impenitent sinner to death but to expel him from the Table of the Lord (1 Corinthians 5:1-13). We can deduce from Paul’s commands nothing about what the state should do in such a case. Certainly, this was a capital offense in the Old Testament. The point to be made about church power is that excommunication is the extent of it. The church is not empowered to seek to impose civil penalties on offenders. That is the prerogative and responsibility of the civil magistrate.
B. The Confessional and Historical Witness

WCF XXXI.4 circumscribes courts of the church so that they are permitted to "handle, or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical." This means that the church is not empowered to deal with matters outside its competency. The church is not to endorse candidates for public office or to serve as a forum for political views. The church is to speak where the Scriptures speak and to remain silent where the Scriptures are silent. The church must do what the Lord has commanded her to do for she alone is competent to do it. If the church seeks to involve herself inappropriately in civil affairs, she disobeys twice: by exceeding her power and by neglecting to do what she has been empowered to do. In a purely practical sense, the church has neither the material nor human resources both to carry out the Great Commission and to administer the civil affairs of the state. It is not for this reason, however, that the church is not ordinarily to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth; it is because the heavenly mandate given to the church and to the state are not the same. Members of the church as citizens of the commonwealth are free to engage in civil affairs as they see fit. But the church as church is not to make the affairs of state its ordinary business.

Opponents of the PNJ’s actions charge that it has exceeded church power by the act of coming as a plaintiff in a lawsuit against the state. They claim that the PNJ’s action is not ecclesiastical and that it intermeddles with civil affairs that concern the commonwealth. The PNJ argues extensively above against this position. The only remaining question in this regard must be whether or not this is an extraordinary case. What is more extraordinary than the state passing a law that dictates to the church what it may not do and say regarding the seventh commandment? Would any of the historical persons adduced by opponents of this action ever have envisaged the state taking such a hostile stance against the church and the preaching of the gospel? Both J. Gresham Machen23 and Paul Woolley24 have been cited in this regard. The entire discussion in James25 and Douglas Bannerman26, John Macpherson27, Charles Hodge28, and James Candlish29 on the province of the church—i.e., the proper power of the church and the limits on that power—lends no support to the claims that the PNJ has exceeded church power. The theologians cited would all consider the state’s action to be a gross usurpation of the church’s prerogatives.

The entire discussion, in fact, on the limits of church power that is so prominent in the writings of the nineteenth-century Scottish theologians centered on the evils of Roman Catholic ecclesiology, on the one hand, and of Erastianism on the other hand. The former gave to the church the supremacy over the state while the latter granted to the state the supremacy over the church. It is vital to understand that it was precisely against such erroneous ecclesiologies that the drafters of both the WCF and the FG inveighed. WCF XXXI.4 was drafted against the background of a medieval church that routinely dealt with non-ecclesiastical matters and made no distinction between its own interests and welfare and that of the commonwealth. "It was Rome’s policy in every Catholic country to assume to herself the civil as well as the ecclesiastical power. Before the Reformation, in Scotland and England, all the chief offices of state were held by Churchmen."30 This continued to be the case with the Anglican Church at the time that the Confession was drafted. The stipulations in WCF XXXI.4 were made at a time when the line between church and state was
quite blurry. Both here and in XXIII the divines were at some pains to steer a clear course between the Scylla of Romanism and the Charybdis of Erastianism.

Some allege that the PNJ violated FG 111.3-4, which reads, in part: “All church power is only ministerial and declarative, for the Holy Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice. No church judicatory may presume to bind the conscience by making laws on the basis of its own authority; all its decisions should be founded upon the Word of God.” The concern of the drafters of the FG here is the same concern of the Divines in WCF XXV.6 and XXXI.4: Jesus Christ is the sole head of the church, not the pope, and the church is to treat that which it is competent to treat; furthermore, the church is to address every issue from the Scriptures and not make “canon law” on its own authority. Without getting into the details of Romanist ecclesiology, it is enough to say that Rome sees the power of the church as magisterial and legislative, over against the Reformers and the Westminster Divines, who understood the power of the church to be ministerial and declarative. The Divines wanted to make it clear that the state received its authority directly from God and not from the church. This classic Presbyterian position rejected the kind of claim that Pope Innocent III in his bull Unam Sanctum had made, a claim of total ecclesiastical hegemony over the state and its rulers.31

The decision of the PNJ to come as plaintiff was “founded upon the Word of God,” as shown above. The PNJ makes no laws by its actions, nor does it seek to make any. The PNJ readily agrees that there have been gross abuses of church power in the church’s history: Rome has claimed a whole line of authority that is unbiblical and that our Lord never intended the church to exercise. In our own day, we have witnessed liberal churches more interested in preaching the social gospel than the gospel of grace and evangelical churches more interested in political activism than in maintaining the purity of church doctrine. Our church constitution addresses such abuses of power and the PNJ is in complete harmony with it. There is clearly a realm that does not belong to the church and that we enter into at our peril. For the church to usurp the state’s authority is nothing less than rebellion against the headship of Jesus Christ. But we also make a great mistake if we misread the Standards or the FG to tell us that the church is powerless to resist the encroachment of the state upon the churches’ prerogatives. The PNJ rejects a view that would so limit church power that it is impossible for the church to “seek the aid of the civil power ... [when] necessary for civil protection and security” (FG III.4). The limits placed on church power in our church documents do not prohibit the PNJ from taking the action that it has.

III THE NATURE OF THE POWER OF THE STATE

A. The Biblical Witness

God’s Word instructs us both to obey our rulers and to pray for them (I Peter 2:17; I Tim. 2:1-2). The Bible is clear that we in the church are not exempt from the proper power of the state. Even the church as church has no warrant to provide refuge for fugitives from the law, to keep secret congregant’s confessions of crime, and to argue that clerics cannot be tried in civil courts of law but are subject only to
the courts of the church even in criminal matters. Such historic disdain for the power of the state as has occurred in the Roman Catholic Church finds no support whatsoever in the Bible. The Bible does not teach that we in the church can break the law of the state with impunity because we are in the church. Rather, God’s Word warns us that we should fear the magistrate if we do evil, for we are answerable to him as the bearer of the sword (Romans 13:4).

Even as “the keys” is the way in which the Bible describes the binding and loosing authority that belongs to the church, “the sword” describes the coercive authority that belongs to the state (Romans 13:1-7). All of the church’s power is moral and suasive: Compliance to its biblical directives is voluntary, i.e., cannot be compelled by force. If a person will not listen to the church, the most that can happen to him is that he be put outside its fellowship and communion. But the state has the power to use whatever physical force is necessary to restrain the lawbreaker, including putting him to death. This is what it means to say that the state has the power of the sword.

Romans 13:1-7 spells out the state’s obligations and prerogatives quite clearly. V. 1 tells us that all are to be subject to the state’s authority because God has ordained that authority. One cannot profess subjection to God and disobey the legitimate commands of the state. To resist the state is to resist God and to invite God’s judgment (v. 2). We are not to fear the ruler if we maintain righteousness. The ruler is a terror not to those who do good works but to those who do evil deeds (v. 3). Paul then says a most remarkable thing: the magistrate is as much a minister of God as a preacher of the gospel. He is God’s minister who does not bear the sword in vain but rather bears it as “an avenger to execute wrath on him who practices evil” (v. 4). Therefore, we are to be subject to our rulers by rendering unto them all that is necessary for the sustenance and upholding of their offices (vv. 5-7).

The power of the state is as inviolable in its own right as is the power of the church. Since the magistrate is God’s minister to attend to the affairs of state, he is directly answerable to God. The Bible does not teach that the state receives its legitimacy from the church but from the Lord Himself. Provisions for human government were made early in the history of the race, with the death penalty being instituted in the time of Noah (Gen. 9:5-7). The charge that the PNJ denies to the state its exclusive right to wield the sword is simply untrue. To argue that by coming as plaintiff the PNJ uses coercion is incredible: the church has no power to coerce the state of New Jersey, even if it wanted to. If the Federal Court rules in favor of the PNJ, it will be the U.S. Government and not the church who is compelling the state to act. The PNJ does not take power from the state that properly belongs only to the state; rather, the PNJ’s action in filing this suit is little different in substance from appealing to a police supervisor to overrule an inferior whose actions were detrimental to the church. Does anyone seriously imagine that the PNJ’s action is tantamount to the church seeking to use the power of the sword when, in fact, the PNJ only appeals to a “higher sword” to restrain a “lower sword?”

B. The Confessional and Historical Witness

While WCF XXIII has undergone major changes since the seventeenth century, it still retains in its present form a very full witness to the power and responsibilities of the state. Section 3 is particularly germane to our consideration
of the question: What should the posture of the state be towards the church? “As nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord ... in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger.” The state of New Jersey has failed to fulfill the obligations that those of us who subscribe to the Standards believe that it must fulfill. They have not only not protected the church but have led the attack against it. The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, though variously construed by the Supreme Court these days, seems to afford a protection to the church that the State of New Jersey denies. In our country, the Federal Court has authority to interpret the U.S. Constitution and the state of New Jersey acknowledges that and submits to that. If a higher magistrate is willing to fulfill the obligations that are his according to the Standards, how can the PNJ’s appealing to him to do what it believe God wants him to do be in error?

WCF XXIII.4 tells us that “Infidelity, or difference in religion doth not make void the magistrates’ just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to them: from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted ... .” The PNJ desires to be in proper submission to the legitimate commands of the state. The PNJ does not believe that it can flout the law because the state is inimical to Christianity in its outlook. Since we are commanded by Paul to “live peaceably with all men” (Romans 12:18), why can not the PNJ take a route that it firmly believes to be biblical and confessional, rather than adopt the tactic of Thoreau, Ghandi, and King—the stratagem of “civil disobedience?” As a church, the PNJ has a responsibility under the Larger Catechism’s exposition of the fifth commandment to pay all the due respect that it can to the state (127-128). The state has passed a law that it has no authority to pass according to the U.S. Constitution. The actions of the PNJ are calculated to strike the best balance between showing proper respect for the state while at the same time making it clear that the PNJ cannot countenance laws passed by the state that infringe on church power. It is because the state exercises power proper to it that the PNJ humbly expresses its dissent by a vehicle that recognizes the separate powers granted by our sovereign God to both church and state.

IV THE LIMITS OF THE POWER OF THE CHURCH

A. The Biblical Witness

Though the distinction between the power of the state and the power of the church finds its fullest expression in the New Testament, distinctions are made in the Old Testament among the offices of prophet, priest, and king. Each of those three offices had functions appropriate to it that were exclusive of the others. All of this is to say that there has always been a limitation on any given office by the duties and prerogatives of the other offices. We find several instances on the limit of the office of king that may prove helpful in seeing biblical limits on the power of the state, that office most closely corresponding to that of the civil magistrate.

Perhaps the clearest encroachment of kingly power on the prerogatives of the priesthood occurred in II Chronicles 26:16ff. We read that King Uzziah usurped
the privilege that belonged to the priests alone of entering into the temple of the Lord to burn incense on the altar of incense. Azariah and the other priests withstood Uzziah's transgression against the Lord, saying, "It is not for you, Uzziah, to burn incense to the Lord but for the priests of Aaron, who are consecrated to burn incense. Get out of the sanctuary, for you have trespassed! You shall have no honor from the Lord God" (v. 18). The Lord brought immediate judgment upon Uzziah: Leprosy broke out on his forehead and he remained a leper the rest of his life (vv. 19-21).

The PNJ believes that the governor and legislature of the state of New Jersey have done no less. By the law that they have passed, they have come to the very Table of the Lord and presumed to preside at it. They have become moral lepers. Their action places them in the study of the pastor as he prepares his sermon, in the room with the session as they deal with the sexual sinner, and on call with the chaplain as he visits the AIDS patient in the hospital. The State of New Jersey has made the church's business its business. They have assumed to themselves the administration of the keys of the kingdom. It is alleged that by the PNJ's action it both gives up the keys and takes the sword. Such charges (contradictory as they are) have herein been answered. The PNJ strenuously maintains is that under no circumstances will it yield the keys; thus it has taken the action that it has as the best way of peaceably resisting the encroachments of the state upon the church.

Even as the apostles withstood the Sanhedrin in its command to refrain from preaching the gospel, the PNJ resists the unjust law of New Jersey. The PNJ should not be so fearful of falling into the error of churches that have clearly exceeded church power that it fails to act in a way both scriptural and confessional, simply allowing the situation to grow worse and worse. Some have indicated that they fear that the PNJ has adopted an "activist" stance and politicized the pulpit. The PNJ does not seek to forward any political agenda or program. Its ministers only want to preach the gospel. However, the PNJ does not simply rush headlong to the opposite extreme: the PNJ refuses to give up the belief that the church is to have a prophetic voice in our society. This lawsuit has proven to be a strong witness of this presbytery to the jurists before whom it has come. Is it wise or right to put the members of our congregations at risk of severe civil penalties when the PNJ believes that the Federal courts would not allow this atrocious law if they only knew about it? If the Federal Courts rule that the U.S. Constitution does not afford the church the protection that it appears to give it, then the PNJ will know where it stands and know that it has done everything as a church to secure the protection that Orthodox Presbyterians believe that the state owes to the church.

B. The Confessional and Historical Witness

WCF XXIII.3 reads, "Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or, in the least, interfere in matters of faith." Does anything more need to be said than this? Surely our opponents would say, "Yes, you may preach this as the role of the magistrate, but you can do nothing more than this." The PNJ cannot make a humble petition to have the situation reversed? To which some reply, "Yes, but only to the legislature or the executive. Not to the judiciary." But can we not appeal to the civil magistrate for security or protection? Our church documents must be revised if the PNJ's actions are to be ruled illegal. The Standards are clear
about the role of the magistrate: He is to provide protection for the church, but he
is not to interfere in anything ecclesiastical. The PNJ's opponents would reply that
we cannot appeal to one arm of the civil magistrate to restrain the actions of another.
Why not? Can such a position be maintained from anything in our constitution? The
PNJ does not think so.

It is the PNJ's contention that if the General Assembly rules the PNJ's
actions unconstitutional, then the General Assembly will, in effect, be amending the
constitution without due process. Any amendments to the Westminster Standards
and the FG restricting church judicatories from taking the action that the PNJ has
would have no effect on the current case, as they would be ex post facto restrictions.
The General Assembly is thus bound to find the action of the PNJ to enter into a
lawsuit to be a legal action.

Opponents of the PNJ's action have maintained that it is incumbent on the
Presbytery of New Jersey to prove that its actions are constitutional, and are in
keeping with the regulative principle (WCF XXI.1). The PNJ believes that it has done
so in this defense. The PNJ's action, however, does not contravene the regulative
principle, because it is not "contrary to the Word of God or beside it" (WCF XX.2).
It is an action fully in accord with the Scripture and the standards, which recognize
"that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government
of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by
the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the
word, which are always to be observed" (WCF I.4). The PNJ rejects the notion that
the regulative principle places the burden of proof on the PNJ to demonstrate that
actions it believes to be biblical are, in fact, biblical. It is not incumbent on a
judicatory to show that its action is not in violation of the Word of God. Rather the
burden of proof rests, as it ordinarily does, with those parties that allege that the
PNJ's action is in violation of the Scriptures and the subordinate standards.

WCF XXIII.3 further reads, "As Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular
government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should
interfere with, let, or hinder the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary mem-
bers of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and
belief. ... It is the duty of civil magistrates to take order that all religious and
ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance." If the state of
New Jersey has failed in its duty to see that the Presbytery of New Jersey meet
without molestation or disturbance, it is still the duty of the civil magistrate to do so,
and it is the duty of the federal magistrate to maintain that duty if the state magistrate
fails. That is why the PNJ calls upon the U.S. District Court. Should the church not
give them an opportunity to uphold their God-given duty and to escape judgment.
Since a law of the commonwealth has been passed that interferes with the due
exercise of gospel ministry here in New Jersey, the government stands under the
condemnation of the LORD GOD ALMIGHTY. Since the legislature and governor
of New Jersey have failed to heed the voice of the righteous, the PNJ turns to the
judiciary as its last civil resort, praying that God will grant them repentance and that
the State of New Jersey make no further laws that interfere in the affairs of the
church.
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His views on the limited power of the state and the absolute separation of church and state would not comport with the actions taken by the State of New Jersey. For those that maintain that either Dr. Machen or Dr. Woolley would not have objected to an individual, as opposed to a church, taking the action against the state that the PNJ has, the Presbytery responds by pointing out that it is only the church as the church that has any legal standing in this matter. Individual pleadings for exemption from New Jersey’s law would leave the question of enforcing the law against the church untouched. It is only the church as a church that can as a plaintiff file a petition to achieve the relief sought.
J. Bannerman, Op. Cit., p. 201: “The civil magistrate denies or detracts from the right of Christ as Head of His Church, when he interferes with those matters in the Church in which Christ claims to act Himself, or usurps that authority which Christ claims to exercise Himself.” Bannerman makes it clear repeatedly that the church must avoid giving up its rightful power and existing under an Erastian scheme and that it must also avoid grasping the state’s rightful power as does the Roman Catholic Church.


