
51ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OVERTURES

Preliminary, Personal Assessments by Dr. David F. Coffin, Jr.

PLEASE NOTE:

For the sake of conscience, a word of explanation about this review: I prepare these materials for myself, as a discipline to help me reflect on the business of the Assembly beforehand, and also, so that in the press of Assembly business on the floor, I can quickly reorient myself to the issues. In no sense is this material prepared for the purpose of encouraging a party spirit, or a pre-committed voting bloc. Although these views reflect my current convictions, I am not even sure that I will vote as specified, because I am committed to listening to the debate, and if compelling arguments are set forth contrary to my current views, to change my position in light of our deliberations.

I hope that all can agree that such a stance is essential to the functioning of the deliberative Assembly that biblical Presbyterianism sets forth, as liable to direction both through reasoned, biblical argument and by the immediate work of the Holy Spirit. The only reason I distribute this material is because it has proven helpful to others to stimulate their prayerful reflections in preparation for the debate.

Finally, I note that I am a member of the Standing Judicial Commission of the General Assembly. According to the requirements of the “Operating Manual of the Standing Judicial Commission” (OMSJC), I am committed to “perform the duties of [my] office with impartiality and shall be diligent to maintain the impartiality of the Commission” (OMSJC 2.10). Thus, I am not permitted to make “any public or private statement that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome of a pending matter or impending matter in any court of the church” (OMSJC 2.5). That notwithstanding, I am permitted to “make public or private statements in the course of [my] duties as a presbyter . . . with respect to biblical teaching, confessional interpretation, the principles of the form of government and discipline. . . .” (OMSJC 2.6). Nothing I have said in this review is intended to intimate, hint, or suggest which party should prevail in any case that might come before me under our current *BCO*, or under any proposed amendments, should they be adopted.

You are free to distribute my summary as you will, but only with the above disclaimer attached. I should note: the intelligibility of my terse comments depends upon one having carefully read the overture in question! Find the full text of the overtures at: <https://pcaga.org/resources/#overtures/> So too, space limits anything but direct speech, so please forgive a dearth of polite expression in what follows.

OVERTURE STATISTICS

- 35 Overtures submitted to the 51st General Assembly
- 29 Overtures referred to OC (#s 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-33)
- 27 Overtures referred to CCB for advice (#s 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14-32)
- 6 Overtures to MNA (#s 5, 8, 11, 12, 34, 35)
- 1 Overture to AC (# 33)
- 1 Overture to CC & CTS (# 14)
- 3 Overtures to all 10 CCs (#s 7, 31, 32)

- 23 proposing amendment to *BCO* (#s 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 15-27, 29-32)
- 3 proposing amendment to *RAO* (#s 7, 14, 28)
- 6 presbyteries & boundaries (#s 5, 8, 11, 12, 34, 35)
- 1 request to commend/distribute *ltr* (# 13)
- 1 erect ad interim committee (#33)
- 1 appoint study committee (#4)

- 25 Presbyteries, 3 Sessions and 1 individual submitting

OVERTURES SUBMITTED TO THE 51ST GA

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
1	Amend <i>BCO</i> 35-1 and 35-8 Regarding Witness Eligibility See also Overture 18	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The proposed language is an inadequate replacement for a time-tested provision. The first line of 35-1 is question-begging. Who can be called as a witness? One who promises truth. Who can promise truth? One who is called as a witness. Further, since there are no parameters to objection, any idiocy can be raised and the court must still “consider and rule.” The ARP categories cited in the explanation are far superior to this blank slate.</p> <p>With respect to 35-8, why is it that a person not a Christian is not able to “take a lawful oath invoking God”? Deists, Jews, Muslims, Unitarians, Pantheists all profess to believe in God. In what sense are they “not able.” The “Explanation” seems, in fact, to grant they can.</p> <p>There may be something to the goal of the proponents, but this is not the vehicle to get there.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment constitutionally vague. <i>CH</i>, 291, item A.</p>	Piedmont Triad	CCB, OC
2	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-6 for Clarity in Transfers of Ordination	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>I am doubtful about the addition of questions for ordination being put to an ordained minister. Cf <i>BCO</i> 21-5 and 21-9.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 291, item B.</p>	Northern California	CCB, OC
3	Grant Constitutional Status to <i>BCO</i> 53 re Preaching	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>I am doubtful about the introduction of “qualified man”.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 291-2, item C.</p>	Pee Dee	CCB, OC
4	Establish Study Committee for Judicial Rules Changes	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>A study committee with such an open-ended and unconstrained brief strikes me as imprudent.</p> <p>So too, the proposal for a suspension of the rules as to the number of members does not appear to be well-informed as to Robert’s Rules.</p> <p>Further, I see no urgency in a wholesale revision of our discipline, as, in the main, it has served well for hundreds of years. And it is worth noting, in the words of one of the wisest of our American Presbyterian forefathers in matters of polity, a general objection ought to be considered against any proposed change in <i>The Book of Church Order</i>. He observed that any new language would undoubtedly include undiscovered ambiguities that might well have disastrous unintended</p>	Central Indiana	CCB, OC

