

MINUTES

Sixth Annual CRE Presbytery

Bellevue, WA - 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM, Friday, October 18, 2002

I. Invocation – Garry Vanderveen – Langley Reformed Evangelical Church

Brett Baker greeting those assembled. Garry Vanderveen opened the meeting in prayer.

II. Psalm Singing: David Erb – Eastside Evangelical Fellowship

David Erb led the assembly in singing Psalms (100A, 128B).

III. Exhortation from the Scriptures – Dennis Tuuri – Reformation Covenant Church

Dennis Tuuri taught on shepherding the flock from John 6.

IV. Introduction of Visitors

Doug Roorda – Christ the Redeemer, Pella ID.
Jack Phelps – Covenant Bible Church, Anchorage, AK.
Craig Mischenko – Covenant Bible Church, Anchorage, AK.
Don Walters – Covenant Bible Church, Anchorage, AK.
Gene Liechty – Christ Church, NC
Doug Hayes – Reformation Covenant Church, Oregon City, OR.
Rick Young – Christ Reformed Church, Waterville, MS
Ryan Young – Christ Reformed Church, Waterville, MS
Kelly Dykema – Lakeside Church (PCA), New Berlin, WI
Doug Enick – First Church of God, Pratti, KS
Ron DeTroye – Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church, Port Washington, WI
Mike Pasarilla – Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church, Port Washington, WI
Michael Hamel – Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church, Port Washington, WI
Dean Hellekson – Christ Covenant Church, Lynnwood, WA.

V. Roll call and establishment of a quorum

Canyon Covenant Church (2001) – Crooked River Ranch, OR
Jeff Harlow
Tom Harlow
Christ Church (1997) -Moscow, ID
Doug Wilson
Chris Schlect
Christ Church (2001) – Spokane, WA
Joost Nixon
Christ Covenant Church (2000) – Lynnwood, WA
Steve Brown
Christ Reformed Evangelical Church (2000)-Glen Burnie, MD
Eric Sauder
Paul Hamelryck
Cornerstone Reformed Church (2000) – Carbondale, IL
Burke Shade
John Rendleman
Eastside Evangelical Fellowship (1997) – Kirkland, WA
Dave Hatcher
Chris Butaud
Emmanuel Covenant Church (2000) - Phoenix, AZ
Jeff Niell
Richard Klaus
Grace Covenant Church (1998) - Texarkana, AR
Steve Ramsey
Grace Covenant Church (2001) – Sechelt, BC

Kenton Spratt
 Nicol Warn
 Grace Evangelical Church (1999) - Redondo Beach, CA
Greg Bero (Was not able to attend)
 Langley Reformed Evangelical Church (2000) – Langley, BC
 Gary Vanderveen
 Robert Liedl
 Reformation Covenant Church (1999)- Oregon City, OR
 Dennis Tuuri
 Christopher Wilson
 Trinity Church (1997) – Wenatchee, WA
 Gene Helsel
 Jon DeJong

VI. Member Reports: (3-5 minutes each)

Canyon Covenant Church (2001) – Crooked River Ranch, OR
 Christ Church (1997) -Moscow, ID
 Christ Church (2001) – Spokane, WA
 Christ Covenant Church (2000) - Lynnwood, WA
 Christ Reformed Evangelical Church (2000)-Annapolis, MD
 Cornerstone Reformed Church (2000) - Carbondale, IL
 Eastside Evangelical Fellowship (1997) - Kirkland, WA
 Emmanuel Covenant Church (2000) - Phoenix, AZ
 Grace Covenant Church (1998) - Texarkana, AR
 Grace Covenant Church (2001) – Sechelt, BC
 Grace Evangelical Church (1999) - Redondo Beach, CA
 Langley Reformed Evangelical Church (2000) - Langley, BC
 Reformation Covenant Church (1999)- Oregon City, OR
 Trinity Church (1997) - Wenatchee, WA

Motion to take a brief break (Butaud, Ramsey)
Passed Unanimously

VII. Consideration of Fraternal Delegates (Recommend/Extend/Withdraw)

Christ Church:

All Saints Presbyterian (1999) – Lancaster PA (Gregg Strawbridge, Marlin Detweiler)

Motion to receive All Saints Presbyterian (Schlect, Sauder)

Mr. Schlect gave a brief update on All Saints Presbyterian. He commended the presbytery to read about the church in the document included in the presbyter’s packet.