Charles Hodge, *Discussions in Church Polity* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1878), pp. 100-118 contain a fine discussion of Hodge’s views on the limits of church power and the proper relation of the church and the state. Hodge writes that the “New Testament ... does not teach that the magistrate is entitled to take care ... that proper persons be admitted, and improper persons rejected from the church,” pp. 117-18. Hodge would scarcely have approved of the state telling the church what to do in such a situation as the PNJ finds itself, though he perfectly well supported the church in instructing the civil magistrate to enforce the Sabbath, *Systematic Theology*, v. 3 (rpt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), pp. 340-8.

Candlish, Op. Cit., pp. 321-34. Candlish could not abide either the identity of church and state or the alliance of the two. He did not believe that the state should exercise control over the church as the State of New Jersey has attempted to do.


I believe the 59th GA encouraged interested individuals to contact you about the view they hold concerning the lawsuit the Presbytery of NJ has brought against the state of NJ. If I am wrong, please forgive this intrusion. I have some interest in the matter because I served on the Presbyterial Record Committee and voted not to find an exception to the minutes of NJ.

The issue which I think the next GA will have to face is whether there has been a violation of the standards of the church, specifically those cited by the minority of the committee. Those alleged violations depend on how one interprets the Westminster Confession, Chapter XXV.6 (and Form of Government, Chapter I) and Westminster Confession, Chapter XXXI.4 (and Form of Government, Chapter III.3 and 4).

The latter ground (WCF XXXI.4; FG III.3 & 4) seems to me more compelling because of the interpretation some give to it and so I would offer the following observations:

1. The plain context of the verbs “handle” and “conclude” is the previous article where doctrinal deliverances are in view. The natural interpretation of the first part of XXXI.4 is that only ecclesiastical deliverances are to be handed down by synods. That is, synods should confine themselves to church doctrine and discipline, but not such civil matters as foreign policy, etc.

2. Intermeddling with civil affairs is forbidden synods and councils with the following qualifications: a) that the civil affair in question “concern the commonwealth”; b) that humble petition is allowable in extraordinary cases; c) that advice may be given when required.

3. One important document for interpreting this section in historical context is the Irish Article of Religion, 1615 (see Chaff, vol III, p. 526ff). It has been said of these articles that “they are still more important as the connecting link between the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession, and as the chief source of the latter.” (See Chaff)

4. Irish articles 59 and 60 (under the section pertaining to the civil magistrate) speak to the lack of authority the Pope has to “depose the King, or dispose any of his kingdoms or dominions; or to authorize any other prince to invade or annoy him or his countries . . . raise tumult . . . “ or to have monarchs that are excommunicated “murdered by their subjects.”

A natural deduction from these observations is that the “intermeddling” which is forbidden in the Confession concerns the church using leverage, ad did the Papacy, to change the political order in ways that the civil magistrate himself did not recognize. Some of the debates at the Westminster Assembly over Erastianism and excommunication may reflect the high sensitivity magistrates had about the church’s
ability to determine who were Christians in an era when being a Christian was the presupposition of holding political office. A civil suit by a church court (assuming this was possible), would if anything, be less revolutionary in its impact that excommunication of a monarch. Parliament and the Assembly were at loggerheads of some of these issues about excommunication.

In observation 2. above, the intermeddling which is forbidden is that which “concerns the commonwealth.” Though it may be argued that the church is part of the commonwealth, that is only true with respect to its interests in real estate, legal incorporation, etc. The content of the church’s message is not something, which in this sense, is a concern of the commonwealth.

These comments above are not the only reason I find the second ground unconvincing. The artificial distinction between plaintiff and defendant has already been argued as well as the possibility of regarding the lawsuit as a form of humble petition.

Concerning the first ground, it seems to me that there is no concession of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the state unless one is prepared to forgo being a defendant as well, and thereby not hire an attorney, make any defense, or even show up in court except by force. We assume that those finding exception to the action of presbytery will grant that one may properly appear in civil court as defendant with a lawyer who is an officer of the court. What then of the right to appeal if the decision is unsatisfactory (e.g., Paul)? When the category of appellant is added, the distinction between plaintiff and defendant seems even more artificial. The distinctive thing a plaintiff does, is initiate the action in the civil court. It has already been noted that this is merely a response to an act of the civil government in its legislation. It is perhaps at this point the debate should focus.

In the Disruption of 1843, the evangelical party which became the Free Church of Scotland lost in a civil court and apparently carried its case on appeal to the House of Lords. There was no doubt in the mind of those concerned that the issue (congregational right to consent to its minister) was ecclesiastical. This party was, if anything, closer than the OPC to the Westminster Divines in its understanding of the church-state relationship. If I understand the positions properly, both the Free Church party and the Westminster Divines would allow the legitimacy and desirability of an established church in the state. They would not agree to giving ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the magistrate, but would expect the magistrate to protect the church. It is as protector of the church, not as definer of the church, that the state may be appealed to. In that vein, we may regard the first amendment as a thing worthy of being used as a valid and God-honoring law of our civil magistrate (at least as it was originally given and understood).

Sincerely,
Stuart Jones

Attachment 2 to “The Biblical and Confessional Rationale . . . “

[Ed. Note: The following was originally framed as a letter to the Editor of New Horizons.]
In The Matter Of:
Presbytery of New Jersey, Petitioner, and Role of the Magistrate

COMES NOW Bradley J. Kelley of Battle Mountain, NV
WHEREAS, the writer is a police officer and a member of the OPC, and is naturally concerned with the role of the magistrate in our society, and;
WHEREAS, the last 6 months has witnessed much comment in the New Horizons regarding the method of action of the Presbytery of New Jersey in dealing with the law, and;
WHEREAS, unsubstantiated claims have been made against the standing of PETITIONERS in this case, and certain fathers and brethren have insisted that wrong methods of resolution have been employed resulting in the violation of confessional subordinate standards of the OPC, and;
WHEREAS, an urgent need to define the facts of this issue for the general membership of the church (hereinafter known as the SHEEP) is of the utmost importance, and furthermore to contend for righteousness in the face of opposition.
HERENOW, certain facts are brought to the SHEEP:
WHEREAS,
1) the English language circa 1650 needs to be examined in light of modern usage and our contemporary system of jurisprudence. Several words, relevant to this issue, have changed in nuance over the years. These are, law suit, petitioner, and equity. In addition, a basic understanding of the system of jurisprudence in operation at the time the Confession was written must be understood in light of how our present system functions.
WHEREAS, the American system of jurisprudence developed from the English system and in its present form differs somewhat from that system. The English system contains two courts - a Law court and an Equity or Chancery court. Courts of Equity in England can deal with certain injustices, or inequities created by a rigorous application of the law. Relief from those strict applications is sought in this court.
The present American system incorporates both courts. An American court can sit either as a court of law or a court of equity at different times. When an individual or a group PETITIONS the court for relief from the strict application of the law in their circumstance, the court sits in equity. The legal mechanism provided for seeking this relief is simply termed a "suit." The remedy requested is termed "injunctive relief." In this case, the law is not changed. Relief from the law is granted to an individual or to a group. A "petition" is simply a written instrument containing a prayer from an individual or group presenting it. This individual or group is called "the petitioner." The petition is addressed to a court which has authority to redress the apparent injustice. Another definition of a petition is, "a formally drawn up request or supplication from an individual or body of INFERI-
ORS to a SUPERIOR, soliciting some mercy or redress of some wrong or grievance.”
Such a petition is necessarily humble by virtue of the position of the petitioner with respect to the court and the manner and form in which the petition is made. The language of the Confession of Faith may well have contemplated the Church’s petitioning of the civil courts. The word “petition” was regularly used in the 17th century for the bringing of matters before equity courts. The Presbytery of N. J. has in no way violated an express or implied stricture in the subordinate standards by filing a suit for injunctive relief. Such a suit is precisely a “humble petition.”

WHEREAS this is an extraordinary case. What is truly extraordinary in this matter is the gross interference in the affairs of the Church perpetrated by the magistrate in violation of Constitutional guarantees and contrary to our subordinate standards in that the magistrate “may not in the least interfere in matters of faith. He shall guarantee that all ecclesiastical persons shall enjoy full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ has appointed a regular government and discipline in His Church, no law of any commonwealth shall interfere with ... or hinder the due exercise thereof.” (Westminster Confession XXIII.3) Scottish Presbyterianism has always held the magistrate to the strict performance of his covenanted duties and obligations with respect to the Church.

WHEREAS time is of the essence. A course of delay by the Church to deal directly with the courts will inevitably lead to the Church’s violation of statute law set down by the magistrate whom we are commanded to obey. By humbly addressing the courts, in the manner provided for by law, the Church evidences respect for the law, and attempts to preempt its own certain violation of existing statute law.

WHEREAS the notion of the spirituality of the Church must not be so narrowly defined as to preclude the Church from addressing the magistrate when he claims authority over the Church. The Church must not permit the magistrate to press such a claim. The spirituality of the Church is directly impacted by the action of the State of New Jersey. Confessional Presbyterians have always contended that, “There is no other Head of the Church than the Lord Jesus Christ” (nor can the State of New Jersey “in any sense be head thereof.” (Westminster Confession XXV.6 adapted) This is not a case of the Church meddling with civil affairs. Quite the contrary, it has to do with the character of the Church as a spiritual government under Christ and with the illegitimate claim of the magistrate to rights of Headship. John Knox contended boldly with Queen Mary who pressed her claim to be Head of the Church and interfere with her liberties. If Knox were alive today, would not the thundering voice of that noble Reformer be heard in our civil courts challenging the claim of the magistrate?

WHEREAS to humbly petition the civil magistrate has differing implications according to which branch of Government one addresses. If one petitions the executive, he communicates with one who can either propose a law or veto one that has been passed. The petition to the executive is an attempt to persuade him to exercise his authority in behalf of some cause. The same can be said of the legislative branch. A lawmaker or an assembly of lawmakers can be petitioned by letter or by a face to face meeting to pass favorable legislation or to oppose adverse legislation.
The third branch of government, the judicial, has an entirely different character as far as persuasion. A judge cannot initiate a case, no matter how deeply he feels about an apparent injustice. He cannot bring a matter to law. It must be brought before him. A case must be initiated so that he can be petitioned to administer justice. He too is humbly petitioned only in the proper manner. The language of the Standards does not restrict the Church as to which branches of government may be addressed by a humble petition. The legal proceeding initiated by the Presbytery of N. J. is in the form of a lawsuit because that is the only vehicle by which the Presbytery can humbly petition the judicial branch of government for equity relief from an oppressive law.
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STATISTICAL REPORTS OF THE CHURCHES
For the Year Ending December 31, 1992
# Regional Church of the Dakotas

## Colorado

### Denver, PROVIDENCE
- Thorpe, NURSE (a)
- 4100 E. Warren Ave. (nml)
- Leonard J. Coppes
- 105,279
- 3,810
- 109,089
- 2
- 0

### Denver, TRINITY
- Caney, CANEY OPC
- 206 N. Vine St.
- LeRoy E. Miller
- 30,524
- 1,607
- 30,524
- 2
- 1

### Thornton, IMMANUEL
- 9261 Clayton St.
- Richard Wynja
- 22,000
- 1,222
- 22,000
- 2
- 0

## Kansas

### Caney, CANEY OPC
- 206 N. Vine St.
- Leroy E. Miller
- 5,220
- 1,000
- 0

### Overland Park, PARK WOODS
- Cottonwood Point Elem. (nm)
- T. Jeffrey Taylor
- 242
- 1,144
- 0

## Nebraska

### Lincoln, FAITH
- 5640 Salt Valley View
- 40,207
- 1,026
- 48,217
- 2
- 2

## North Dakota

### Carson, BETHEL
- 601 Grant St.
- 39,523
- 12,965
- 53,309
- 6
- 0

### South Dakota

### Bancroft, MURDOCK MEMORIAL
- Main St.
- Edward A. Eppinger
- 21,747
- 23,516
- 6
- 0

### Bridgewater, TRINITY
- 2nd & Poplar
- Carl A. P. Durham
- 26,806
- 813
- 3
- 1
### SOUTH DAKOTA, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE at</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (nr = no mail)</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>C.M.  P/F  R/F  L/T  Dth  Dml  D&amp;E  C.M.  AM Worship,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td>B.C.  Bap Par  P/F  Dth  Dml  D&amp;E  B.C.  Sun. School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other(_)</td>
<td>Total (+) (--) Total (May) (Nov)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.</td>
<td>Note: The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.</td>
<td>Note: Members are on the roll of the regional church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hamill, WESTMINSTER        | 44 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 47 60 58 29,183 36,619 | 3 4          |                           |                 |
| WC 89, Box 4               | 23 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 28 29 35 7,436 779 | 2            |                           |                 |
| Mark J. Larson             | 67                                           | 0 0          |                           |                 |
| Volga, CALVARY             | 72 1 0 1 1 0 0 73 65 65 31,848 34,920 | 3 3          |                           |                 |
| 119 3rd St. at Astrachan   | 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 28 43 43 2,238 478 | 6            |                           |                 |
| Joseph Auksela             | 100                                          | 101          |                           |                 |
| Winner, WINNER OPC         | 50 0 0 0 0 2 0 48 41 40 24,933 29,090 | 3 3          |                           |                 |
| 5th & Lincoln St.          | 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 17 23 26 3,962 606 | 2            |                           |                 |
| Vacant                     | 68                                           | 65           |                           |                 |

| WYOMING                    |                                             |               |                           |                 |
| Cheyenne, NORTHWOODS COMMUNITY | 48 4 0 0 0 4 0 48 45 35 59,001 65,233 | 1 0          |                           |                 |
| Daryl Daniels (supply)     | 17 3 0 0 0 6 0 14 30 20 2,131 1,359 | 0            |                           |                 |
| Remaining members of former congregations, others (A) | 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 | 3 |                           |                 |
|                            | 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 7 | 4 |                           |                 |
| TOTALS                     | 552* 17 24 14 6 13 12 576 671 651 514,046 575,503 | 38 19 |                           |                 |
|                            | 244* 16 5 4 0 8 6 247 450 453 48,504 999 | 15 |                           |                 |
|                            | 796* 823 | 12,951 24,365 | 38 19 |                           |                 |
REGионаl CHURCH OF THE DAKOTA'S, Continued

Membership: 16 Ministers; 53 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: March (1st Tuesday); September (4th Tuesday)

Clerk and Moderator: Edward A. Eppinger, Stated Clerk (3/93); LeRoy E. Miller, Moderator (3/93)

Total Congregations: 13 Churches; 0 Unorganized Mission Work

Changes in Congregations: TRINITY, Denver CO organized as a new and separate church 8/8/92

Mission Works: None

Ordinations: Joseph Auksela, 3/23/92

Ministers Received: Sam M. Allison, from the Reformed Church in the U.S., 4/28/91 (not reported last year)
None in 1992

Ministers Removed: Arthur J. Fox, dismissed to the Presbytery of Philadelphia 7/31/92, received 9/19/92
Stephen D. Doe, dismissed to the Presbytery of New York and New England 11/10/92, received 12/11/92
Roswell R. Kamrath, deceased 12/10/92

Ministers Removed:
Arthur J. Fox, dismissed to the Presbytery of Philadelphia 7/31/92, received 9/19/92
Stephen D. Doe, dismissed to the Presbytery of New York and New England 11/10/92, received 12/11/92
Roswell R. Kamrath, deceased 12/10/92

Roll of Ministers:
Sam M. Allison
Edward A. Eppinger
Jonathan D. Male
T. Jeffrey Taylor
Joseph Auksela
Mark T. Harrington
LeRoy E. Miller
Jack K. Unangst, Jr.
Leonard J. Coppes
Richard G. Hodgson
V. Robert Nilson
Gerald I. Williamson
Carl A. P. Durham
Mark J. Larson
Craig R. Rowe

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:
Arthur J. Fox, pastor, WINNER OPC, Winner SD, 7/31/92
Craig R. Rowe, pastor, NORTHWOODS COMMUNITY, Cheyenne WY, 7/31/92
Stephen D. Doe, pastor, FAITH, Lincoln NE, 11/10/92

Ministers Installed:
Sam M. Allison, associate pastor, BETHEL, Carson ND, 4/28/91 (not reported last year)
T. Jeffrey Taylor, pastor, PARK WOODS, Overland Park KS, 1/19/92
Joseph Auksela, pastor, CALVARY, Volga SD, 3/23/92
Jack K. Unangst, Jr., pastor, TRINITY, Denver CO, 8/8/92
Jonathan D. Male, associate pastor to labor at Park Hill, IMMANUEL, Thornton CO, 10/25/92

Licenstes: None

Licentiates Received: Joseph Auksela, from the Presbytery of the Midwest, 3/23/92