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
		<p>consequences, consequences that would only appear when the provisions were tested in cases by sharp and contending minds seeking possible meanings to their advantage. Thus, he concluded, unless the change proposed is clearly necessary, the old language is to be preferred, because it has already been long tested in cases, and persuasive precedents guide the church as to its meaning.</p> <p>Finally, the financing provision appears to endorse a pay-to-play principle that would be corrupting.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 292, item D. Cf. RAO 9-3.</p>		
5	Change Piedmont Triad and Catawba Valley Presbytery Boundaries	<p>AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.</p> <p>MNA approves, <i>CH</i>, 605, item 5.</p>	Piedmont Triad	MNA
6	<p>Amend <i>BCO</i> Sections to Require Background Checks for Church Office.</p> <p>See also Overtures 16, 17, 23, 24. Appendix I provides a comparison chart</p> <p>The rationale for Negative answer for all listed here only</p>	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background checks are not reliable.¹ 2. The ephemeral has no place in the <i>BCO</i>.² 3. Questions of conscience are not addressed adequately.³ 4. Legal liability for sharing results of background check with receiving Presbytery, with dismissing Presbytery, with calling body are not addressed. O.23 <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 292, item E. Cf. WCF 23.3 & PP2; <i>BCO</i> 13-6</p>	Susquehanna Valley	CCB, OC
7	Amend RAO 11-5 to Clarify Process for RAO Amendments	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Too complicated and time consuming. Sentences two and three are out of chronological order and are thus confusing. All this “advice” giving strikes me as increasing the burden on the Overtures Committee. There is a fix needed here, but this is not the cure.</p>	Ascension	CCB, OC, AC, CC, CDM, CTS, GEN, MNA, MTW,

¹ “Based on our analysis, private-sector background checks are laden with false-positive and false-negative errors: 60 percent and 50 percent of participants had at least one false-positive error on their regulated and unregulated background checks, and nearly all (90 percent and 92 percent of participants, respectively) had at least one false-negative error. We define specific problems with private-sector criminal records: mismatched data that create false negatives, missing case dispositions that create incomplete and misleading criminal records, and incorrect data that create false positives. Accompanying qualitative interviews show how errors in background checks limit access to social opportunities ranging from employment to education to housing and violate basic principles of fairness in the legal system.” Sarah Lageson and Robert Stewart, “The problem with criminal records: Discrepancies between state reports and private-sector background checks,” *Criminology* 62:1 (February 2024): 1-171; <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.1235>.

² “Identity History Summary” from the FBI . . . or a “Vulnerable Sector Check” from the Canadian Government.

³ A set forth in Overture 17’s rationale: “Some candidates who have nothing to hide may refuse to submit to a background check, because they do not trust the State and do not believe the church should be looking to the state for the approval of candidates. This liberty of conscience should be left free and not bound by extra-biblical rules.” (M50GA,108) “It is also not clear what will happen if a candidate refuses to submit to a criminal background check. If a man refuses to be fingerprinted or undergo a background check for reasons of conscience, is he disqualified for office? Is refusal to submit to a criminal background check by the civil magistrate is not a legitimate ground to disqualify a man for office. Thus, the overture would add an extra-Biblical requirement for officers.” (M50GA, 108–109). Note, the rationale’s answer is profoundly misinformed with respect to binding the conscience.