Mr. Strawbridge was invited to take some question from the floor.

- Mr. Nixon asked Mr. Strawbridge to comment on scripture regarding overseers giving account for the souls under them.
- Mr. Vanderveen asked if Mr. Strawbridge is still a member of the PCA Presbytery.
- Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Strawbridge to describe the pattern of his home.
- Mr. Helsel asked Mr. Strawbridge to describe the relationship he has with his parents.
- Mr. Helsel asked how the Apostle’s & Nicene creeds will be used in pastoring.
- Mr. Niell asked what the liturgy looks like at All Saints Presbyterian.
- Mr. Niell asked what the greatest challenges are for Mr. Strawbridge as he pastors All Saints Presbyterian.
- Mr. Schlect asked for the rationale for the Book of Confession that All Saints Presbyterian uses.
- Mr. Butaud asked how All Saints Presbyterian would handle a Credo-Baptist who desired membership.

- Mr. Shade asked if he was comfortable with the covenant of works.
- Mr. Shade asked what he would do if a child was baptized and the father refused to allow the child to the table.

The motion passed unanimously.

Providence Church (2000) – Lynchburg, VA (Virgil Hurt)

Motion to receive Providence Church (Wilson, Hesel)

Mr. Wilson gave a brief update on Providence Church. He recommended that the presbytery read about the church in the document included in the presbyter's packet.

Mr. Hurt was invited to take some question from the floor. (Mr. Schlect pointed out that the questions for Mr. Hurt ought not be pastoral, but focused on the church.

- Mr. Wilson asked about the aroma of his home. What is your family like?
- Mr. Wilson asked for the basic outline of the liturgy at Providence Church.
- Mr. Hatcher asked why he is not sitting for an ordination exam at this time.

The motion passed unanimously.

Church of the King (2001) – Santa Cruz, CA (Scott Snider)

Motion to extend the fraternal status of Grace Covenant Church (Wilson, Harlow, J)

No discussion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Grace Covenant Church:

Grace Covenant Church (2000) – Nacogdoches, TX (Randy Booth, David Alders)

Motion to receive Grace Covenant Church (Ramsey, Niell)

Mr. Ramsey asked Mr. Booth to the floor for questions.

- Mr. Wilson asked about the aroma of his home. What is your family like?

The motion passed unanimously.

Tanglewood Baptist Church (2000) – Sand Springs, OK (Rogers Meredith, Monty Whitten)

Motion to receive Tanglewood Baptist Church (Ramsey, Nixon)

Mr. Ramsey explained the relationship that Grace Covenant has with Tanglewood. Mr. Ramsey asked Mr. Meredith and Mr. Whitten to the floor for questions.

- Mr. Nixon asked for some history of Tanglewood Baptist Church.
- Mr. Niell asked for the status of the ordination of Mr. Meredith.
- Mr. Schlect clarified that the disappointment was in the process not the candidate.
- Mr. Wilson asked about the aroma of his home. What is your family like?
- Mr. Wilson asked if they're set up to accommodate a paedobaptist family.
- Mr. Schlect asked if there is issue with the independency of local session government juxtaposed with Presbyterianism.
- Mr. Vanderveen asked if mode of baptism affects the validity of baptism.
- Mr. Tuuri asked if a baptized three year old arrived at Tanglewood Baptist Church would be granted membership.
- Mr. Nixon asked, regarding the three old scenario, if that member could vote.

- Mr. Tuuri asked about ordination and Mr. Meredith's position that ordination is a formality.
- Mr. Klaus asked if Tanglewood Baptist Church has adopted the CRE constitution into their constitution.
- Mr. Booth followed up on the ordination question, by stating that the local church that refuses the recommendation of an elder candidate may be subject to some discipline. Why were you ordained (directed to Mr. Whitten), without the CRE ordination exam.
- Mr. Nixon stated that the ordination process has been messy. Mr. Nixon has never been examined by presbytery either.
- Mr. Strawbridge asked about Mr. Meredith's Christian experience & college experience.