Licentiates Removed: Joseph Auksela, ordained 3/23/92

Roll of Licentiates: None
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MID-ATLANTIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>Membership Roll Statistics for the Year 1992</th>
<th>Attendance at</th>
<th>Contributions in 1992 ($)</th>
<th>Church Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin --- Added --- --- Removed --- END</td>
<td>AM Worship,</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F B/F L/T Dth Dml Dl E C.M.</td>
<td>Sun. School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dml Dl E B.C.</td>
<td>(May) (Nov)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) (-- Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MARYLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>General Total Rcvd</th>
<th>R.E. Dea</th>
<th>Benevolence Avg per CM</th>
<th>Capital Imp</th>
<th>Bequests</th>
<th>R.E. Dea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, FIRST</td>
<td>3455 Erdman Ave.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie, TRINITY REFORMED</td>
<td>13600 Annapolis Rd.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtonsville, COVENANT</td>
<td>4515 Sandy Spring Rd.</td>
<td>160*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, COLUMBIA</td>
<td>10001 Route 108</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick, NEW HOPE</td>
<td>216 Carroll Parkway</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laytonsville, PURITAN</td>
<td>6325 Griffith Rd. (nm)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring, KNOX</td>
<td>410 Granville Dr.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NORTH CAROLINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>General Total Rcvd</th>
<th>R.E. Dea</th>
<th>Benevolence Avg per CM</th>
<th>Capital Imp</th>
<th>Bequests</th>
<th>R.E. Dea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, MATTHEWS OPC</td>
<td>2701 Rice Rd.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills River, CHRIST</td>
<td>Mtg. at SDA, Jeffress Rd (nm)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy Davenport</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, PILGRIM</td>
<td>TWCA, 1012 Oberlin Rd. (nm)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cromwell G. Roskamp</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIRGINIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>General Total Rcvd</th>
<th>R.E. Dea</th>
<th>Benevolence Avg per CM</th>
<th>Capital Imp</th>
<th>Bequests</th>
<th>R.E. Dea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, BEREA</td>
<td>229 Main St. (nm)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy H. Gregson</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Appendix
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MID-ATLANTIC, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION (no mail)</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>at AM Worship, General Total Revd Benevolence Avg per CM</td>
<td>SUMMARY: OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml De E C.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dml De E B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA, Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leesburg, BETHEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Mills Rd</td>
<td>65* 6 0 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 66 58 58 68,511 72,061 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Hammond (elect)</td>
<td>30* 2 0 1 0 4 0 27 30 30 3,550 1,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg, GRACE</td>
<td>41 0 2 4 0 0 4 43 80 70 43,600 48,200 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723 Ward’s Ferry Rd.</td>
<td>30 0 2 0 0 0 4 28 80 70 4,600 1,121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Knodel, Jr.</td>
<td>71 71 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manassas, DAYSpring</td>
<td>37 0 2 4 0 0 4 39 38 36 67,049 67,989 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8659 Sudley Rd. (nm)</td>
<td>12 1 7 0 0 3 2 15 34 33 940 1,743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Hall, Jr.</td>
<td>49 49 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke, GARST MILL</td>
<td>27 0 0 0 2 5 0 20 36 35 30,255 30,355 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3739 Willetta Dr. (nm)</td>
<td>26* 0 0 0 0 2 0 24 26 21 100 1,518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard L. Horner</td>
<td>53 53 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain, Grace Chap. (B)</td>
<td>8 1 2 2 0 0 0 10 13 12 12 7,600 8,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Inn, 950 N. Main (nm)</td>
<td>13 1 3 1 0 0 0 6 0 0 1,200 677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Knodel, Jr.</td>
<td>11 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling, STERLING OPC</td>
<td>34 2 2 6 0 3 0 41 56 58 62,966 66,953 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf. Cent. Algonkian Pk. (nm)</td>
<td>18 2 3 0 0 0 0 23 36 40 3,987 1,633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin C. Urban</td>
<td>52 52 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, GRACE</td>
<td>93 0 8 0 1 10 4 86 98 93 96,312 194,930 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2381 Cedar Lane</td>
<td>30 9 0 0 0 1 0 38 60 50 98,618 2,267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert J. Tricarico, Jr.</td>
<td>123 123 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailu Mekonnen (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASHINGTON, D.C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Kidane-Hiwot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3150 Chesapeake St., NW (nm)</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailu Mekonnen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1148* 37 38 38 5 64 21 1171 1353 1354 1,032,663 1,703,474 52 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495* 54 22 12 1 28 20 510 926 988 351,250 1,455 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643* 1681 319,560 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.

* The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.

(A) Members are on the roll of the regional church.

(B) Members are on the roll of GRACE, Lynchburg, VA.
REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MID-ATLANTIC, Continued

Membership: 29 Ministers; 63 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: April (4th Friday and Saturday); September (3rd Friday and Saturday); December (1st Friday and Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: Stuart R. Jones, Stated Clerk (9/94); Richard Kochendarfer, Moderator (9/93)

Total Congregations: 17 Churches; 1 Unorganized Mission Work

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works: Grace, Rocky Mountain VA

Ordinations: None

Ministers Received: John Carrick, from an independent church, 4/24/92

Ministers Removed: None

Roll of Ministers:
John Carrick
Richard N. Ellis
Stephen R. Hake
Stephen G. Hohenberger
Richard E. Knodel, Jr.
David M. Moore
Lyman M. Smith
Edwin C. Urban

Roy Davenport
Douglas A. Felch
George W. Hall, Jr.
Richard L. Horner
Robert L. Myers
Leonard N. Stewart

Elmer M. Dortzbach
Stephen Green
George E. Haney
Stuart R. Jones
Cromwell G. Roskamp
Albert J. Tricarico, Jr.

Robert Y. Eckardt
Timothy M. Gregson
Allen H. Harris
Edward L. Kellogg
Dennis W. Smith

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:
Douglas A. Felch, pastor, BEREA, Leesburg VA, 3/13/92

Ministers Installed:
John Carrick, pastor, MATTHEWS OPC, Matthews NC, 2/24/92

Licensures: None

Licentiates Received: Chip Hammond, from the Presbytery of Philadelphia (PCA), 12/5/92

Licentiates Removed: None

Roll of Licentiates:
Chip Hammond
Mark Hartzell
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### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>CATEGORIES:</th>
<th>SUMMARY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>Benevolence Avg per CM</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH or Mission Work</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</td>
<td>ATTENDANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED----- ---REMOVED----- END</td>
<td>At AM Worship. Sun. School (May) (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>c.M.</td>
<td>P/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt, Grace Chapel (C)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Jr Hi, 5780 W. Holt (nm)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen A. Pribble (org. p.)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo, COMMUNITY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131 Alamo Ave.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth A. Smith</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentwood, Meadow Springs Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 36th St. SE (A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald J. Neumair (e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metamora, PILGRIM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 W. High St.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Stazen II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, Apple Valley (D)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3375 W. Brewster (nm)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William B. Acker (e)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Grove, CALVARY</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 W. Union Ave.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald F. Ritsman</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay, NEW HOPE</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Winchester Way</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan F. Peters</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham, OLD STOCKBRIDGE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1204 Morgan Rd.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael D. Kniep</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janesville, CHRIST</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 N. Wright Rd.</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David W. King</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menomonee Falls, FALLS</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W156 N7356 Pilgrim Rd.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Tolsma</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Church of the Midwest, Continued

#### Membership Roll Statistics for the Year 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pastor</th>
<th>Associate(s), Teacher(s), Other(____)</th>
<th>Evangelist(e), Other(-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, Oostburg</td>
<td>Henry Fikkert (interim)</td>
<td>807 8 0 1 6 6 0 404</td>
<td>500 510 121,814 283,351 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, Sheboygan</td>
<td>Lawrence R. Eyres (st</td>
<td>40 0 0 0 1 0 0 39</td>
<td>40 43 26,254 29,310 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, Zoar</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 4 0 0 3 0 0 17</td>
<td>35 40 2,500 2,500 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, St. Thomas</td>
<td>Theocharis Joannides</td>
<td>8 1 0 0 1 0 0 9</td>
<td>23 22 20,533 21,033 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, S1 Hiawatha</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 1 0 0 1 0 0 8</td>
<td>18 17 500 2,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contributions in 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Categories:</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Worship,</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sun. School</td>
<td>Total Rcvd</td>
<td>n/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Avg per CM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Imp</td>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
- Members are on the roll of the regional church.
- Under the oversight of the session, GRACE, Hanover Park, IL, but not included in their statistics.
- Under the oversight of the session, SPENCER MILLS, Gowen, MI, but not included in their statistics.
- Under the oversight of the session, NEW HOPE, Green Bay, WI, but not included in their statistics.
- Under the oversight of the session, BETHEL, Oostburg WI, but not included in their statistics.
PRESBYTERY OF THE MIDWEST

Membership: 30 Ministers; 148 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: March (3rd Friday and Saturday); September (2nd Friday and Saturday after Labor Day)

Clerk and Moderator: Douglas B. Clawson, Stated Clerk (3/94); Donald F. Stanton, Moderator (3/94)

Total Congregations: 18 Churches; 5 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works:
Hope, Libertyville, IL
Meadow Springs Community, Kentwood, MI
Grace Community, Holt (Lansing), MI
Apple Valley, Appleton, WI
Grace, Sheboygan, WI

Ordinances:

None

Ministers Received:
Jude J. Reardon, from the Presbytery of New York and New England, 9/25/92
Timothy L. Bero, from the Presbytery of the Southwest, 10/11/92

Ministers Removed:
James M. Garretson, dismissed to the Presbytery of the South, received 8/30/92
Calvin R. Malcor, dismissed to the Presbytery of the Northwest, received 11/8/92
James T. Hoekstra, dismissed to the Presbytery of the Southwest, received 12/11/92

Roll of Ministers:
William B. Acker
Douglas B. Clawson
Abd W. Ediger
Theocar A. Ioannides
David L. Melvin
Jude J. Reardon
Kenneth A. Smith
Cornelius Tolma

Victor B. Atallah
David W. Cole
Lawrence R. Eyres
David W. King
Gerald J. Neumaier
Ralph A. Rebandt II
Lendall H. Smith
John R. Wiers

Timothy L. Bero
Dennis L. Desselkoon
Henry H. Fikker
Michael D. Krierim
Jonathan F. Peters
Donald F. Ritsman
Donald F. Stanton

James L. Bosgraf
Leslie A. Dunn
John N. Fikker
Frank J. Marsh
Stephen A. Pribble
William O. Rudolph, Jr.
Peter Stazen II

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:
James M. Garretson, pastor, TRINITY, Chicago IL, 4/30/92
Calvin R. Malcor, pastor, HARVEST, Grand Rapids MI, 10/11/92
James T. Hoekstra, associate pastor, BETHEL, Oostburg WI, 11/2/92

Ministers Installed:
Jude J. Reardon, pastor, COVENANT, Cedar Falls IA, 9/25/92
Timothy L. Bero, associate pastor, COMMUNITY, Kalamazoo MI, 10/11/92
Frank J. Marsh, pastor, SPENCER MILLS, Gowen MI, 10/16/92
James L. Bosgraf, evangelist of presbytery, RHM to Chicago area, 10/18/92

Licenses:
Dale Collison, 9/19/92

Licentiates Received:
None

Licentiates Removed:
Joseph Aukesia, dismissed to the Presbytery of the Dakotas, received 3/23/92
C. Christian Baker, dismissed to Northeast Presbytery, PCA, 3/20/92

Roll of Licentiates:
Dale Collison

William D. Densim
### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)

**Categories:**
- General
- Total Recvd
- Benevolence
- Avg per CH
- Capital
- Imp
- Bequests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE at General Total Rcvd</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ----REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School</td>
<td>General Total Recvd R.E. Dea</td>
<td>n/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml D&amp;E C.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(s), Teacher(s)</td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dml D&amp;E B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(s), Other(_ )</td>
<td>Total (+) Total (-)</td>
<td>(May) (Nov) Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellmawr, IMMANUEL</td>
<td>65 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 2 65 62 85</td>
<td>56,503 70,741</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>R.E. Dea w v m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Dr. &amp; Market St. (nm)</td>
<td>30 2 0 0 2 0 1 0 29 30 35</td>
<td>9,654 1,088</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas D. Church</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton, CALVARY</td>
<td>71 6 0 0 2 2 2 73 96 101</td>
<td>44,267 55,945</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Hitchner Ave.</td>
<td>18 2 0 0 2 0 0 2 16 51 52</td>
<td>9,791 766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn P. Evans</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill, CHERRY HILL OPC</td>
<td>42 3 0 0 0 2 2 2 41 45 45</td>
<td>56,423 68,455</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 S. Coles Ave.</td>
<td>23 0 1 0 0 3 3 3 18 50 50</td>
<td>11,312 1,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter J. Puliatti</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Lawn, GRACE</td>
<td>50 0 0 2 0 1 5 46 56 66</td>
<td>57,760 92,746</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Amsterdam Ave at Ryan Rd</td>
<td>28 0 1 0 0 0 0 4 25 35 31</td>
<td>23,951 2,016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth J. Campbell</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,035</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenchtown, NEW LIFE</td>
<td>44 4 1 0 0 1 10 38 65 59</td>
<td>39,800 53,510</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everittstown Hill Rd.</td>
<td>18 1 0 0 0 0 1 11 8 30 22</td>
<td>13,710 1,408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O. Slack</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackettstown, CHURCH OF THE COVENANT, SDA Ch., Rt. 517</td>
<td>91* 3 3 4 0 0 6 95 133 138</td>
<td>120,000 126,432</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald E. Pearce (nm)</td>
<td>31 3 0 1 0 0 2 31 55 60</td>
<td>4,382 1,331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammonton, NEW LIFE</td>
<td>30 0 0 0 0 2 0 28 57 55</td>
<td>26,070 43,021</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Central Ave. (nm)</td>
<td>23 0 0 0 0 0 0 23 45 47</td>
<td>15,818 1,536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Evangelista (st. supply)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlton, GreenTree (A)</td>
<td>15 1 0 0 0 0 0 16 32 27</td>
<td>25,559 25,559</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Elem School, Kings Grant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Malus (org pas.) (nm)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune, GOOD SHEPHERD</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inactive)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune, GOOD SHEPHERD (inactive)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipsburg, CALVARY COMMUN.</td>
<td>218 3 0 0 3 2 4 212 208 222</td>
<td>154,401 240,368</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Old Church Rd.</td>
<td>139 6 3 1 1 2 0 144 108 116</td>
<td>68,185 1,134</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,782</td>
<td>1,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipsburg, River of Life (B)</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>12,218 14,318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 S. Main St.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2,100 14,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Holmes (intern.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW JERSEY, Continued

#### CHURCH or Mission Work
- **Location (nm = no mail)**
- **Pastor**
- **Associate(s), Teacher(t)**
- **Evangelist(e), Other**

#### MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992
- **BEGIN**
- **+++ADDED+++**
- **+++REMOVED+++**
- **END**
- **C.M.**
- **P/F R/F L/T**
- **Dth Dnl DkE**
- **C.M.**
- **B.C.**
- **Bap Par F/F Dth Dnl DkE**
- **B.C.**
- **Total**
- **(+)**
- **(-)**
- **Total**

#### ATTENDANCE at
- **SUMMARY:**
- **CHURCH**
- **OF PI CERS**
- **R.E. Dea**
- **n/s**

#### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)
- **CATEGORIES:**
- **GENERAL**
- **TOTAL RCEVD**
- **AVG PER CM**
- **CAPITAL IMP**
- **REQUESTS**

---

### EXAMPLE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsgrove, FAITH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>83,283</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daretown Rd., Pole Tavern</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19,977</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David B. Cummings</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>110,379</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringoes, CALVARY</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47,44</td>
<td>41,940</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hwy 202</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21,18</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas A. Watson</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford, STRATFORD OPC</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89,95</td>
<td>69,807</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Warwick Rd. (nm)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24,030</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin L. Dawson</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, GRACE</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56,51</td>
<td>52,688</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416 White Horse Av, Hamilton</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard A. Nelson</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnersville, CROSS KEYS FEL LOWSHIP, Grange Hall, Rt. 555 (nm)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30,192</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan D. Strange</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland, COVENANT</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55,751</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029 E. Landis Ave.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19,732</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Reber</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Collingswood, IMMANUEL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48,837</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm &amp; Calvert Aves. (nm)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16,412</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Currie</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield, GRACE</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73,975</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Boulevard</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36,446</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford M. Sutton, Jr.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whippany, EMMANUEL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54,854</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 Whippany Rd.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24,005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan R. Davis</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood, CALVARY</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32,499</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 E. Rio Grande Ave.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George S. Kostas</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>83,283</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW JERSEY, Continued

#### MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>BEGIN</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>END</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM Worship,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other(_)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rcvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.M.</th>
<th>P/F</th>
<th>R/F</th>
<th>L/T</th>
<th>Dth</th>
<th>Dml</th>
<th>D&amp;E</th>
<th>C.M. AM</th>
<th>Worship, General</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rcvd</th>
<th>R.E.</th>
<th>Dea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>(-)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATTENDANCE CATEGORIES: SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Capital Imp</th>
<th>Bequests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1,136,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>328,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>159,168</td>
<td>22,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Total Rcvd</th>
<th>Benevolence Avg per CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td>1,136,827</td>
<td>1,624,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>328,445</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>159,168</td>
<td>22,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
- The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.
- Members are on the roll of the regional church.
- Members are on the roll of CALVARY, Phillipsburg.
REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW JERSEY, Continued

Membership: 31 Ministers; 75 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: February (4th Saturday); April (4th Tuesday); September (4th Saturday); December (1st Tuesday)

Clerk and Moderator: Richard A. Barker, Stated Clerk (9/93); Ronald E. Pearce, Moderator (9/93)

Total Congregations: 19 Churches; 2 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works: Greentree, Marlton, NJ
River of Life, Phillipsburg, NJ


Ministers Received: None

Ministers Removed:
L. Kenneth Bash, dismissed to Presbytery of Susquehanna Valley (PCA), 9/26/92
Douglas Rogers, removed at own request, 9/26/92
Theodore Hard, dismissed to the Presbytery of Ohio, received 10/17/92
Allen D. Curry, dismissed to the Presbytery of the South, received 10/24/92

Roll of Ministers:
Samuel H. Bacon
George S. Christian
Howard Currie
Glenn F. Evans
George S. Kostas
LeRoy B. Oliver
Charles F. Robbins, IV
Donald H. Taws
W. Lee Benson
Thomas D. Church
Ivan R. Davis
Richard B. Gaffin, Sr.
Gerald P. Malik
Ronald E. Pearce
William O. Slack, II
Harry W. Warner
Kenneth J. Campbell
Harvie M. Conn
Martin L. Dawson
Ross W. Graham
Robert L. Marshall
Peter J. Puliatti
Alan D. Strange
Douglas A. Watson
Leonard F. Chanoux
David B. Cummings
David F. Elmer
Meredith G. Kline
Richard A. Nelson
James W. Reber
Stanford M. Sutton, Jr.