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
		<p>The AC recommends an answer in the Affirmative, <i>CH</i>, 306, item 3 (so also CMD #9; MNA #9; MTW #9; CC #11; Foundation #5; Geneva # 8) .</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, F, item 292.</p>		PCAF, RH, RUF
8	Change Boundaries of Covenant and Mississippi Valley Presbyteries	<p>AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.</p> <p>MNA approves, <i>CH</i>, 606, item 7.</p>	Covenant	MNA
9	Amend <i>BCO</i> 12-5.e. to add Great Commission	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Sessions are to “determine the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the church and congregation.” The overture would add the phrase “including living in obedience to the Great Commission (Matthew 28:19-20).”</p> <p>The proponents, I am sure, are full of zeal for the good, but this is ill-considered. Has this duty not been implicitly included, along with all others, heretofore?</p> <p>Why should this, and no other matters of concern, be highlighted (e.g., including living as faithful to the Scriptures, or, living as true to the Reformed faith, or living to glorify God and enjoy him forever, or, living to love God with all your heart and soul and mind and to love your neighbor as yourself)?</p> <p>The <i>BCO</i> is not a hobbyhorse of particular concerns; it is a document of governmental principles.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 292, item G.</p>	Metro Atlanta	CCB, OC
10	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-9 to add Presbytery TE Care	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>See on Overture 9. If not persuaded, then perhaps we should make other such additions? “b. To review the records of church Sessions, redress whatever they may have done contrary to order and take effectual care that they, <i>and each teaching elder</i>, observe the Constitution of the Church”; or, here “f. To condemn erroneous opinions which injure the purity or peace of the Church; to visit churches, <i>and the home of each teaching elder</i>, for the purpose of inquiring into and redressing the evils that may have arisen in them;</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 292, item H.</p>	Metro Atlanta	CCB, OC
11	Change Boundaries of Mississippi Valley and Covenant Presbyteries	<p>AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.</p> <p>MNA approves, <i>CH</i>, 606, item 8.</p>	Mississippi Valley	MNA

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
12	Change Catawba Valley and Piedmont Triad Presbytery Boundaries	AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners. MNA approves, <i>CH</i> , 606, item 6.	Catawba Valley	MNA
13	Commend and Encourage Distribution of Commission Letter Regarding Gender Reassignment for Minors	NEGATIVE The document's constitutional standing is suspect, as it appears to violate Westminster Confession of Faith 31:4 and <i>BCO</i> 3-3, 3-4.	Calvary	OC
14	Amend RAO 4-21.d to Require Enrollment Data From Higher Ed Institutions	AFFIRMATIVE CC approves. However, the recommendation notes that "the enrollment information requested to be reported in the minutes of the Board of Trustees is, and has been, publicly available." <i>CH</i> , 1,311, item 8. CTS approves. <i>CH</i> , 1,431, item 12. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i> , I, item 293.	Northwest Georgia	CCB, OC, CC, CTS
15	Amend <i>BCO</i> 7-2 to Specify Ordination for Biological Males Only	NEGATIVE The language of the <i>BCO</i> should not capitulate to a gruesome fad. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i> , 293, item J.	Session of West End Presbyterian Church	CCB, OC
16	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-6, 21-4, 24-1 to Require Background Checks See also Overtures 6, 17, 23, 24	NEGATIVE See the reasons listed at Overture 6. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i> , 293, item K.	Warrior	CCB, OC
17	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-6, 21-4, and 24-1 to Require Background Checks for Church Office See also Overtures 6, 16, 23, 24	NEGATIVE See the reasons listed at Overture 6. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i> , 293, item L.	Ohio	CCB, OC
18	Amend <i>BCO</i> 35-1 and 35-8 Regarding Witness Eligibility See also Overture 1	NEGATIVE The proposed language is an inadequate replacement for a time-tested provision. The proposed change to the first sentence has it assert something that is not true: "All persons are competent witnesses. . . ." Other considerations set forth with respect to Ov. 1 are relevant here as well. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i> , 293, item M.	Ohio	CCB, OC