A lot of discussion ensued around the CRE constitution (Article II, section I) on the issue of membership in general (household & individual) & membership transferal in particular.

Mr. Helsel asked a procedural question regarding the inconsistency of the constitutional language and how to deal with it.

Motion to table the current motion (Detweiller, Harlow, J.)
No discussion.

The motion passed, with one nay (Vanderveen).

Motion to add a new agenda item to add the constitutional discussion around Article II, section I to the agenda for before agenda item VIII (Wilson, Vanderveen)
Discussion to ensure this is handled before more fraternal delegates are added.

Amended motion so that the timing of the constitutional discussion would proceed immediately (Wilson, Vanderveen)
No discussion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn for lunch (Wilson, Shade)
No discussion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Erb led us in the singing of Psalms (42 & 2).

Mr. Baker called the meeting was called back to order at 1:18PM.

Examination of Article II, section I of the CRE Constitution.

Motion to add the following to Article II, section I:

All CRE churches will handle problems arising from differences in how membership is reckoned from church to church (e.g. individual vs. household) with all charity & good faith, seeking to include one another's members.

In the transfer of members, from one CRE church to another differences arising from issues such as membership, paedobaptism & paedocommunion must be handled with pastoral sensitivity. Receiving churches do not have to adopt or practice such variations but they should do all within their power to accommodate them.

No change to the existing language, or the numbering of the constitution (Wilson, Helsel)

- Mr. Doug Wilson gave a brief overview of what the new language is trying to accomplish.

- Mr. Chris Wilson asked if the new language address' the issue of membership that is trying to fix.
- Mr. Booth asked if this new language is consistent with the current language.
- Mr. Schlect queried whether the current language ought to be changed as well. Ultimately clarification is being sought by Mr. Schlect.

The motion was amended to include a change to Article II, section I where the three words "into membership in" are being replaced with the word "by". Also, strike the following: "No member in good standing in a local CRE congregation shall be refused membership in any other CRE church because", and replaced by the word "regardless" (Wilson, Booth)

The new Article II, section I will read, in entirety:

All members in good standing in a local CRE congregation must be received by any other CRE church regardless of confessional differences between the churches.

All CRE churches will handle problems arising from differences in how membership is reckoned from church to church (e.g. individual vs. household) with all charity and good faith, seeking to include one another's members.

In the transfer of members from one CRE church to another, differences arising from issues such as membership, paedobaptism and paedocommunion, must be handled with pastoral sensitivity. Receiving churches do not have to adopt or practice such variations but they should do all within their power to accommodate them.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Motion to un-table the Tanglewood Baptist Church motion (Wilson, Nixon)

- Mr. Wilson and Mr. Schlect would like to encourage Tanglewood Baptist Church to examine their constitution in light of the 1689 London Baptist Confession. Mr. Ramsey pointed out that Tanglewood Baptist Church is coming in under the Reformed Evangelical Confession.

Motion to amend to the original motion to encourage Tanglewood Baptist Church to examine their constitution in light of the CRE Constitution (Ramsay, Nixon)

The motion was passed unanimously.

Reformation Covenant Church

Trinity Reformation Church (2001) - Salem, OR (Marty Allen)

Motion to extend the fraternal status of Grace Covenant Church (Tuuri, Harlow, J)
No discussion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Trinity Church

Immanuel Presbyterian Church (2000) – Fallon, NV (Tim Tucker, Ed Iverson, Rob Holley)

Motion to receive Immanuel Presbyterian Church (Helsel, Niell)

Mr. Helsel gave a brief overview of Immanuel Presbyterian Church and recommended that the presbyters look at their packets.

Mr. Tucker was invited to the microphone.

- Mr. Tucker gave a brief statement on how he came to Immanuel Presbyterian Church.
- Mr. Hatcher asked about the aroma of Mr. Tuckers home. The state of his family.
- Mr. Nixon asked what confession Immanuel Presbyterian Church is coming in under. (Westminster Confession of Faith).
- Mr. Hatcher asked about the liturgy at Immanuel Presbyterian Church.