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:
Donald H. Taws, pastor, CALVARY COMMUNITY, Phillipsburg NJ, 10/1/92

Ministers Installed:
William O. Slack, II, pastor, NEW LIFE, Frenchtown NJ, 3/29/92

Licenses:
Charles K. Telfer, 2/22/92

Licentiates Received: None

Licentiates Removed:
John Vroegindewe, dismissed to the Presbytery of Northern California 2/22/92, received 3/21/92

Roll of Licentiates: Charles K. Telfer
### Connecticut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
<th>Pastor(s)</th>
<th>Associate(s)</th>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Evangelist</th>
<th>Other(s)</th>
<th>Total Attendance (1992)</th>
<th>Contributions (1992) ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>WESTMINSTER</td>
<td>Richard W. Campbell (t)</td>
<td>565 Shepard Ave.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>William B. Kessler</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
<th>Pastor(s)</th>
<th>Associate(s)</th>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Evangelist</th>
<th>Other(s)</th>
<th>Total Attendance (1992)</th>
<th>Contributions (1992) ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>PILGRIM</td>
<td>Jonathan B. Falk</td>
<td>375 Mt. Hope Ave.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath/Brunswick</td>
<td>OPC (B)</td>
<td>Richard M. Dickinson (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>Donald R. Miller</td>
<td>91 College St.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>SECOND PARISH</td>
<td>John R. Hillibink</td>
<td>32 Neal St.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockport</td>
<td>LAKEVIEW</td>
<td>Randolph B. Patterson</td>
<td>Rt. 17 &amp; Rockville St.</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skowhegan</td>
<td>SKOWHEGAN OPC</td>
<td>Harold L. Dorman</td>
<td>50 North Ave. (nm)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH or Mission Work</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</td>
<td>ATTENDANCE at</td>
<td>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</td>
<td>CHURCH OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>---ADDED---</td>
<td>END</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total Rcvd</td>
<td>Benevolence Avg per CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M.</td>
<td>P/F</td>
<td>R/F</td>
<td>L/T</td>
<td>Dth Del DeE</td>
<td>C.M.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bap</td>
<td>Par</td>
<td>R/F</td>
<td>Dth Del DeE</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Capital Im</td>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Peace (A)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Saint Botolph St. (nm)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert H. Tannie (e)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Saint Botolph St. (nm)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Kern (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River, GRACE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 Cherry St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell L. Rockey (st. supply)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich, FIRST</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 County Rd.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M. Wingard</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Andover, MERRIMACK</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY COMMUNITY CHURCH</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson Elementary School</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Van Meerbeke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hadley, NEW LIFE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 Granby Rd.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John K. Pederson</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Barnstable, CAPE COD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2391 Iyanough Rd.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert S. Rienstra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell L. Rockey (emeritus)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam, COVENANT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Trinity Place (nm)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David G. Barker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Square, FRANKLIN SQ.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin &amp; Sobo Aves.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shishko</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon, LISBON OPC</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon-Flackville Rd. (nm)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence W. Veinott</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Vernon, WESTCHESTER</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 W. Sydney Ave.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[2]= reinstated members
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND, Continued

#### CHURCH or Mission Work
- **Location (nm = no mail)**
- **Pastor**
- **Associate (a), Teacher (t)**
- **Evangelist (e), Other (-)**

#### MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>BEGIN ---ADDED---</th>
<th>---REMOVED---</th>
<th>END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/P L/T</td>
<td>Dth Oml D&amp;E</td>
<td>C.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, COVENANT</td>
<td>84* 5 0 1 1 8 1 78</td>
<td>105 97</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201 Dewey Ave</td>
<td>56* 2 0 1 0 6 0 53</td>
<td>75 75</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth M. Campbell</td>
<td>142*</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, MEMORIAL</td>
<td>81 2 4 2 0 0 0 87</td>
<td>77 82</td>
<td>58,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650 Merchants Rd.</td>
<td>28 1 4 0 0 0 0 31</td>
<td>42 45</td>
<td>22,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady, CALVARY</td>
<td>84* 5 4 0 1 2 3 87</td>
<td>71 66</td>
<td>57,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 Rugby Rd.</td>
<td>21 0 0 3 0 0 0 18</td>
<td>49 44</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Gorrell</td>
<td>105*</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island, Hope (A)</td>
<td>24 3 0 0 0 9 0 18</td>
<td>52 63</td>
<td>54,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942 Huguenot Ave. (nm)</td>
<td>25 4 0 0 0 11 0 18</td>
<td>47 46</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre, COVENANT</td>
<td>33 3 0 0 0 2 0 34</td>
<td>48 48</td>
<td>30,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaulding B.S., Ayres St. (nm)</td>
<td>24 5 0 1 0 4 0 24</td>
<td>33 33</td>
<td>9,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen D. Doe</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston, CH. OF THE SERVANT</td>
<td>25 2 0 2 0 1 3 25</td>
<td>44 36</td>
<td>20,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA, Rt. 2A, S of I-89 (nm)</td>
<td>26 3 0 0 0 3 0 26</td>
<td>20 22</td>
<td>2,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis W. Smith</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</td>
<td>9 0 0 0 0 0 0 9</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1350*</td>
<td>82 69 38 12 70 31 1426 1734 1869 1,297,280 1,802,194</td>
<td>76 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012*</td>
<td>58 44 17 0 38 17 692 1066 1187 309,483 1,264 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018*</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>195,433</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)
- **Categories:**
  - Summary: Officers
  - Total: R.E. Dea

### CHURCH OFFICERS
- **Summary:**
  - General
  - Total: R.E. Dea

**Notes:**
- Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
- The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.
- (A) Members are on the roll of the regional church.
- (B) Parent church is SECOND PARISH, Portland, ME.
- (C) Under the oversight of the session, TRINITY, Lewiston, ME, but not included in their statistics.
REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND, Continued

Membership: 40 Ministers; 95 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: April (normally 1st Friday, Saturday); October (normally 1st Monday, Tuesday)

Clerk and Moderator: Stephen L. Phillips, Stated Clerk (10/93); Robert W. Eckardt, Moderator (10/93)

Total Congregations: 21 Churches; 4 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: CHURCH OF THE SERVANT moved from Essex Junction to Williston VT

Mission Works:
- OPC, Bath/Brunswick ME
- Maple Grove Reformed Fellowship, Maple Grove ME
- Peace, Boston MA
- Hope, Staten Island NY

Ordinations:
- Samuel N. Folta, 8/2/92
- William J. Gorrell, 11/7/92

Ministers Received:
- Gary B. Magur, from the Florida Presbytery (ARPC) 8/29/92
- Stephen D. Doe, from the Presbytery of the Dakotas 12/11/92

Ministers Removed:
- Jude J. Reardon, dismissed to the Presbytery of the Midwest, received 9/25/92

Roll of Ministers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel N. Folta</td>
<td>8/2/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary B. Magur</td>
<td>8/29/92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory E. Reynolds</td>
<td>WESTCHESTER</td>
<td>4/1/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude J. Reardon</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>5/3/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymon E. Commeret</td>
<td>COVENANT</td>
<td>6/30/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael W. Bobick</td>
<td>EVANGELIST/PASTOR</td>
<td>9/1/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen D. Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth M. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ministers Installed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel N. Folta</td>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>8/2/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary B. Magur</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>8/29/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Gorrell</td>
<td>CALVARY</td>
<td>11/7/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen D. Doe</td>
<td>COVENANT</td>
<td>12/11/92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Licencures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel N. Folta</td>
<td>4/22/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Gorrell</td>
<td>8/7/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger W. Banes</td>
<td>8/16/92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Licentiates Received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William J. Gorrell</td>
<td>KENTUCKY-tennessee</td>
<td>8/7/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger W. Banes</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/16/92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Licentiates Removed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel N. Folta</td>
<td>8/2/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Gorrell</td>
<td>11/7/92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roll of Licentiates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Name</th>
<th>Ordination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger W. Banes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael G. Fettus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey C. Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Church of Northern California

### Attendance Statistics for the Year 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>Attendance (May)</th>
<th>Attendance (Nov)</th>
<th>Total (May)</th>
<th>Total (Nov)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antioch, Delta Oaks (A)</td>
<td>102 96</td>
<td>118 115</td>
<td>108 99</td>
<td>119 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Cavallo Rd.</td>
<td>12 67</td>
<td>18 73</td>
<td>18 69</td>
<td>18 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin R. Ban (e)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, COVENANT</td>
<td>26 23</td>
<td>28 25</td>
<td>27 23</td>
<td>28 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623 University Ave.</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard M. Lewis</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian H. Nicolson (a)</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford, New Hope (A)</td>
<td>38 51</td>
<td>38 51</td>
<td>38 51</td>
<td>38 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redington and Elm Sts. (nm)</td>
<td>21 0</td>
<td>21 0</td>
<td>21 0</td>
<td>21 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Needham (st. supply)</td>
<td>59 0</td>
<td>59 0</td>
<td>59 0</td>
<td>59 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto, GRACE</td>
<td>27 24</td>
<td>27 24</td>
<td>27 24</td>
<td>27 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448 Standiford Ave.</td>
<td>76 0</td>
<td>76 0</td>
<td>76 0</td>
<td>76 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novato, TRINITY</td>
<td>47 24</td>
<td>47 24</td>
<td>47 24</td>
<td>47 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA at 495 San Marin Dr (nm)</td>
<td>13 0</td>
<td>13 0</td>
<td>13 0</td>
<td>13 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Miller</td>
<td>50 0</td>
<td>50 0</td>
<td>50 0</td>
<td>50 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, FIRST</td>
<td>32 40</td>
<td>32 40</td>
<td>32 40</td>
<td>32 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 Lawton St.</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>11 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. McLhenny</td>
<td>43 0</td>
<td>43 0</td>
<td>43 0</td>
<td>43 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, COVENANT</td>
<td>101 115</td>
<td>101 115</td>
<td>101 115</td>
<td>101 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350 Leigh Ave.</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>11 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery A. Landis</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz, WESTMINSTER</td>
<td>18 20</td>
<td>18 20</td>
<td>18 20</td>
<td>18 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2245 Capitol Rd.</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>22 0</td>
<td>22 0</td>
<td>22 0</td>
<td>22 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora, CALVARY</td>
<td>39 33</td>
<td>39 33</td>
<td>39 33</td>
<td>39 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14892 Peaceful Valley Rd.</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>14 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vroegendewey</td>
<td>53 0</td>
<td>53 0</td>
<td>53 0</td>
<td>53 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. San Francisco, NEW COVENANT</td>
<td>47 63</td>
<td>47 63</td>
<td>47 63</td>
<td>47 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 Country Club Dr.</td>
<td>11 27</td>
<td>11 27</td>
<td>11 27</td>
<td>11 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl E. Erickson</td>
<td>58 0</td>
<td>58 0</td>
<td>58 0</td>
<td>58 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale, FIRST</td>
<td>93 105</td>
<td>93 105</td>
<td>93 105</td>
<td>93 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110 Brookfield Ave.</td>
<td>42 45</td>
<td>42 45</td>
<td>42 45</td>
<td>42 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred G. Buchanan, Jr.</td>
<td>135 17,061</td>
<td>135 17,061</td>
<td>135 17,061</td>
<td>135 17,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH or Mission Work Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</td>
<td>ATTENDANCE at</td>
<td>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</td>
<td>CHURCH OFFICERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ----REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>AM Worship,</td>
<td>CATEGORIES: SUMMARY:</td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml DlE C.M.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total Rcvd</td>
<td>n/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dml DlE B.C.</td>
<td>Sun. School</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td>(May) (Nov)</td>
<td>Avg per CM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Imp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Mountain, Grace (B)</td>
<td>[18] 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 18] 30 30 51,469 53,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th St., between Broad and Reese (nm)</td>
<td>[9] 1 2 0 0 0 0 12] 30 30 2,273 2,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 0 0 0 0 1 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>548* 17 25 55 4 45 35 561 673 713 670,792 783,564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>229* 19 50 1 0 36 17 244 351 348 94,461 1,397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>777*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
(A) Members are on the roll of the regional church.
(B) Members are on the roll of COVENANT, Berkeley CA
PRESBYTERY OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, Continued

Membership: 15 Ministers; 31 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: March (3rd Friday and Saturday); September (4th Friday and Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: William J. Fredericks, Stated Clerk (3/95); Salvador M. Solis, Moderator (3/94)

Total Congregations: 9 Churches; 3 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works: Delta Oaks, Antioch, CA
New Hope, Hanford, CA
Grace, Battle Mountain, NV

Ordinations: John Vroegindewey, 5/29/92

Ministers Received: None

Ministers Removed: Chong (Charles) Y. Lee, dismissed to the Presbytery of Southern California, received 4/3/92

Roll of Ministers:
- Martin R. Ban
- Donald G. Buchanan, Jr.
- Carl E. Erickson
- William J. Fredericks
- Robert H. Graham
- Jeffery A. Landis
- Gerald G. Latal
- Richard M. Lewis
- Charles A. McIlhenny
- Richard C. Miller
- William A. Miller, Jr.
- Allen P. Moran
- Brian H. Nicholson
- Salvador M. Solis
- John Vroegindewey

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved: None

Ministers Installed: John Vroegindewey, pastor, CALVARY, Sonora CA, 5/29/92

Licenses: Eric James Woody, 9/25/92

Licentiates Received: John Vroegindewey, from the Presbytery of New Jersey, 3/21/92

Licentiates Removed: John Vroegindewey, ordained 5/29/92

Roll of Licentiates:
- Steven Richert
- Eric James Woody
### Regional Church of the Northwest

#### CHURCH or Mission Work
- **Location (nm = no mail)**
- **Pastor**
- **Associate(s), Teacher(t)**
- **Evangelist(e), Other(____)**

#### ALASKA
- **Wasilla, New Life (B)**
  - 1451 E. Parks Hwy (nm)
  - Mark Sumpter (st. supply)

#### MONTANA
- **Billings, ROCKY MTN. COMMUNITY**
  - 1246 Cook Ave.
  - Alfred J. Poirier
- **Kalispell, FAITH COVENANT**
  - 611 Third Ave. East
  - Harold S. Kellam
- **Missoula, CORNERSTONE**
  - S. 10th W.
  - Ronald J. McKenzie

#### OREGON
- **Bend, GRACE COMMUNITY**
  - 118 N.W. Newport Ave.
  - Daniel J. Dillard
- **Eugene, OAK HILL**
  - 3350 Willamette St.
  - Calvin R. Malcor
- **Grants Pass, FAITH**
  - 280 Red Mountain Dr.
  - Larry D. Conrad
- **Medford, TRINITY**
  - 2544 Samoa Way
  - Jay M. Milojevich (interim)
- **Newberg, TRINITY**
  - 208 S. Blaine (nm)
  - John W. Mahaffy
- **Portland, FIRST**
  - 8245 N.E. Fremont St.
  - Donald M. Poundstone

#### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total Rcvd</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Avg per CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>21,802</td>
<td>24,469</td>
<td>34,269</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34,269</td>
<td>43,133</td>
<td>77,403</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>3,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td>20,001</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>20,001</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>20,001</td>
<td>21,336</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,336</td>
<td>21,336</td>
<td>42,672</td>
<td>21,336</td>
<td>21,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHURCH OFFICERS

- R.E. Deacon
- 34
- 3
- 43
- 12
- 1
- 31
- 22
- 2
- 34
- 32
- 2
- 21
- 46
- 6
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE NORTHWEST, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dnl D&amp;E C.M. AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov)</td>
<td>Total (-)</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dnl D&amp;E B.C.</td>
<td>Total (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other(____)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASHINGTON

#### Bothell, NEW LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Earl Vanderhoff (st. supply)] 23211 S. Meridian Ave.</th>
<th>25*</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>32,126</th>
<th>35,249</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Kent, Emmanuel (C)

|------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|--------|--------|---|---|

**Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)**

| [5] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [0] | [9] | [9] | [9] |

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[594*]</th>
<th>[41]</th>
<th>[30]</th>
<th>[10]</th>
<th>[5]</th>
<th>[21]</th>
<th>[42]</th>
<th>[607]</th>
<th>[812]</th>
<th>[848]</th>
<th>[521,590]</th>
<th>[690,624]</th>
<th>[27]</th>
<th>[26]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[301*]</td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>[286]</td>
<td>[470]</td>
<td>[513]</td>
<td>[91,179]</td>
<td>[1,138]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[895*]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[893]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[77,856]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
- The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.
- (A) Members are on the roll of the regional church.
- (B) Under the oversight of OAK HILL, Eugene OR, but not included in their statistics.
- (C) Members are on the roll of FIRST, Portland, OR.
REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE NORTHWEST, Continued

Membership: 20 Ministers; 44 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: April (4th Friday and Saturday); September (4th Friday and Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: Donald M. Poundstone, Stated Clerk (9/94); Daniel J. Dillard, Moderator (9/93)

Total Congregations: 10 Churches; 2 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works: New Life, Wasilla AK
Emmanuel, Kent WA

Ordinations: Murray I. Uomoto, 10/18/92

Ministers Received: Larry D. Conard, from the South Coast Presbytery (PCA), 10/23/92
Calvin R. Malcor, from the Presbytery of the Midwest, 11/8/92

Ministers Removed: None

Roll of Ministers: Harold L. Baurer
Daniel J. Dillard
Calvin R. Malcor
George Y. Uomoto

Randall A. Bergquist
Albert G. Edwards III
Ronald J. McKenzie
Alfred J. Poirier
Murray I. Uomoto

Glenn T. Black
Harold S. Kellam
Jay M. Milojevich
Donald M. Poundstone
Samuel van Houte

Larry D. Conard
John W. Mahaffy
Patrick H. Morison
John R. Spain
Eugene B. Williams

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:
Patrick H. Morison, pastor, NEW LIFE, Bothell WA, 1/15/92
Alfred J. Poirier, pastor, OAK HILL, Eugene OR, 6/15/92

Ministers Installed: Alfred J. Poirier, pastor, ROCKY MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY, Billings MT, 9/25/92
Murray I. Uomoto, evangelist, Sendai, Japan, 10/18/92
Larry D. Conard, pastor, FAITH, Grants Pass OR, 10/23/92
Calvin R. Malcor, pastor, OAK HILL, Eugene OR, 11/8/92

Licenses: None

Licentiates Received: None

Licentiates Removed: Murray I. Uomoto, 10/18/92, ordained

Roll of Licentiates: John Karas
G. Mark Sumpter
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO

### CHURCH or Mission Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (nn = no mail)</th>
<th>Membership Roll Statistics for the Year 1992</th>
<th>Attendance at</th>
<th>Contributions in 1992 ($)</th>
<th>Church Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begin ---Added--- ---Removed--- End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. F/F R/F L/T Dth Dnl De B.C. Bap Par F/F Dth Dnl De</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov)</td>
<td>Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) Total (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, GRACE</td>
<td>88 5 6 0 0 6 0 6 0 93 116 117</td>
<td>103,408 146,304</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5099 Postlewaite Rd.</td>
<td>42 4 0 0 0 1 0 45 89 82</td>
<td>32,366 1,573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry E. Wilson</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, REDEEMER</td>
<td>62 14 7 0 4 0 81 92 99</td>
<td>105,867 121,820</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020 Indian Ripple Rd.</td>
<td>42 7 6 1 0 6 0 48 72 74</td>
<td>7,423 1,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael F. Frangipane</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataskala, JERSEY REFORMED</td>
<td>33 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 38 28 28</td>
<td>30,873 32,369</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12239 Morse Rd.</td>
<td>6 4 0 0 0 0 10 15 17</td>
<td>1,496 852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis A. Orteza</td>
<td>39 4 0 0 0 0 48</td>
<td>0 10,591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburg, NASHUA</td>
<td>47 0 1 0 0 0 3 0 45 41 45</td>
<td>29,223 32,632</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. 55, R.D.4</td>
<td>15 0 0 0 0 0 0 15 25 25</td>
<td>3,410 725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Smith (pastor-elect)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin, Trinity (A)</td>
<td>[0] 0 0 0 0 0 0 19 30 32</td>
<td>6,000 7,500</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 8th St. (nm)</td>
<td>[0] 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 28 30</td>
<td>1,000 395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett C. DeVeDe, Jr.</td>
<td>[0] 0 24</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City, COVENANT</td>
<td>113 0 3 2 0 0 0 5 113 101 117</td>
<td>56,620 97,065</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Poplar St. (nm)</td>
<td>32 5 1 0 2 3 33 53 58</td>
<td>12,295 859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel G. Osborne</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>28,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett C. DeVeDe, Jr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisville, CALVARY</td>
<td>157 4 1 1 1 3 1 158 138 137</td>
<td>60,985 92,958</td>
<td>9 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. 8, North</td>
<td>53 5 0 0 2 0 0 56 85 74</td>
<td>26,073 588</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis P. Wislocki</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage, Shenango Valley (B)</td>
<td>12 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 13 34</td>
<td>6,414 7,469</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermitage (nm)</td>
<td>14 0 2 0 0 0 0 16 34</td>
<td>1,055 575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>26 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollidaysburg, WESTMINSTER</td>
<td>151 15 11 8 2 0 1 182 247 238</td>
<td>142,077 216,099</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankstown Rd., Box 104</td>
<td>68 11 5 6 0 0 0 78 156 165</td>
<td>60,648 1,187</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark R. Brown</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>13,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, COVENANT</td>
<td>102 5 6 6 2 0 2 115 125 126</td>
<td>91,572 125,215</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604 Graham Blvd.</td>
<td>46 3 7 5 0 0 2 49 69 76</td>
<td>26,023 1,089</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Wilson</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contributions in 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories:</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total Rcvd Benevolence Avg per CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Imp</td>
<td>Bequests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ----REMOVED---- END</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>CATEGORIES: SUMMARY: OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (na = no mail)</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dnl D&amp;E C.M. AM Worship, Sun. School</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par F/P Dth Dnl D&amp;E B.C. Sun. School (May) (Nov)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other( )</td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA, Continued</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewickley, GRACE</td>
<td>49 4 9 9 0 3 3 65 95 95</td>
<td>61,498</td>
<td>95,572</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419 Beaver Rd.</td>
<td>37 3 17 1 0 2 5 49 50 40</td>
<td>31,106</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles G. Dennison</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Daniel Knox (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Christ (C)</td>
<td>0 1 9 0 0 0 0 10 25 25</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>24,875</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Road (nm)</td>
<td>0 0 7 0 0 0 0 7 22 22</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Daniel Knox (e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantown, REFORMATION</td>
<td>46 0 0 1 0 6 0 41 62 71</td>
<td>52,727</td>
<td>62,023</td>
<td>4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 Arch St.</td>
<td>25 1 0 0 6 1 19 52 66</td>
<td>9,296</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Semel</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>860 43 58 35 5 25 12 954 1134 1130</td>
<td>769,184</td>
<td>1,061,901</td>
<td>40 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380* 43 45 15 0 17 11 425 750 729</td>
<td>214,394</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240*</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>78,323</td>
<td>10,591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.

- The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.
- (A) Under the oversight of the session, COVENANT, Grove City PA. Members are on rolls of COVENANT and CALVARY, Harrisville PA.
- (B) Under the oversight of the session, CALVARY, Harrisville PA, but not included in their statistics.
- (C) Under the oversight of the session, GRACE, Sewickley PA, but not included in their statistics.
REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO, Continued

PRESBYTERY OF OHIO

Membership: 19 Ministers; 46 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: April (1st Friday and Saturday); October (3rd Friday and Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: James F. Alexander, Stated Clerk (10/93); Lawrence Semel, Moderator (10/93)

Total Congregations: 10 Churches; 3 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works: Trinity, Franklin PA; Shenango Valley, Hermitage, PA; Christ, Washington PA

Ordinations: None

Ministers Received: Theodore Hard, from the Presbytery of New Jersey, 10/17/92

Ministers Removed: David W. Kiestier, deposed 10/17/92 (under appeal)

Roll of Ministers: Marvin O. Bowman, Mark R. Brown, Paul E. Copeland, Charles G. Dennison
Everett C. DeVeide, Jr., Leo A. Frailey, Michael F. Frangipane, Theodore Hard
R. Daniel Knox, Stewart E. Launer, Luis A. Orteza, Daniel G. Osborne
Lawrence Semel, Douglas Snyder, Bryan J. Weaver, John W. Wilson
Larry E. Wilson, Louis P. Wislocki, Douglas M. Withington

Ministers Installed: None

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved: David W. Kiestier, pastor, Shenango Valley, Hermitage PA, 6/6/92

Licenures: None

Licentiates Received: None

Licentiates Removed: None

Roll of Licentiates: None
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE at</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN --- ADDED --- --- REMOVED ---- END</td>
<td>AM Worship,</td>
<td>General Total Rcvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml DnE C.M.</td>
<td>Sun. School</td>
<td>Total Rcvd</td>
<td>R.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dml DnE B.C.</td>
<td>(May) (Nov)</td>
<td>Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td>n/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown, Grace</td>
<td>13 Pennington St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert P. Harting, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Emmanuel</td>
<td>1006 Wilson Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert W. A. Letham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, Living Hope (A)</td>
<td>Swain Sch., 1100 S. 24th (nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim W. Young (org. pastor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartonville, Pocono</td>
<td>Bartonville (P.O. Box 292)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William A. Laverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton, New Life</td>
<td>120 S. 12th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack D. Kinneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawn Grove, Faith</td>
<td>N. Market St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas C. Winward, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg, Living Hope</td>
<td>155 Early Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard H. Craven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenside, Calvary</td>
<td>734 Willow Grove Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven F. Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover, Grace</td>
<td>Grandview Rd. (nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Sheely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatboro, Trinity</td>
<td>151 W. County Line Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George R. Cottenden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Total Rcvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Avg per CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Imp</td>
<td>Bequests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Church Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Ext.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appendix

395
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE at AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED----- END</td>
<td>General Total Rcvd Benevolence Avg per CM Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dm E Dm E B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dm E Dm E B.C. Total (+) Total (-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other(_)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampeter, NEW LIFE</td>
<td>24 0 5 0 0 0 2 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Bldg, Rt 741 (nm)</td>
<td>17 1 4 0 0 0 2 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence N. Vail</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansdowne, KNOX</td>
<td>32 0 0 0 1 1 30</td>
<td>17 1 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 N. Lansdowne Ave.</td>
<td>7 1 0 0 0 0 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Scott Emery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madisonville, COVENANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madisonville Grange</td>
<td>22 0 0 0 0 4 0 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>11 13 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield, Grace Fellowship (A)</td>
<td>20 0 2 1 0 3 3 17</td>
<td>13 2 26 28</td>
<td>3,261 1,552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 N. Main St.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel C. Kershner (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanicsville, COVENANT</td>
<td>43 6 0 6 0 8 2 45</td>
<td>11 2 22 32</td>
<td>6,274 1,816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt 413, N. of Doylestown</td>
<td>11 0 2 1 0 5 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Bettler (st. supply)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown, CALVARY</td>
<td>117* 0 0 0 1 6 2 108</td>
<td>27* 0 0 0 5 2 20</td>
<td>94,911 115,911 5 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce &amp; Emaus Sts.</td>
<td>144* 0 0 0 0 0 0 128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert W. Steever, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James D. Day (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, BETHANY</td>
<td>180* 11 4 5 2 1 8 189</td>
<td>92* 5 2 5 0 6 2 86</td>
<td>112,730 170,583 7 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8602 Old Baltimore Pike</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton S. Forsaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, EMMANUEL</td>
<td>80 4 7 1 0 0 1 91</td>
<td>66 12 1 3 0 0 76</td>
<td>65,074 86,873 3 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127 S. Broad St.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson L. Cummings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, GRACE FELLOWSHIP</td>
<td>43 16 4 2 0 13 0 52</td>
<td>21 1 12 38 46</td>
<td>45,685 57,578 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5547 Germantown Ave. (nm)</td>
<td>21 1 0 4 0 6 0 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward W. Gross</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PILGRIM</td>
<td>73 0 1 0 0 0 0 74</td>
<td>17 1 19 62 63</td>
<td>85,845 99,660 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3815 Terrace St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Minnig</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry A. Traver (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**REGIONAL CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA, Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ----REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml D&amp;E C.M. B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Dml D&amp;E B.C.</td>
<td>CATEGORIES: SUMMARY:</td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Associate(a), Teacher(t) Evangelist(e), Other(____)</td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School</td>
<td>General Total Rcvd</td>
<td>B.E. Dea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PENNSYLVANIA, Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pastors</th>
<th>F/P</th>
<th>R/F</th>
<th>L/T</th>
<th>Dth</th>
<th>Dml</th>
<th>D&amp;E</th>
<th>C.M.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Bap</th>
<th>Par</th>
<th>P/F</th>
<th>Dth</th>
<th>Dml</th>
<th>D&amp;E</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Avg per CM</th>
<th>Capital Imp</th>
<th>Bequests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, SW PHILA. REF.</td>
<td>7014 Elmwood Ave.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,611</td>
<td>41,662</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George F. Morton</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenixville, TRINITY</td>
<td>110 S. Main St.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark W. Holler</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, COVENANT</td>
<td>Lackawana &amp; Snyder Sts.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,786</td>
<td>137,438</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David J. O'Leary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsport, New Life (A)</td>
<td>Packer and Ross Sts. (nm)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,814</td>
<td>27,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Georgian (org. pas.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,420</td>
<td>1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1629*</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2096</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,450,951</td>
<td>1,986,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
- The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.
- Members are on the roll of the regional church.

---

Appendix
PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA

Membership: 45 Ministers; 91 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: February (1st Saturday); May (1st Saturday); September (3rd Saturday); November (3rd Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: A. LeRoy Greer, Stated Clerk (9/94); Douglas C. Winward, Jr., Moderator (9/93)

Total Congregations: 21 Churches; 3 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: GRACE FELLOWSHIP, Philadelphia PA, organized as a new and separate church 5/22/92

Mission Works: Living Hope, Allentown, PA
Grace Fellowship, Mansfield, PA
New Life, Williamsport, PA

Ordinations: None

Ministers Received: Arthur J. Fox, from the Presbytery of the Dakotas, 9/19/92
Donald J. Duff, from the Presbytery of Southern California, 11/21/92

Ministers Removed: John H. Harbison, dismissed to Rocky Mountain Presbytery, PCA, 2/1/92
Arthur J. Steltzer, dismissed to the Presbytery of the South, 2/1/92
Bruce F. Hunt, deceased, 7/26/92

Roll of Ministers:

Lester R. Bachman
Richard C. Craven
Donald J. Duff
Clinton S. Foraker
Theodore J. Georgian
Robert P. Harting
Robert D. Knudsen
H. Jeffrey Lawson
Robert A. Minnig
Jeff Sheely
Bernard J. Stonehouse
Tim W. Young

John F. Bettler
Calvin K. Cummings, Jr.
W. Scott Emery
Arthur J. Fox
Jonathan C. Gibbs
Mark W. Holler
William C. Krispin
Robert W. A. Letham
John J. Mitchell
Moises Silva
Barry A. Traver

Bruce A. Coie
Wilson L. Cummings
F. Clarke Evans
A. LeRoy Greer
Joel C. Kechinger
Arthur W. Kuscheke
Robert C. Marsh
George F. Morton
Young J. Son
Laurence N. Vail

George R. Cottenden
James D. Day
John F. Galbraith
Edward N. Gross
Jack D. Kinneer
William A. Laverty
Steven F. Miller
David J. O'Leary
Albert W. Steeven, Jr.
Douglas C. Winward, Jr.