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
19	Amend <i>BCO</i> 41 to allow Venue Change in Judicial Cases	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>There is nothing to be gained by increasing the complexity of our Rules of Discipline. Further, the critical element of the proposal, amendment to the last sentence of <i>BCO</i> 41-3, lacks coherence.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 293-94, item N. Cf. <i>BCO</i> 39-1, PP6, <i>BCO</i> 31-2.</p>	Session of Fountain Square Presbyterian Church	CCB, OC
20	Amend <i>BCO</i> 31, 32, and 35 with Proposed Systematic Changes	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>A complicated and confusing proposal that will undo our time-tested order. Further, the proposal depends upon passage of Overture 4, but wisdom will lead to an answer in the negative. Further, I would like the Presbytery to repay me for the cost of the printing the 37 pages of this overture! I have begun to consider a ROA page limit for Overtures.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in grave conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 294, item O. Cf. multiple cites.</p>	Session of Fountain Square Presbyterian Church	CCB, OC
21	Amend <i>BCO</i> 43-1 to change the Prohibition Against 'Interlocutory Appeal' by Complaint	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The Overture identifies a real problem. However, this is also an unusually complicated subject, largely because of the peculiarity of our rules concerning complaints.</p> <p>In early American Presbyterian polity there was no such thing as a complaint. Every objection to a lower court's behavior was an appeal immediately to the court next higher.</p> <p>In the 19th century the church decided to distinguish between an appeal, conceived of as an act of a party found to be guilty on trial to the court next higher, from a complaint, understood as an against an action by the court that a member thought was wrong, originally, also immediately to the court next higher.</p> <p>The PCA, at its origin, complicated the matter, by applying Mat. 18 to the complaint, thus making the first court to hear the complaint the original court. Why this reasoning was not supposed to apply to the appeal is a mystery (but perhaps common sense prevailed in the former, but not the latter).</p> <p>All of this is to explain why, under our rules, errors of a trial court, or a subordinate appeals court, are treated as that which must be dealt with at the time of the error by the court, or, finally, by the court of last resort. There is no interruption of the proceedings.</p> <p>However, a complaint, which is against <i>any</i> action of a court (including, now, courts at trial), must be heard immediately by the court at its next meeting, and must be pursued until the highest court settles the matter. Thus, one or more complaints, with respect to a trial in process, could potentially delay trial proceedings indefinitely. A quandary.</p>	Central Indiana	CCB, OC

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
		<p>The Overture before us seeks to remedy this quandary, but “Ephraim is but a cake half-baked” (Hos. 7:8). The problem before us is in our conception of the complaint, and that touches on a number of other areas. We should attend to the root, not merely the fruit, and thus not complicate matters even further.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS internally inconsistent and IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 294, item P. Cf. <i>BCO</i> 43-2</p>		
22	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-2 to clarify Teaching Elder Presbytery Membership	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The Overture fails to demonstrate the alleged conflict.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 294, item Q.</p>	South Florida	CCB, OC
23	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-6, 21-4, and 24-1 to Require Background Checks for Church Office See also Overtures 6, 16, 17, 24	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>See the reasons listed at Overture 6.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 294-95, item R. Cf. WCF 23.3 & PP2; <i>BCO</i> 13-6.</p>	Missouri	CCB, OC
24	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-6, 21-4, and 24-1 to Require Background Checks for Church Office See also Overtures 6, 16, 17, 23	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>See the reasons listed at Overture 6.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 295, item S.</p>	South Texas	CCB, OC
25	Amend <i>BCO</i> 31-2 to Expand Who May Assist in an Investigations	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>“As circumstances warrant . . . encouraged to consider”! Pious advice, that requires virtually nothing at all, does not belong in the <i>BCO</i>.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 295, item T.</p>	Tennessee Valley	CCB, OC

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
26	Amend <i>BCO</i> 32-19 To Expand Representation of Accused Persons Before Church Courts	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>There is a problem identified by the Overture, but I think the remedy proposed is too broad. There was a reason the original text moved in a circle that widened with the rise of a matter to a higher court. That is, to prevent “gunslinger” advocates from disturbing local jurisdictions. One may acknowledge the inadequacy of some local advocates; but there is as well an inadequacy of some local sessions with respect to polished “professional” advocates from the outside. The current proposal seems oblivious to this problem.</p> <p>There is an alternative proposal being floated, set forth below, that seeks to address that concern, while broadening the pool of representatives as the case rises, and, crucially, allowing for continuity of representation (which no one seems to see that our current rule, read precisely, makes almost impossible).</p> <p>“32-19. No professional counsel shall be permitted as such to appear and plead in cases of process in any court; but an accused person may, if he desires it, be represented before the Session by any communing member of the same particular church, or before any other court, by any member of that court. <u>or the Presbytery by any member in good standing of a church in the same Presbytery or by any TE member of that Presbytery, or before the General Assembly by any member in good standing in the PCA.</u> A member of the court so employed shall not be allowed to sit in judgment in the case. <u>Courts are encouraged to suggest to the accused/appellant the names of potential representatives and potential advisors he might contact.</u>”</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 295, item U.</p>	Tennessee Valley	CCB, OC
27	Amend <i>BCO</i> 13-6 to Add Personal Character and Family Management to the Examination of Transferring Ministers	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>The amendment makes the provision consistent with <i>BCO</i> 21-4.c.(1)(a).</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 295, item V.</p>	Potomac	CCB, OC