- Mr. Shade asked about Mr. Tucker's status at Greyfriars.
- Mr. Strawbridge asked for some background on Mr. Tucker's call to the ministry.
- Mr. Helsel asked about the doctrinal and community health at Immanuel Presbyterian Church.
- Mr. Wilson would like to know about Mr. Tucker's status regarding ordination.
- Mr. Hatcher asked Mr. Helsel his thoughts/opinions on Mr. Tucker and his status at Immanuel Presbyterian Church.

The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Seating of Visiting Delegations

Christ The Redeemer Church – Pella, IO (Douglas Roorda)
 Christ Church – Cary, North Carolina (Gene Leichy)
 Covenant Bible Church – Anchorage, AK (Craig Mischenko, Don Walters, Jack Phelps)
 Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church – Port Washington, WI (Michael Hamel)

IX. Seating of New Fraternal Delegations

Christ Reformed Evangelical Church:

Grace New Covenant Church - Walkersville, MD
 Withdraw this request as no members of Grace New Covenant Church are present.

Eastside Evangelical Fellowship:

The King's Congregation - Boise, ID (Alan Burrow, Mark Filicetti, Jeff Kezar)

Motion to receive The King's Congregation as a fraternal delegation into the CRE (Hatcher, Liedl)

Mr. Hatcher gave an overview of The King's Congregation and how they came into being. The King's Congregation started as a church plant under Eastside Evangelical Fellowship.

- Mr. Helsel asked if Mr. Hatcher knows the quality of the families of the prospective elders.
- Mr. Nixon asked whether there are unresolved issues with Valley West, PCA.

The motion passed unanimously.

Emmanuel Covenant Church:

Christ the King Presbyterian Church - Eugene, OR (Mike Rench, Brian Kern, Kip Poindexter, Scott Snider)

Motion to receive Christ the King Presbyterian Church as a fraternal delegation into the CRE (Niell, Nixon)

Mr. Niell gave an overview of Christ the King Presbyterian Church and their past. Mr. Niell made the point of telling Presbytery that there are outstanding issues with another local church in Eugene. Mr. Niell will be working with the Pastors of both churches.

The motion passed unanimously.

Grace Covenant Church:

Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church – Hockley, TX

Motion to receive Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church as a fraternal delegation into the CRE (Booth, Ramsey)

Mr. Booth gave an overview of Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church and their past.
No discussion

The motion passed unanimously.

Providence Church:

Covenant Reformed Church - Knoxville, TN

Motion to receive Covenant Reformed Church as a fraternal delegation into the CRE (Hurt, Hatcher)

Mr. Hurt gave an overview of Covenant Reformed Church and his relationship with them. R.C. Sproul's church will provide pastoral oversight

- Mr. Strawbridge asked for clarification on the relationship with the PCA. Mr. Queener took the floor to give an explanation. Mr. Queener took the opportunity to give a brief overview of Covenant Reformed Church and her relationship to other churches in the area.
- Mr. Shade asked for clarification on the status of the ordination of the leadership.

The motion passed unanimously.

Christ Church – Moscow, ID:

Christ Reformed Church – Albion, Maine

Motion to receive Christ Reformed Church as a fraternal delegation into the CRE (Wilson, Shade)

Mr. Wilson gave an overview of Christ Reformed Church and his relationship with them.

- Mr. Hatcher asked if this is a new fellowship or if it is a re-formed church. It is both. Mr. Rick Young answered by stating that it is both.
- Mr. Shade asked if this church is fully constituted.

The motion passed unanimously.

Christ Church – Moscow, ID:

Lakeside Church – New Berlin, WI

Motion to receive Lakeside Church as a fraternal delegation into the CRE (Wilson, Hesel)

Mr. Wilson gave an overview of Lakeside Church and his relationship with them. Mr. Wilson pointed out that the church is still a PCA church and is looking for a new congregational home.

The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to take a brief break (Niell, Hesel)

The motion passed unanimously.

X. Old Business

A. Subcommittee Report on Plurality of Presbyteries.

Motion to accept the subcommittee report into Presbytery (Schlect as the chair)

The committee report is included in full below (Between the borders).

.....

I. Introduction and Background

In its 2001 meeting of presbytery, the CRE unanimously passed the following motions:

- “To extend the moratorium on having a plurality of presbyteries through the scheduled presbytery meeting 2002.”
- “Presbytery to select a sub-committee to propose constitutional language for the formation of a plurality of presbyteries.”