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:

H. Jeffrey Lawson, pastor, COVENANT, Madisonville PA, 11/30/92

Ministers Installed: Edward N. Gross, pastor, GRACE FELLOWSHIP, Philadelphia PA, 5/22/92

Licences: None

Licentiates Received: Brian T. Wingard, from the Louisiana Presbytery, PCA, 2/1/92

Licentiates Removed: None

Roll of Licentiates:

Paul Archbald
Barry Hofstetter

Douglas E. Bond
Philip G. Byken

Jesse R. Cowell
Brian T. Wingard

Daryl Daniels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE at</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>LOCATION (May) (Nov) *</td>
<td>END</td>
<td>CATEGORIES: General Total Rcvd Benevolence Avg per CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.</td>
<td>P/F</td>
<td>R/F</td>
<td>L/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>____________</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover, Hoover OPC (A)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 Hoover Court</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon D. Smith (e) (formerly Hueytown, First)</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah, IGLESIA PRESBITERIANA</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17680 NW 78th Ave.</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Gomez (st. supply)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah, SHARON</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17680 NW 78th Ave.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey K. Boer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key West, NEW LIFE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtg at Amer. Legion Post 28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Welzien (nm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth, FELLOWSHIP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6680 Lantana Rd. #8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur J. Steltzer, Jr.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale, BETHEL</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551 NW 47th Ave.</td>
<td>110*</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan J. DeMaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne, COASTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 Guava Ave.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald M. Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niceville, GRACE</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2865 Edgewater Dr.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold E. Thomas</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, LAKE SHERWOOD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8200 Balboa Dr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted F. Gray</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocala, FAITH</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 S.E. 58th Ave.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry G. Mininger</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin A. Novak (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GlobalChurchOfTheSouth**
## Regional Church of the South, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE at</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location (nm = no mail)</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ----REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>CATEGORIES: SUMMARY:</td>
<td>R.E. Dea n/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par</td>
<td>P/F Dth Dml DnE</td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td>Total (+)</td>
<td>Total (-)</td>
<td>Total (May) (Nov)</td>
<td>(I+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>==============</td>
<td>===============</td>
<td>===============</td>
<td>===============</td>
<td>===============</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, CALVARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814 N. Gadsden St.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William M. Hobbs</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, REDEEMER</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3930 Chamblee-Tucker Rd.,</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doraville</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas S. Chamness, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grange, COVENANT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 New Franklin Rd.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Power</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineville, PINEVILLE OPC</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2522 Military Hwy.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Haehl</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, Covenant Commun. (A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109-B S. High St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. Garretson (e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville, Sandy Springs (A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 Montville Station Rd.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Berry, Jr. (e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly Covenant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>740*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>297*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Members are on the roll of the regional church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIOBAL CEURCE OF THE SOUTH, Continued

Membership: 26 Ministers; 49 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: Spring (2nd Friday and Saturday after Easter); October (4th Friday and Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: Ted F. Gray, Stated Clerk (10/94); Donald M. Parker, Moderator (10/93)

Total Congregations: 13 Churches; 3 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: NEW LIFE, Key West FL, organized as a new and separate church 7/12/92
Covenant Community, Columbia TN, received as a mission work 8/30/92

Mission Works: Hoover OPC, Hoover AL (formerly First, Hueytown)
Covenant Community, Columbia TN
Sandy Springs (formerly Covenant), Maryville, TN

Ordinations: None

Ministers Received: Arthur J. Steltzer, from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, 2/5/92
William J. Hobbs, from the PCUSA, 3/6/92
James M. Garrettson, Jr., from the Presbytery of the Midwest, 8/30/92
Allen D. Curry, from the Presbytery of New Jersey, 10/24/92
Robert A. Berry, from the PCA, 12/4/92

Ministers Removed: Paul J. Hill, divested without censure, 5/1/92

Roll of Ministers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert A. Berry</th>
<th>Jeffrey K. Boer</th>
<th>Henry Buikema</th>
<th>Thomas S. Champness, Jr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen D. Curry</td>
<td>Ivan J. DeMaster</td>
<td>W. Ralph English</td>
<td>James M. Garrettson, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted F. Gray</td>
<td>Robert D. Haehl</td>
<td>William M. Hobbs</td>
<td>Hendrick Krabbendam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Heber McIlwaine</td>
<td>Larry G. Mininger</td>
<td>Martin A. Novak</td>
<td>Donald M. Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Power</td>
<td>Roger W. Schnurr</td>
<td>Jon D. Smith</td>
<td>Arthur J. Steltzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold E. Thomas</td>
<td>John H. Thompson, Jr.</td>
<td>Jose Vera</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William V. Welzien</td>
<td>Gordon T. Woolard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved:

None

Ministers Installed:

Arthur J. Steltzer, pastor, FELLOWSHIP, Lake Worth FL, 2/5/92
William M. Hobbs, pastor, CALVARY, Tallahassee FL, 3/6/92
Allen D. Curry, pastor, NEW LIFE, Key West FL, 11/12/92
James M. Garrettson, organizing pastor, Covenant Community, Columbia TN, 8/30/92
Robert A. Berry, organizing pastor, Sandy Springs, Maryville TN, 12/4/92

Licensures: None

Licentiates Received: None

Licentiates Removed: Orlando Rivera, dismissed to independent church at his request, 5/1/92
Roger Banes, dismissed to the Presbytery of New York and New England, received 9/16/92

Roll of Licentiates: None
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Total (+)</td>
<td>Total (May) (Nov)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/F R/F</td>
<td>Bap Par</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L/T Dth Dm DsE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M.</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/E Dea</td>
<td>Benevolence Avg per CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.E.</td>
<td>n/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pastor Name</th>
<th>Tel</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonita</td>
<td>BONITA PRES.</td>
<td>Michael D. Dengerink</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60,175</td>
<td>63,380</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5111 Central Ave.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>GRACE</td>
<td>Rollin P. Keller</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>83,380</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22511 S. Figueroa St.</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>BAYVIEW</td>
<td>Roger Wagner</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100,184</td>
<td>125,558</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 E. Naples St.</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25,374</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory L. Bahnsen (a)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Needham (a)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George C. Scipione (a)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
<td>GARDEN GROVE OPC</td>
<td>William E. Warren</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79,754</td>
<td>151,540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9881 Trask Ave.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71,786</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen A. Larsen (a)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>EL CAMINO</td>
<td>Robert W. Newsom</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55,800</td>
<td>59,751</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7526 Calle Real</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>TRINITY</td>
<td>Jack L. Smith</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32,240</td>
<td>35,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050 Barranca Pkwy (nm)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>CALVARY</td>
<td>Jay E. Fluck</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12120 La Mirada Blvd.</td>
<td>39b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76,957</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>FAITH</td>
<td>Daniel H. Overduin</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>106,976</td>
<td>159,315</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 E. San Antonio Dr.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>52,338</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>BEVERLY</td>
<td>Alan R. Pontier</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52,772</td>
<td>64,911</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 S. Woods Ave.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Beach (see Santa Ana)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (statistics include members meeting in Westminster, CA)
## Membership Roll Statistics for the Year 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>Membership Roll Statistics for the Year 1992</th>
<th>Attendance at</th>
<th>Contributions in 1992 ($)</th>
<th>Church Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml DSE C.M. B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bap P/F Dth Dml DSE B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (May) (-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard, Covenant Of Grace</td>
<td>25 1 0 2 0 4 1 23</td>
<td>15 18</td>
<td>29,014</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Mueller (st. supply)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgecrest, Ridgecrest OPC</td>
<td>(Closed 12/31/92, no report available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, New Life</td>
<td>205 14 6 5 1 16 5 208</td>
<td>200 215</td>
<td>377,606</td>
<td>6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George C. Miladin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark A. Schroeder (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos, Presby. Chapel (B)</td>
<td>49 1 4 5 2 2 2 53</td>
<td>104 75</td>
<td>61,085</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory L. Price (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, Covenant Community</td>
<td>102 1 0 0 0 31 10</td>
<td>62 50 53</td>
<td>47,189</td>
<td>4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Of Orange County</td>
<td>31 3 0 0 0 9 1 24</td>
<td>32 34</td>
<td>660 772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Anthony Curto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee, Valley</td>
<td>44 1 1 0 1 1 0 44</td>
<td>50 48</td>
<td>37,311 41,210</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth J. Meilahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California, Mission</td>
<td>(See Note C below.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David A. Crum (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</td>
<td>20 0 0 0 0 1 0 19</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 0 0 0 1 0 1 5</td>
<td>1 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1126 45 25 52 11 80 65 1092</td>
<td>1191 1156 1,226,763</td>
<td>1,277,466 44 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512* 48 40 10 0 55 40 495</td>
<td>693 692 392,883</td>
<td>1,582 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1618*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.
- *The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.
- (A) Members are on the roll of the regional church.
- (B) Members are on the roll of Bayview, Chula Vista, but reported separately.
- (C) The mission work in Baja California is an indigenous Mexican work aided by presbytery. Its members are not on the roll of the OPC.
PRESBYTERY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Membership: 32 Ministers; 63 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: February (1st Friday and Saturday); May (1st Friday and Saturday); October (3rd Friday and Saturday)

Clerk and Moderator: Robert M. Coie, Stated Clerk (12/94); William E. Warren, Moderator (12/93)

Total Congregations: 13 Churches; 2 Unorganized Mission Works

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works:
- Ridgecrest OPC, Ridgecrest CA (closed effective 12/31/92)
- San Marcos OPC, San Marcos CA

Changes in Mission Works: None

Ordinations:
- Michael D. Dengerink, 7/19/92

Ministers Received:
- Chong (Charles) Y. Lee, from the Presbytery of Northern California, 4/3/92

Ministers Removed:
- Dennis E. Johnson, dismissed to the South Coast Presbytery (PCA), 11/8/92
- Donald J. Duff, dismissed to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, received 11/21/92

Ordinations:
- Michael D. Dengerink, 7/19/92

Ministers Received:
- Chong (Charles) Y. Lee, from the Presbytery of Northern California, 4/3/92

Ministers Removed:
- Dennis E. Johnson, dismissed to the South Coast Presbytery (PCA), 11/8/92
- Donald J. Duff, dismissed to the Presbytery of Philadelphia, received 11/21/92

Roll of Ministers:

- W. Wilson Albright
- Henry W. Coray
- Jay E. Fluck
- Stephen A. Larsen
- George C. Miladin
- Daniel H. Overduin
- Mark A. Schroeder
- Robert B. Strimple
- Gregory L. Bahnsen
- David A. Crum
- John W. Garrisi
- Charles Y. Lee
- Robert B. Needham
- Alan R. Pontier
- George C. Scipione
- Roger Wagner
- Josue I. Balderas
- L. Anthony Curto
- William A. Hard
- George W. Marston
- Robert W. Newsom
- Dwight H. Poundstone
- Jack L. Smith
- William E. Warren
- Thomas M. Cooper
- Michael D. Dengerink
- Rollin P. Keller
- Kenneth J. Meilahn
- Robert E. Nicholas
- Gregory L. Price
- Michael D. Stingley
- Andrew E. Wikholm

Pastoral Relationships Dissolved: None

Ministers Installed:
- Gregory L. Bahnsen, associate pastor, BAYVIEW, Chula Vista CA, 3/10/92
- Robert B. Needham, associate pastor, BAYVIEW, Chula Vista CA, 3/10/92
- George C. Scipione, associate pastor, BAYVIEW, Chula Vista CA, 3/10/92
- Michael D. Dengerink, pastor, BONITA OPC, Bonita CA, 7/19/92

Licentious:

- James R. Megchelsen, 10/16/92

Licentiate Received: None

Licentiate Removed:
- Michael D. Dengerink, ordained 7/19/92

Roll of Licentiate:

- Stephen R. Hart
- Calvin D. Keller
- Gerard M. Marinucci
- James R. Megchelsen
- Mark C. Mueller
### Contributions in 1992 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN (ADD)------(REM)------END</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATEGORIES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml D &amp; E C.M. B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NEW MEXICO

- **Albuquerque, COVENANT OF GRACE**
  - 1991 Indian School Rd, NE
  - Rcvd: 33,805
  - Bequests: 1,271
  - Officers: 3

- **Roswell, ROSWELL OPC**
  - 1601 W. McGaffey St.
  - Rcvd: 22,216
  - Officers: 1

- **Oklahoma City, KNOX**
  - 4511 N. Independence
  - Rcvd: 13,013
  - Officers: 1

#### OKLAHOMA

- **Bartlesville, WESTMINSTER**
  - 1001 S. Adams Blvd.
  - Rcvd: 22,216
  - Officers: 2

- **Texas**

- **Abilene, COVENANT**
  - 2742 Buffalo Gap Rd.
  - Rcvd: 65,526
  - Officers: 3

- **San Antonio, GRACE**
  - 5602 UTEX Blvd.
  - Rcvd: 88,848
  - Officers: 4

#### ATTENDANCE (AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN (ADD)------(REM)------END</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATEGORIES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml D &amp; E C.M. B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATTENDANCE (AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN (ADD)------(REM)------END</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATEGORIES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Dml D &amp; E C.M. B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+) (-) Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ATTENDANCE (AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov))
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTHWEST, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH or Mission Work Location (nm = no mail)</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ----REMOVED---- END</td>
<td>C.M. AM Worship, General Total Rcvd R.E. Dea Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate(a), Teacher(t)</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T Dth Del D&amp;I C.M.</td>
<td>AM Worship, General Total Rcvd R.E. Dea Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist(e), Other(_)</td>
<td>B.C. Bap Par P/F Dth Del D&amp;I B.C.</td>
<td>Sun. School Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>==---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORIES: SUMMARY: OFFICERS</td>
<td>TOTAL (May) (Nov) Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td>TOTAL (May) (Nov) Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>TOTAL (May) (Nov) Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td>TOTAL (May) (Nov) Capital Imp Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES: Heading abbreviations are defined in the Summary of Statistics table at the end of the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The value indicated is revised from the previous year's report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A)</strong> Members are on the roll of the regional church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TEXAS, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tyler, TYLER OPC 4554 FM Rd 2813 (nm)</th>
<th>John H. Johnson, Jr.</th>
<th>Remaining members of former congregations, others (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>428* 28 17 19 4 19 3 466 498 494 514,334 710,235</th>
<th>190* 17 12 11 0 7 0 201 316 322 145,201 1,524</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196*</td>
<td>618*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>667</td>
<td>50,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>77,668</th>
<th>1,387</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28 17 19 4 19 3 466 498 494 514,334 710,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196*</td>
<td>196*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618*</td>
<td>618*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>667</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,700</td>
<td>50,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>77,668</th>
<th>1,387</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28 17 19 4 19 3 466 498 494 514,334 710,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196*</td>
<td>196*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618*</td>
<td>618*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>667</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,700</td>
<td>50,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTHWEST, Continued

Membership: 18 Ministers; 29 Ruling Elders

Stated Meetings: March and September

Clerk and Moderator: John H. Johnson, Jr., Stated Clerk (3/95); Neil J. Lodge, Moderator (3/93)

Total Congregations: 9 Churches; 1 Unorganized Mission Work

Changes in Congregations: None

Mission Works: Geneva, Dallas TX

Ordinations: Michael D. Pazarilla, 4/24/92

Ministers Received: James T. Hoekstra, from the Presbytery of the Midwest, 12/11/92

Ministers Removed: Timothy L. Bero, dismissed to the Presbytery of the Midwest 9/18/92, received 10/11/92
Gerald S. Taylor, dismissed to the Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic 4/29/92, on roll at end of year

Roll of Ministers:

William H. Doerfel
Glenn D. Jerrell
E. Scott McLaren
Roger A. Ramsey
Gerald S. Taylor
Roger L. Gibbons
John H. Johnson, Jr.
K. Scott Oliphint
Arthur G. Riffel
Christopher H. Wisdom

James T. Hoekstra
Chester H. Lanious
Michael D. Pazarilla
Richard A. Shaw
Aureliano A. Tan, Jr.