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
28	Amend RAO 16-6.c.1. to Eliminate Conflict with <i>BCO</i> 40-5	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>RAO 16-6.c.1. and RAO 16-10.c. are not in conflict with <i>BCO</i> 40-5. At the culmination of an unsuccessful resolution to the normal RAO 16 procedure, <i>BCO</i> 40-5 is engaged and its “proceedings” are followed precisely. As the premise of the Overture is faulty, there is no reason for the proposed change in the text. Further, it is not at all clear how the word change would alleviate the conflict if there was one.⁴</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 295, item W.</p>	New Jersey	CCB, OC
29	Amend <i>BCO</i> 53 by Addition to Ensure Only Men Preach	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The <i>BCO</i>’s current language is more than adequate.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 296, item X. Cf. question of jurisdiction.</p>	Session of Bryce Avenue Presbyterian Church	CCB, OC
30	Amend <i>BCO</i> 23-1 To Require that the Presbytery of Jurisdiction Conduct an Exit Interview Prior to Dissolution of Call	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The proposal limits Presbytery from acting expeditiously when there is no problem and tries to deal with the use of NDAs by some, by placing a burdensome process upon all.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 296, item Y.</p>	Lowcountry	CCB, OC
31	Amend <i>BCO</i> 14-1 Regarding Changes in Permanent Committee and Agency Policy	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>This is a worthy goal, but the means proposed are require a more careful drafting.</p> <p>The AC recommends that the Overture be referred to the 52nd GA in order to give all the Committees and Agencies time to consider it, <i>CH</i>, 306, item 4. CC concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,311, item 9. CTS concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,431 item 13. Foundation concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,504, item 6. Ridge Haven concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,702. Item 5</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 296, item Z.</p>	New River	CCB, OC, AC, CC, CDM, CTS, GEN, MNA, MTW, PCAF, RH, RUF

⁴ Concerning the relation of RAO 16-6.c.1., RAO 16-10.c. and *BCO* 40-5, see the “Report of the Standing Judicial Commission: Case 2023-13,” *CH*, pp. 2157-2159; “Concurring Opinion,” by Coffin, 2162-2165; “Concurring Opinion,” by Donahoe, 2166-2168.

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
32	Amend <i>BCO</i> 23 to Address Dissolution of Call for those employed by a Committee or Agency	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Again, a worthy goal, but the proposal requires further refinement.</p> <p>The AC recommends that the Overture be referred to the 52nd GA in order to give all the Committees and Agencies time to consider it, <i>CH</i>, 306, item 5. CC concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,311, item 9. CTS concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,431 item 14. Foundation concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,504, item 7. Ridge Haven concurs, <i>CH</i>, 1,703. Item 6</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 296, item AA. Cf. <i>BCO</i> 11-4.</p>	Eastern Pennsylvania	CCB, OC, AC, CC, CDM, CTS, GEN, MNA, MTW, PCAF, RH, RUF
33	Erect Ad Interim Committee on the Book Jesus Calling	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Brings to mind a saying I have heard about the treatment of expired equines, and another about somnolent canines.</p>	TE Benjamin Inman	OC, AC
34	Merge Columbus Metro and Ohio Valley Presbyteries	AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.	Columbus Metro	MNA
35	Merge Ohio Valley and Columbus Metro Presbyteries	AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.	Ohio Valley	MNA