Presbytery then approved the following nominations to the committee: Eastside Evangelical Fellowship of Kirkland, WA, Trinity Church of Wenatchee, WA, and Christ Church of Moscow, ID.

The committee understood its charge as being to develop procedures for the initial division into multiple CRE presbyteries, and the formation of a CRE council. The committee worked by telephone and electronic mail to create this proposal, which was adopted unanimously by the committee. We respectfully offer it to the 2002 presbytery of the Confederation of Reformed Evangelicals for their action.

Sincerely in Christ,

Teaching Elder Christopher Schlect
chairman, representing Christ Church of Moscow, Idaho

Pastor David Hatcher
representing Eastside Evangelical Fellowship of Kirkland, Washington

Pastor Gene Helsel
representing Trinity Church of Wenatchee, Washington

II. Committee’s Findings

Mindful of our charge from presbytery, the committee determined that the CRE’s initial division into presbyteries is a procedural matter designed to meet a peculiar circumstance, and it therefore does not call for new language in the constitution. Though it is technically out of step with the 2001 presbytery’s charge to propose constitutional language, we believe we have accomplished what the 2001 presbytery intended for us to do.

The committee offers the following recommendations to the presbytery.

1. Prior to dividing into more than one presbytery, hold upcoming presbyteries outside the northwest. (Suggestion: 2003 in south-central United States, 2004 on east coast.)
2. Prior to dividing into more than one presbytery, appoint the writing of a history of the CRE. The author will narrate the story of why the CRE formed, who was involved in its formation, what the circumstances were at its formation, and what were its influences and founding principles. A completed draft of the history will be brought before presbytery as a proposed position paper.
3. Prior to dividing into more than one presbytery, appoint a committee to conduct a thorough review of the CRE Constitution. The committee is charged to (i) educate themselves in issues of polity that have arisen in church history and how they have been handled [see Appendix A], (ii) prepare reports and, if it deems appropriate,

proposed constitutional changes to both the 2003 and 2004 meetings of presbytery [see Appendix B], (iii) communicate with the various sessions of CRE churches to gather input and reactions to drafts of their findings, and (iv) serve as an editorial board for the writing of the history of the CRE as per no. 2 above.

4. Upon dividing into more than one presbytery for the first time, resolve to divide into no more than two presbyteries until at least two councils have met. The first council will convene immediately following the adjournment of the presbytery in which the two presbyteries are formed.
5. Upon dividing into more than one presbytery for the first time, leave no fewer than three churches in each presbytery.
6. In the initial dividing into two presbyteries, we wish to ensure the atmosphere of unity amidst the confessional diversity that currently exists among our churches. This is clearly a distinctive of our young denomination and we hope to encourage it even while 'sharpening iron' with one another at the same time. Therefore, in the first division (and only in the first division), we will require that there be at least two different confessions held by the churches making up each presbytery. [See Appendix C.]
7. Upon dividing into more than one presbytery, the assignment of the various CRE churches to their particular presbyteries requires unanimous approval of the presbytery that initiates the division.

III. Appendices

Appendix A (c.f. recommendation no. 3 above)

The committee members are encouraged to study issues in church polity as they have worked out in history. Here is a brief list of suggested readings.

Augustine, Anti-Donatist writings. Here we find an important articulation of the church's catholicity in time of controversy.

De Jong, J., ed., *Bound Yet Free: Readings in Reformed Church Polity* (Winnipeg: Premier Publishing, 1995).

Hart, D. G. and John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*. (Philadelphia: Committee for Christian Education and the Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995). A brief, well-written history of the OPC that captures the character of that communion.

Hodge, Charles. *The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. (Scarsdale, NY: Westminster Discount Book Service, reprint of 1851 ed.) History of American Presbyterianism up to 1788, written from the Old School perspective during the schism. An important work overall, and includes an especially good treatment of the Old-Side / New Side schism of 1741-58.