Ministers Installed:

Michael D. Pazarilla, organizing pastor, Geneva, Dallas TX, 4/24/92
James T. Hoekstra, pastor, PROVIDENCE, Austin TX, 12/11/92

Licenises:

David T. Brack, 9/18/92
Gary W. Davenport, 9/18/92

Licentiates Received: None

Licentiates Removed: Michael D. Pazarilla, ordained 4/24/92

Roll of Licentiates:

David T. Brack
Gary W. Davenport
Douglas J. Smith
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>END</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T</td>
<td>Dth Dnl D&amp;F C.M. P/F Dth Dnl D&amp;F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (+)</td>
<td>Total (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAKOTAS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>552* 17 24 14 6 13 12 576</td>
<td>671 651</td>
<td>514,046</td>
<td>16 38 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>244* 16 5 4 0 8 6 247</td>
<td>450 453</td>
<td>48,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>796*</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>12,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID-ATLANTIC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1148* 37 38 38 5 64 21 1171</td>
<td>1353 1354</td>
<td>1,032,663</td>
<td>29 52 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>495* 54 22 12 1 28 20 510</td>
<td>926 988</td>
<td>351,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1643*</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>319,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1851* 77 39 33 16 47 21 1916</td>
<td>2252 2252</td>
<td>1,295,398</td>
<td>30 67 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>919* 43 33 21 0 25 15 954</td>
<td>1246 1294</td>
<td>392,829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2730*</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>101,257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1339* 51 22 14 12 28 54 1392</td>
<td>1537 1600</td>
<td>1,136,827</td>
<td>31 54 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>660* 34 28 12 1 19 32 658</td>
<td>884 873</td>
<td>328,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2059*</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>159,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY 4 NE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1350* 82 69 38 12 70 31 1426</td>
<td>1734 1869</td>
<td>1,297,280</td>
<td>40 76 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>612* 58 44 17 0 38 17 1066</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>309,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012*</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>195,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. CALIF.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>518* 17 25 55 1 4 45 35 561</td>
<td>672 713</td>
<td>670,792</td>
<td>15 26 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>229* 19 50 1 0 36 17 244</td>
<td>351 348</td>
<td>94,461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>777*</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>594* 41 30 10 5 21 42 607</td>
<td>812 848</td>
<td>521,590</td>
<td>20 27 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>361* 24 11 10 1 12 27 286</td>
<td>470 513</td>
<td>91,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>895*</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>77,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>860* 43 58 35 5 25 12 954</td>
<td>1134 1130</td>
<td>769,184</td>
<td>19 40 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360* 43 45 15 0 17 11 425</td>
<td>750 729</td>
<td>214,394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1240*</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>78,323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1629* 66 74 39 6 80 50 1672</td>
<td>2031 2096</td>
<td>1,450,951</td>
<td>45 79 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>743* 48 53 22 0 54 22 796</td>
<td>1213 1299</td>
<td>495,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2422*</td>
<td>2468</td>
<td>40,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Statistics - 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCH</th>
<th>Number of Churches &amp; Mission Works</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP ROLL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1992</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS IN 1992 ($)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>BEGIN --ADDED-- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
<td>BEGIN ---ADDED--- ---REMOVED--- END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.C. A/B Par Total (+)</td>
<td>C.M. P/F R/F L/T P/F Dth Dml D/E B.C.</td>
<td>AM Worship, Sun. School (May) (Nov)</td>
<td>General Total Rcvd Benevolence Avg per CM Capital Imp. Bequests</td>
<td>Min R.E. Dee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>13 3</td>
<td>740* 49 62 20 4 50 20 797</td>
<td>985 987</td>
<td>818,107 1,036,915</td>
<td>26 39 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1037*</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td></td>
<td>161,976 1,301</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,830 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. CALIF.</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>1126 45 25 52 11 80 65 1092</td>
<td>1191 1156</td>
<td>1,226,763 1,727,466</td>
<td>32 44 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512*</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td></td>
<td>392,883 1,582</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1638*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,820 44,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST</td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>420* 28 17 19 4 19 3 466</td>
<td>498 494</td>
<td>514,334 710,235</td>
<td>18 23 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>667</td>
<td></td>
<td>145,201 1,524</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,700 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLE</td>
<td>170 26</td>
<td>12225 553 483 367 90 542 366 12620</td>
<td>14871 15150</td>
<td>11,248,935 15,492,993</td>
<td>321 565 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH 1992</td>
<td>17927*</td>
<td>18446</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,325,824 1,227</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,217,331 120,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLE 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,364,350 14,331,549</td>
<td>315 553 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,705,293 1,172</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,261,903 45,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
An asterisk (*) indicates a value revised from the previous year's report.

**Heading Abbreviations:**
- **C.M.** communicant members (also CM)
- **B.C.** baptized children (noncommunicants)
- **P/F** profession of faith
- **R/E** ruling elders on session
- **L/T** letter of transfer, received
- **Dth** death
- **Dml** dismissal (transfer)
- **D/E** discipline or erasure
- **Min** ministers
- **R.E.** ruling elders not on session
- **n/s** ruling elders not on session
# Recapitulation of Membership Statistics

## 1938-1992

### As of December 31, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ministers*</th>
<th>Communicant Members</th>
<th>Baptized Children</th>
<th>Total Membership**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>5,816</td>
<td>18,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>18,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>12,159</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>18,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>12,573</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td>18,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>19,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>13,013</td>
<td>5,827</td>
<td>18,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>12,919</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>18,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>18,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>12,278</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>17,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>17,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>11,956</td>
<td>5,186</td>
<td>17,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>11,884</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>17,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>11,553</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>16,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>11,306</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>16,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10,939</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>15,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10,683</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>15,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>10,372</td>
<td>4,934</td>
<td>15,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>10,129</td>
<td>4,874</td>
<td>15,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10,186</td>
<td>4,912</td>
<td>15,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9,940</td>
<td>4,893</td>
<td>14,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>9,741</td>
<td>4,925</td>
<td>14,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>9,536</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>14,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9,401</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>14,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9,276</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>14,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9,197</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>14,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6,734</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>10,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>7,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Ministers were included in Total Membership beginning December 31, 1972.

Total membership figures given above for all years have been adjusted to include ministers; they will differ, therefore, from the figures that appear in the Minutes of the General Assembly for years prior to 1973.

**Total membership in each year was revised in the following year's Statistician's report, and the revised figures are shown above. Figures for communicant members and baptized children prior to 1984 were not revised, so their totals differ slightly from revised total memberships.
### APPORTIONMENT OF COMMISSIONERS TO THE 61ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In accordance with the Standing rules of the General Assembly, Chapter I, commissioners to the Sixty-First General Assembly are apportioned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dakotas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York and New England</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator, 60th G.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk, 60th G.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS

Class of 1996 - Stuart R. Jones
Class of 1995 - Alan D. Strange
Class of 1994 - Arthur W. Kuschke, Jr. (Chairman)

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Class of 1996 - MINISTERS: Allen D. Curry, Ed.D., John P. Galbraith*, Donald M. Poundstone* (President)
RULING ELDERS: F. Kingsley Elder, Jr., Ph.D., Paul S. MacDonald

Class of 1995 - MINISTERS: Calvin A. Malcor, George C. Miladin, Larry E. Wilson
RULING ELDERS: James S. Gidley, Ph.D.*, David Winslow, Jr.*

Class of 1994 - MINISTERS: Douglas A. Felch, Jack J. Peterson, G. I. Williamson*
RULING ELDERS: J. Donald Phillips*, Larry A. Woiwode, Litt.D.

General Secretary: The Rev. Thomas E. Tyson, 303 Horsham Road, Suite G, Horsham, PA 19044

*Member of Subcommittee on Ministerial Training

COORDINATION

Class of 1996 - MINISTER: Jonathan D. Male
RULING ELDER: Gordon H. Singer

Class of 1995 - MINISTER: Roger L. Gibbons
RULING ELDER: Russell W. Copeland, Jr.

Class of 1994 - MINISTER: Steven F. Miller
RULING ELDER: Peyton H. Gardner

Representative, Christian Education: J. Donald Phillips (Chairman)
Thomas E. Tyson, Gen. Sec., ex officio

Representative, Foreign Missions: John D. Williams
Mark T. Bube, Gen. Sec., ex officio
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Representative, Home Missions and Church Extension: David J. O'Leary
Ross W. Graham, Gen. Sec., ex officio

Controller: David E. Haney, 303 Horsham Road, Suite G, Horsham, PA 19044

DATE, PLACE AND TRAVEL

Class of 1996 - Howard A. Porter
Class of 1995 - Douglas A. Watson
Class of 1994 - Donald R. Miller (Chairman)

DIACONAL MINISTRIES

Class of 1996 - MINISTER: David W. King (Chairman)
RULING ELDER: Howard A. Porter
Class of 1995 - MINISTER: Donald J. Duff
RULING ELDER: Joe M. Moody, Jr., M.D.
Class of 1994 - MINISTER: Leonard J. Coppes, Th.D.
DEACONS: Roy Ingelse, Gregorio R. Nightengale

ECUMENICITY AND INTERCHURCH RELATIONS

Class of 1996 - John P. Galbraith, Robert B. Needham,
Jack J. Peterson (Chairman)
Class of 1995 - Richard A. Barker, Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., Th.D.,
Thomas E. Tyson
Class of 1994 - Donald J. Duff, John R. Hilbelink, G. I Williamson

FOREIGN MISSIONS

Class of 1996 - MINISTERS: James L. Bosgraf, Richard B.
Gaffin, Jr., Th.D. (President), Lendall H. Smith
RULING ELDERS: Edward P. Hardesty, John O. Kinnaird
Class of 1995 - MINISTERS: Jeffrey K. Boer, Donald J. Duff, John W. Mahaffy,
RULING ELDERS: Gary W. Davenport, John D. Williams
Class of 1994 - MINISTERS: George R. Cottenden, Theodore Hard, Hendrik
Krabbe, R. Arthur Thompson
RULING ELDERS: Herbert R. Muether, Ph.D.,

General Secretary: Mr. Mark T. Bube, 303 Horsham Road, Suite G,
Horsham, PA 19044
HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION

RULING ELDERS: Richard L. Hake, Jack H. Julien, D.D.S.

Class of 1995 - MINISTERS: Mark R. Brown, Salvador M. Solis, Gerald S. Taylor
RULING ELDERS: Robert A. Kramm, Leonard W. Schmurr

Class of 1994 - MINISTERS: John R. Hilbelink (President), William Shishko, William E. Warren
RULING ELDERS: Richard A. Barker, Garret A. Hoogerhyde

General Secretary: The Rev. Ross W. Graham, 303 Horsham Road, Suite G, Horsham, PA 19044

PENSIONS

Class of 1996 - MINISTER: John P. Galbraith
RULING ELDERS: Garret A. Hoogerhyde (President), Robert M. Meeker

Class of 1995 - MINISTER: Douglas A. Watson, William E. Warren
RULING ELDERS: Gordon H. Singer

Class of 1994 - MINISTER: Marven O. Bowman, Jr.,
RULING ELDERS: Roger W. Huibregtse, Earl Voskuil

TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Class of 1996 - MINISTER: Steven F. Miller (President)
RULING ELDER: Willard E. Neel

Class of 1995 - MINISTER: Martin L. Dawson
RULING ELDER: Howard A. Porter

RULING ELDER: William R. Haden, Jr.
SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE SIXTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SIXTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Douglas A. Watson (Convener), William O. Slack

CHAPLAINS COMMISSION

Class of 1996 - P. Lee House
Class of 1995 - Robert B. Needham
Class of 1994 - William E. Warren

HISTORIAN

Charles G. Dennison

COMMITTEE FOR THE HISTORIAN

James F. Alexander (Chairman), Brian O'Leary, Charles G. Dennison, David K. Thompson

COMMITTEE ON REVISIONS TO THE DIRECTORY FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP

George R. Cottenden (Chairman), John P. Galbraith, Bernard J. Stonehouse

COMMITTEE ON RECONCILIATION IN THE PRESBYTERY OF THE DAKOTAS

Jack J. Peterson, Thomas E. Tyson (Chairman)
# MODERATORS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MODERATOR</th>
<th>PLACE OF ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>R. B. Kuiper</td>
<td>Quarryville, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Everett C. DeVelde</td>
<td>Glenside, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Paul Woolley</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>John P. Clelland</td>
<td>Rochester, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Oscar Holkeboer</td>
<td>Willow Grove, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Cedar Grove, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Edward L. Kellogg</td>
<td>Wildwood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Dwight H. Poundstone</td>
<td>Los Angeles, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Lawrence R. Eyres</td>
<td>Glenside, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Calvin K. Cummings</td>
<td>Denver, Col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Edward J. Young, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Denver, Col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Bruce F. Hunt</td>
<td>W. Collingswood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Edmund P. Clowney</td>
<td>Oostburg, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>David L. Neilands, Esq.</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Robert L. Atwell</td>
<td>Cedar Grove, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Vineland, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Glenn R. Coie</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Oostburg, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Henry W. Coray</td>
<td>Long Beach, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Arthur O. Olson</td>
<td>Westfield, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ralph E. Clough</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th 1971 George W. Knight, III, Th.D. Wilmington, Del.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th 1972 Jack J. Peterson Oostburg, Wis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th 1973 Charles H. Ellis Manhattan Beach, Cal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st 1974 Laurence N. Vail Palos Heights, Ill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd 1975 George R. Cottenden Beaver Falls, Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th 1988 Mark T. Bube Lookout Mountain, Tenn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th 1989 Donald J. Duff Beaver Falls, Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th 1990 Theodore J. Georgian San Diego, Calif.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th 1993 Donald M. Poundstone Beaver Falls, Pa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CLERKS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>STATED CLERK</th>
<th>ASSISTANT CLERK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Paul Woolley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>John H. Skilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Paul Woolley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Robert E. Nicholas</td>
<td>Edward L. Kellogg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Edward Heerema</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Eugene Bradford</td>
<td>Charles H. Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>H. Wilson Albright</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Raymond M. Meiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
<td>Ralph W. Clough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Henry D. Phillips</td>
<td>Theodore J Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Raymond M. Meiners</td>
<td>F. Kingsley Elder, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Raymond M. Meiners</td>
<td>Elmer M. Dortzbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Robert S. Marsden</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Robert S. Marsden</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Robert S. Marsden</td>
<td>Raymond O. Zorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Henry D. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>C. Herbert Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Laurence N. Vail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robley J. Johnston</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Robley J. Johnston</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Robley J. Johnston</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>John J. Mitchell</td>
<td>Ronald E. Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Robert E. Nicholas</td>
<td>Ronald E. Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Stated Clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DAKOTAS              | The Rev. Edward A. Eppinger  
Box 22  
Bancroft, SD 57316          |
| MID-ATLANTIC         | The Rev. Stuart R. Jones  
3846 Emley Avenue  
Baltimore, MD 21213       |
| MIDWEST              | The Rev. Douglas B. Clawson  
7602 D Bristol Lane  
Hanover Park, IL 60103-2543 |
| NEW JERSEY           | Mr. Richard A. Barker  
639 Shadowlawn Drive  
Westfield, NJ 07090-3557 |
| NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND | The Rev. Stephen L. Phillips  
42 Beresford Road  
Rochester, NY 14610      |
| NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  | The Rev. Richard C. Miller  
8 Doris Dr.  
Novato, CA 94947         |
| NORTHWEST            | The Rev. Donald M. Poundstone  
624 N.E. 63rd Avenue  
Portland, OR 97213       |
| OHIO                 | The Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, Jr.  
RD #1, Box 336, Georgetown Rd.  
Franklin, PA 16323       |
| PHILADELPHIA         | The Rev. A. LeRoy Greer  
113 Chestnut Ave.  
Elsmere  
Wilmington, DE 19805 |
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SOUTH

The Rev. Ted F. Gray
600 S.E. 58th Ave.
Ocala, FL 32671

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. Robert M. Coie
P.O. Box 4258
Cerritos, CA 90703-4258

SOUTHWEST

P. O. Box 131573
Tyler, TX 75713-1573
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE DAKOTAS

#### COLORADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Denver, Providence | 9 4
| Denver, Trinity | 2 2
| Thornton, Immanuel | 2 2

#### KANSAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Caney, OPC   | 2 2
| Overland Park, Park Woods | 2 2

#### NEBRASKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Faith</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NORTH DAKOTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson, Bethel</td>
<td>7 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft, Murdock Memorial</td>
<td>5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater, Trinity</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamill, Westminster</td>
<td>5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volga, Calvary</td>
<td>9 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner, OPC</td>
<td>4 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WYOMING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne, OPC</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of Ruling Elders On Total Session*

*CLERKS OF SESSION*

(revised to 09-17-93)
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MID-ATLANTIC

### MARYLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baltimore, First</td>
<td>L. Fred Baum, Jr., 425 Haslett Rd., Joppa, 21085-4229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bowie, Trinity Reformed</td>
<td>Newman deHaas, 913 Loxford Terrace, Silver Spring, 20901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burtonsville, Covenant</td>
<td>Dr. Lawrence Johnson, 12516 O’Fallon St., Silver Spring, 20904-1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Columbia, Columbia</td>
<td>L. E. Clifford, 7534 Summer Leave, 21046-2457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frederick, New Hope</td>
<td>Spencer Higgins, 13 Maple Ave., Walkersville, 21793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laytonsville, Puritan</td>
<td>Robert M. Lucas P.O. Box 212, 484 Holiday St., Odenton, 21113-1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Knox</td>
<td>Newman deHaas, 913 Loxford Terrace, 20901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NORTH CAROLINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Matthews, Orthodox Presbyterian</td>
<td>Christopher Williams, 5026 Allison Ave., Charlotte, 28226-4902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mills River, Christ Presbyterian</td>
<td>Clint Swank, 354 Long Shoals Dr., Arden, 28704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raleigh, Pilgrim</td>
<td>Charles A. Van Deventer, Route 2, Box 379 Z, Middlesex, 27557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIRGINIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dayton, Berea</td>
<td>Leon J. Lucas, 104 Breezewood Terr., Bridgewater, 22812-1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leesburg, Bethel</td>
<td>Steven Rogers, Rt. 1 Box 308-D, 22075-8717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lynchburg, Grace</td>
<td>Richard A. Kochendarfer, 601 North St., Bedford, 24523-3423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manassas, Dayspring</td>
<td>Donald H. Potter, 268 Glen Ave. SW, Vienna, 22180-6211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roanoke, Garst Mill</td>
<td>James E. Horner, 3822 Chesterton St., SW, 24018-1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sterling, Sterling</td>
<td>The Rev. Edwin C. Urban, 202 Stratford Place, S.W., Leesburg 22075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vienna, Grace</td>
<td>Burton Mullins, Jr., 5224 Ampthill Dr., Alexandria, 22312-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MIDWEST

## ILLINOIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City, Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chicago, Trinity</td>
<td>Roy Ingvoldstadt, 4942 N. Hamlin Ave.</td>
<td>60625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hanover Park, Grace</td>
<td>John Baldwin, 6860 Juniper St.</td>
<td>60103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Libertyville, Hope</td>
<td>c/o John Baldwin 6860 Juniper St.</td>
<td>60103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westchester, Westminster</td>
<td>Ralph Lubben, 41 N. Lind, Hillside</td>
<td>60162-0153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wheaton, Bethel</td>
<td>Donald A. Brinks, 924 Irving</td>
<td>60187-3840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IOWA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City, Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cedar Falls, Covenant</td>
<td>Tom Uhlenhopp, 624 W. Park Ave., Waterloo</td>
<td>50702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MICHIGAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City, Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Farmington Hills, Oakland Hills</td>
<td>Richard Wagner, 215 Milford Meadows Dr., Milford</td>
<td>48381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gowen, Spencer Mills</td>
<td>David Raith, 11111 Podunk Rd., Greenville</td>
<td>48838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, Harvest</td>
<td>Dean Ter Haar, 3000 Woodside Ave. S.E.</td>
<td>49508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kalamazoo, Community</td>
<td>Henry Mejeur, 8889 Angling Rd., Portage</td>
<td>49002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metamora, Pilgrim</td>
<td>Bill Winter, 31420 Slumber Lane, Frazier</td>
<td>48026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ONTARIO, CANADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City, Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Thomas, Orthodox Reformed</td>
<td>James vant Voort, Box 2, Iona Station</td>
<td>ON Canada N0L 1P0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WISCONSIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City, Church</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Appleton, Apple Valley</td>
<td>Richard Irwin, 119 Lexington Ct., Neenah</td>
<td>54956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cedar Grove, Calvary</td>
<td>David Heuver, 10 Van Altena</td>
<td>53013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Green Bay, New Hope</td>
<td>David Tenpas, 533 Beaupre</td>
<td>54301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gresham, Old Stockbridge</td>
<td>Virgil Murphy, Rt. 1, Bowler</td>
<td>54416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Janesville, Christ</td>
<td>the Rev. David W. King, 2014 Adel St.</td>
<td>53546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Menomonee Falls, Falls</td>
<td>John Williams, 7029 Grand Parkway Wauwatosa</td>
<td>53213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oostburg, Bethel</td>
<td>Roger DeMaster, 731 New York Ave.</td>
<td>53070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sheboygan, Grace</td>
<td>Ronald L. Demaster, 412 N. 13th St., Oostburg</td>
<td>503070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zoar, Menominee</td>
<td>Harry Shawano, Star Rt., Neopit</td>
<td>54150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW JERSEY

### NEW JERSEY

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bellmawr, <em>Immanuel</em> - David F. Swanson, 74 Lynn Ave., Woodbury, 08096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bridgeton, <em>Calvary</em> - Russell S. Lodge, 28 Institute Pl., 08302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cherry Hill, <em>OPC</em> - John I. Beauchamp, II, 18 Hartford Rd., Mt. Laurel, 08054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair Lawn, <em>Grace</em> - Robert A. Reith, 40 N. 17th St., Prospect Park, 07508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hackettstown, <em>Church of the Covenant</em> - Edward O. Lewis, 150 Hope Road, Blairstown, 07825-9737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neptune, <em>Good Shepherd</em> - R. Arthur Thompson, 408 Birch Place, Westfield, 07090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Phillipsburg, <em>Calvary Community</em> - Charles T. De Boer, 893 N. Broadway, Wind Gap, PA 18091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phillipsburg, <em>River of Life</em> - Frank Leary, P.O. Box 177, 133 Cedar Rd., Rieglesville, PA 18077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pittsgrove, <em>Faith</em> - Kevin L. Parks, 66 S. Miller Ave., Pennsgrove, 08069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ringoes, <em>Calvary of Amwell</em> - Jesse J. Denton, Jr., NJ Highway 179, P. O. Box 380, 08551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stratford, <em>OPC</em> - Gordon H. Singer, 107 Parkview Rd., 08084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trenton, <em>Grace</em> - Perley J. Allen, 452 Lehigh Ave., Hamilton, 08619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turnersville, <em>Cross Keys Fellowship</em> - Ward Gibson, 71 E. Tomlin Station Rd., Mickleton, 08056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vineland, <em>Covenant</em> - John C. Shepherd, 1773 Magnolia Rd., 08360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>W. Collingswood, <em>Immanuel</em> - Joseph R. Wyatt, II, 422 North 40th St., Camden, 08110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westfield, <em>Grace</em> - Richard A. Barker, 639 Shadowlawn Dr., 07090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whippany, <em>Emmanuel</em> - The Rev. Harry W. Warner, 22 Conger St., Dover, 07801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wildwood, <em>Calvary</em> - Thomas A. Jorgensen, 136 W. Lavender Rd., 08260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND

### CONNECTICUT

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hamden, <em>Westminster</em> - Frank Emley, 79 Squire Lane, 06518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newtown, <em>Community</em> - The Rev. William B. Kessler, 22 Culvert City Rd., New Milford, 06776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAINE

5 4 Bangor, Pilgrim - Paul S. MacDonald, RFD 1, Box 1477, Carmel 04419-9703
6 6 Lewiston, Trinity - William G. Blodgett, III, 57 Davis Ave., Auburn, 04210-4701
9 6 Portland, Second Parish - Stephen A. MacDonald, Ph.D., 85 South St., Gorham, 04038
3 3 Rockport, Lakeview - Alan G. Clark, RR #1, Box 330, Jefferson, 04348
2 1 Skowhegan, OPC - Fremont A. Moody, RFD 4, Box 8860, 04976

MASSACHUSETTS

0 0 Boston, Peace - The Rev. Wendell L. Rockey, Jr., 498 Nottingham Dr., Centerville, MA 02632
0 0 Fall River, Grace - Karl H. Deubert, Ph.D., 24 Sachem Dr., Buzzards Bay, 02532
8 7 Ipswich, First - Robert Joss, Ph.D., 60 High St., 01938
3 3 North Andover, Merrimack Valley Community - Richard A. Mulley, 86 Second St., North Andover, 01845
3 3 South Hadley, New Life - B. Robert Robinson, Jr., 274 Franklin St., Holyoke, 01040
4 2 West Barnstable, Presbyterian of Cape Cod - Fred I. Buhler, 3 Farmedge La., Harwich, 02645-3109

NEW YORK

1 1 Amsterdam, Covenant - R. Alfred Hanna, 320 Locust Ave., 12010
8 6 Franklin Square, OPC - Herbert R. Muether, Ph.D., 25 Blinker Light Rd., Stony Brook, 11790
4 4 Lisbon, OPC - Delmer C. Putney, Rt.2, Box 374, 13658
2 2 Mount Vernon, Westchester - Donald S. Swanson, 247 Lincoln Ave., New Rochelle, 10801
6 6 Rochester, Covenant - Carl N. Schaufele, 60 Evergreen Dr., 14624
12 4 Rochester, Memorial - David L. Terpstra, 1285 York St., Lima, 14485
6 6 Schenectady, Calvary - Arthur L. Comstock, 11 Berwyn St., 12304-4402

VERMONT

2 2 Barre, Covenant - Ronald J. Regan, 55 Allen St., 05641
2 1 Williston, Church of the Servant - Robert A. Fales, 85 Oakwood Dr., So. Burlington, 05403
Appendix

REGIONAL CHURCH OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA

4 4 Berkeley, Covenant - David L. Neilands, 1601 Cedar St., 94703
Hanford, New Hope -
3 2 Modesto, Grace - Richard Nielson, 3324 John Lee Lane, 95350
2 2 Novato, Trinity - Jeffrey A. Hibbits, 75 Hickox Rd., 94947
1 1 San Francisco, First - J. Scott Cox, 2445 Lincoln Way, 94122
6 6 San Jose, Covenant - James Huizinga, 5935 Hosta Lane, 95124
2 2 Santa Cruz, Westminster - Dr. Michael H. Powell, 235 Grove St.,
Boulder Creek, 95006
4 3 Sonora, Calvary - Jerry Hayenga, P.O. Box 4743, 95370
4 4 South San Francisco, New Covenant - Dennis J. Fullalove,
427 Heathcliff Dr., Pacifica, 94044
6 4 Sunnyvale, First - Arnold E. Larson, 2949 Jessie Court,
San Jose, 95124

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE NORTHWEST

ALASKA

0 0 Wasilla, New Life - Steve Booth, 3600 Jaeger Circle,
99687

MONTANA

5 3 Billings, Rocky Mtn. Community - Rexford J. Clark,
4507 Palisades Park Dr., 59106
4 3 Kalispell, Faith Covenant - The Rev. Patrick H. Morison,
206 4th Ave. E., 59901
0 0 Missoula, Cornerstone - The Rev. Ronald J. McKenzie,
2345 S. 7th. West, 59801

OREGON

3 3 Bend, Grace Community - The Rev. Daniel J. Dillard,
62906 Nasu Park Loop, 97701
2 2 Eugene, Oak Hill - Douglas Moorehead, 1460 Flintridge, 97401
4 2 Grants Pass, Faith - Frode Jensen, 1355 Ferry Rd., 97526
5 3 Medford, Trinity - David A. Van Den Berg,
2544 Samoan Way, 97504
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>Portland, <em>First</em> - Gerrit Schouten, 30700 NE Lampert Rd., Troutdale, 97060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WASHINGTON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 2</th>
<th>Bothell, <em>New Life</em> - David Kerrigan, 1809 Ashworth Ave. N., Seattle, 98133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>Kent, <em>Emmanuel OPC</em> - The Rev. Randall A. Bergquist, 10930 SE 256th. Street, 98031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO**

**OHIO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 5</th>
<th>Columbus, <em>Grace</em> - John L. Gerwig, 864 Old Coach Rd., Westerville, 43081</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>Dayton, <em>Redeemer</em> - T. Andrew Demana, 1237 Carlisle, 45420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Pataskala, <em>Jersey Reformed Presbyterian</em>, Robert L. Shaffer 337 Mink St., SW, 43062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PENNSYLVANIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 2</th>
<th>Edinburg, <em>Nashua</em> - James T. Cover, RD #1, Evergreen Rd., Pulaski, 16143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Franklin, <em>Trinity</em> - Ronald Shay, R.D. 1, Cooperstown, 16317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>Grove City, <em>Covenant</em> - Jack Kendall, 430 Summit Street, 16127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>Harrisville, <em>Calvary</em> - William H. Kiester, RD1, Box 102, Boyers, 16020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>Hollidaysburg, <em>Westminster</em> - Gary Steiner, 109 Scenic Knoll Dr., 16648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, <em>Covenant</em> - Daniel M. O'Roark, 3913 Princess Court, Murrysville, 15668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>Sewickley, <em>Grace</em> - Jonathan Stark, 1054 Vance St., Apt. 2, Coraopolis, 15108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEST VIRGINIA**

| 4 3 | Morgantown, *Reformation* - the Rev. Lawrence Semel, 156 Gondville Ave., 26505 |
REGIONAL CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA

DELWARE

3 3 Middletown, Grace - Larry Stewart, 911 Blackbird Landing Rd., Townsend, 19734
12 6 Wilmington, Emmanuel - David Rittenhouse, 1106 N. Broom St., 19806

PENNSYLVANIA

3 3 Easton, New Life - Lawrence Jarrett, 1368 Jacobsburg Rd., Windgap, 18091
4 4 Fawn Grove, Faith - William Harold Brown, RD3, Box 70, Delta, 17314
7 3 Gettysburg, Living Hope - Thomas L. Boven, 228 Ewell Ave., 17325
6 5 Glenside, Calvary - Howard A. Porter, 329 Oak Road, 19038
5 5 Hanover, Grace - The Rev. Jeffrey Sheely, 322 Diller Rd., 17331-4301
8 9 Hatboro, Trinity - F. Thomas Sanderson, 785 Wallace Dr., Warminster, 18974
2 2 Lampeter, New Life - David Mueller, 714 South West End Ave., Lancaster, 17603
4 4 Lansdowne, Knox - Robert H. English, 116 W. Hillcrest Ave., Havertown, 19083
2 2 Madisonville, Covenant - Douglas Batzel, RR #1, Box 1681, Moscow, 18444
0 0 Mansfield, Grace Fellowship - Peter C. McLelland, RD 2, Box 59-C, 16933
2 2 Mechanicsville, Covenant - Bruce McMordie, 105 Chelsea Court, Perkasie, 18944
10 5 Middletown, Calvary - Stephen Hunter, 329 Nagle Court, Harrisburg, 17112
8 8 Oxford, Bethany - John Kinnaird, 420 Fremont Rd., Nottinham, 19362
2 2 Philadelphia, Emmanuel Chapel - Dwaine Whitley, 1425 S. Hicks St., 19146
2 2 Philadelphia (Germantown), Grace Fellowship - Eddie L. Chappelle, Sr., 8516 Willaims Ave., Philadelphia, 19150-1913
5 5 Philadelphia (Roxborough), Pilgrim - Ralph T. Angstadt, 4542 Manayunk Ave., 19128
2 2 Philadelphia, Southwest Reformed - William Brasch, 1412 Parkside Dr., Havertown, 19083
0 0 Phoenixville, Trinity - The Rev. Mark W. Holler, 110 S. Main St., 19460
5 4 Reading, Covenant - John Sallade, 36 Lawndale Rd., Wyomissing, 19610
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTH

**FLORIDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>John Q. Bishop, 8640 NW 11 St., Pembroke Pines, 33024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>New Life -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fellowship - Dr. John S. Deliyannisides, 4931 NW 49th Ave., Coconut Creek, 33073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderhill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bethel - Seaton Salkey, 1106 NW 16th St., 33311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coastal - Wayne J. Stevenson, 1303 S. Lakemont Dr., Cocoa, 32922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niceville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grace - Robert L. Grete, 1039 Forest Rd., 32578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faith - Art Lawson, 600 SE 58th Ave., 34471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lake Sherwood - James D. Phillips, 12436 Summerport Beach Way, Windermere, 34786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Calvary - Michael L. Andrews, 814 N. Garden St., 32303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEORGIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Redeemer - George Johnson, 1986 Crescent Dr., Snellville, 30278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Covenant - Clark Bonner, 203 Lake Forest Dr., 30240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOUISIANA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pineville</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pineville - Larkin B. Agnew, 401 Idlewild Dr., Alexandria, 71303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

**CALIFORNIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OPC - Michael T. Steege, 5111 Central Ave., 91902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grace - Robert E. Lee, III, 20836 Halldale Ave., Torrance, 90501-2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bayview - Garry Roy Postma, 1525 Melrose Ave., 91911-5952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>OPC - David Winslow, Jr., 10130 Stilbite Ave., Fountain Valley, 92708-1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Church Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goleta, El Camino</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>La Mirada, Calvary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Long Beach, Faith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Los Angeles, Beverly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oxnard, Covenant of Grace</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>San Diego, New Life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Santa Ana, Covenant Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Santee, Valley</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTHWEST**

**NEW MEXICO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Albuquerque, Covenant of Grace</th>
<th>Gary Westerfield, 921 Spur Place, S. E., Rio Rancho, 87124-3061</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roswell, OPC</td>
<td>Marvin K. Zylstra, 904 S. Plains Park Drive, 88201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OKLAHOMA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Bartlesville, Westminster</th>
<th>Jerold W. Barnett, 4101 SE Lakeview Dr., 74006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, Knox</td>
<td>Ted A. Weber, 9906 S. Morgan Rd., Mustang, 73064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Abilene, Covenant</th>
<th>Virgil T. Seaberry, 2742 Buffalo Gap Rd., 79605</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amarillo, Christ Covenant</td>
<td>Mike T. Mahon, 5510 Everett Ave., 79106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Austin, Providence OPC</td>
<td>James W. Van Dam, Ph.D., 11102 Henge Dr., 78759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas, Geneva Presbyterian</td>
<td>James W. Van Dam, Ph.D, 11102 Henge Dr., Austin, 78759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Antonio, Grace</td>
<td>Fred D. Klatt, 12902 Waynesboro, 78233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tyler, OPC</td>
<td>H. Kenneth Turman, 2225 Suanne, 75701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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