APPENDIX I: BACKGROUND CHECK OVERTURES 6, 16, 17, 23, 24

Overture 6	Overture 16 ⁵	Overture 17 ⁶	Overture 23	Overture 24 ⁷
<p>13-6. Ministers seeking admission to a Presbytery from other Presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church in America shall be examined on Christian experience. . . . <u>Before “receiving the minister from a Presbytery in the PCA or from another denomination, the Presbytery shall obtain and review with the candidate an “Identity History Summary”¹ from the FBI and a state/local background check or a “Vulnerable SectoCheck”² from the Canadian Government. . . .</u></p>	<p>13-6. Ministers seeking admission to a Presbytery from other Presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church in America shall be examined on Christian experience. . . .</p> <p><u>A Presbytery shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Presbytery, as part of its examination of the candidate’s Christian experience (if seeking admission from another Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church in America) or acquaintance with experiential religion (if seeking admission from other denominations [see BCO 21-4.c.(1)(a)]). The candidate shall be permitted to address the content of the background check.</u></p>	<p>13-6. . . .</p> <p><u>A Presbytery shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Presbytery, as part of its examination of the candidate’s Christian experience (if seeking admission from another Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church in America) or acquaintance with experiential religion (if seeking admission from other denominations [see BCO 21- 4.c.(1)(a)]). The candidate shall be permitted to address the results of the background check.</u></p>	<p>13-6. <u>When a minister is Ministers seeking admission to a Presbytery from another Presbytery other Presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church in America, or from another denomination, the receiving Presbytery shall cause a state and federal level fingerprint-based background check to be performed on the minister. The results of the background check shall be shared with the members of the receiving Presbytery, with the members of the dismissing Presbytery, and with the calling church or other organization that is calling the minister. He shall be examined on Christian experience, and also touching his the# views in theology. . . .</u></p>	<p>13-6. . . .</p> <p><u>A Presbytery shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Presbytery, as part of its examination of the candidate’s Christian experience (if seeking admission from another Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church in America) or acquaintance with experiential religion (if seeking admission from other denominations [see BCO 21- 4.c.(1)(a)]). The candidate shall be permitted to address the content of the background check.</u></p>
<p>18.3 <u>The Presbytery shall obtain a and review with the applicant an “Identity History Summary” from the FBI and a state/local background check or a “Vulnerable Sector Check” from the Canadian Government. . . .</u></p>				

⁵ Includes “Policy” attachment.

⁶ Includes “Policy” attachment and extensive rationale.

⁷ Includes “Policy” attachment.

<p>19-2. Examination for Licensure. The examination for licensure shall be as follows: a. The Presbytery shall obtain and review with the candidate an "Identity History Summary" from the FBI and a state/local background check or a "Vulnerable Sector Check" from the Canadian Government.</p>	<p>21-4 c. Trials for ordination shall consist of: (1) The Presbytery shall obtain and review with the candidate an "Identity History Summary" from the FBI and a state/local background check or a "Vulnerable Sector Check" from the Canadian Government.</p>	<p>24-1. Every church shall elect persons to the offices of ruling elder and deacon in the following manner. . . . The session should obtain and review with the candidate an "Identity History Summary" from the FBI and a state/local background check" from the Canadian Government.</p>
	<p>21-4.c.(1) A Presbytery shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Presbytery, as part of its examination of a candidate's experiential religion (BCO 21-4.c.(1)(a)). The candidate shall be permitted to address the content of the background check.</p>	<p>24-1.c. A Session shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Session, as part of its examination of a candidate's Christian experience (BCO 24-1.a). The candidate shall be permitted to address the content of the background check.</p>
	<p>21-4.c.(1) A Presbytery shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Presbytery, as part of its examination of a candidate's experiential religion (BCO 21-4.c.(1)(a)). The candidate shall be permitted to address the results of the background check.</p>	<p>24-1.c. A Session shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Session, as part of its examination of a candidate's Christian experience (BCO 24-1.a). The candidate shall be permitted to address the results of the background check.</p>
	<p>21-4. b. Prior to ordination, the examining Presbytery shall cause a state and federal level fingerprint-based background check to be performed on each candidate. The results of the background check shall be shared with the Presbytery and with the calling church. The fee for the background check shall be paid for by the calling church or organization, or in the case of the ordinand being an evangelist, the Presbytery shall pay the fee.</p>	<p>24-1. Every church shall elect. . . . Titus 1. The Session shall cause a state and federal level fingerprint-based background check to be performed on each candidate eligible for election. The cost shall be covered by the nominee's church. The results of the background check may be shared with the congregation if deemed prudent by the Session. Nominees for the office of ruling elder and/or deacon shall receive instruction. . . .</p>
	<p>21-4.c.(1) A Presbytery shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Presbytery, as part of its examination of a candidate's experiential religion (BCO 21-4.c.(1)(a)). The candidate shall be permitted to address the content of the background check.</p>	<p>24-1.c. A Session shall order and review a background check on each candidate, administered under the specific rules and policies of the Session, as part of its examination of a candidate's Christian experience (BCO 24-1.a). The candidate shall be permitted to address the content of the background check.</p>