Loetscher, Lefferts A. *The Broadening Church: A Study of the Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church since 1869*. (Philadelphia: University of Penn. Press, 1954) Liberal perspective of events in the wake of the Old School-New School reunion in the northern church, including the Briggs trial and the awful 1903 amendments to the WCF. The title is self-explanatory. This is a highly-respected work from the famous Princeton Seminary historian.

Longfield, Bradley J. *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). Title is self-explanatory. A superb introduction to the struggles in the northern church in the 1920s and 30s.

Marsden, George. *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience: A Case Study of Thought and Theology in Nineteenth-Century America*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970). Here is an excellent discussion of perhaps the most important

schism in the history of American Presbyterianism. There are several polemical writings written amidst the Old-School / New-School schism that also deserve attention, notably Lewis Cheeseman, *The Differences Between Old and New School Presbyterians* (Rochester: Erastus Darrow, 1848); Zebulon Crocker, *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church in 1837* (New Haven: B & W Noyes, 1838); Samuel J. Baird, *A History of the New School* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1868).

Richards, John Edwards. *The Historical Birth of the Presbyterian Church in America*. (Liberty Hill, SC: The Liberty Press, 1986) Documentary history of the secessions from the old PCUS and the founding of the PCA in 1973.

Smith, Frank J. *The History of the Presbyterian Church in America*, second ed. (Lawrenceville, GA: Presbyterian Scholars Press, 1999.) Detailed PCA history.

Thornwell, James Henley. *Collected Writings vol. IV*. (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, reprint). Important work that includes Thornwell's polemics against church boards, and his arguments for "the spirituality of the church" that were so influential in the founding old PCUS (Southern Presbyterian Church) in 1861.

Tierney, Brian. *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contributions of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism*. (New York: Brill, 1998). When the papal hierarchy asserted itself, the conciliarists opposed it emerged with the prevailing view of church polity from 1378 to the mid-1400s. Conciliarists understood that the church's catholicity is better expressed in ecumenical council, not in the office of pope. Tierney's is the finest explanation of their point of view available.

Books of Order of various Presbyterian and Reformed communions.

Appendix B (c.f. recommendation no. 3 above)

The committee will give particular attention to such matters as the following:

1. Address the relationship between council and the presbyteries. Is council a fundamentally distinct, *higher* and more authoritative judicatory than the presbyteries? Or is council basically the same sort of entity as a presbytery, the only difference being its greater *breadth* of representation? This central question has important ramifications, and it lies back of a few of the questions we pose below.
2. When acting as a judicatory, do councils deal only with presbyteries? May a council admonish or even dissolve or expel an entire presbytery as a whole?
3. Over what (if any) matters may a council assume original jurisdiction? Would it ever be appropriate for a session or individual appeal to council without having first appealed to a presbytery?
4. Shall we continue in the PCA model, as we currently do, with every *session* represented at council? Or shall we adopt another approach, with every *presbytery* represented at council? Shall we compromise between the two options by alternating every other council with sessional vs. presbyterial representation?
5. Shall we make provision for synods?
6. Can presbyteries form themselves, or are presbyteries formed only by council?
7. Revisit the frequency of council meetings. (Committee members have heard concerns expressed on the part of some presbyters about the infrequency of councils under the current constitution.)
8. In those years when a council meets, shall the presbyteries meet, or not? Should this decision be left up to each respective presbytery, along with other procedural matters?

Appendix C (cf. recommendation no. 6 above)

Having received questions and concerns about recommendation no. 6, the committee believes a further word of explanation is in order.

Concern has been expressed that recommendation no. 6 would render permanent the confessional diversity within the CRE. But the committee's proposal deals with the CRE's *initial* breakout into presbyteries and the initial formation of the first CRE council. This proposal does not suggest a precedent for how presbyteries would be formed at a later time.

The committee's proposal deals with how to create something that does not yet exist—a CRE council. We believe it wise to keep our council's agenda as simple as possible during its infancy. This is why we propose, *initially*, no more than two presbyteries, and that each presbytery include churches of differing confessions. It would be simpler for council to gather from two presbyteries than from three or four, and we should protect our immature council from the nuances that could arise out of constituent presbyteries that differ theologically. Our prayer is for the day when we will mature into that. But we ought not foist difficult issues upon our first councils until we first learn from experience how a council functions.

In the meantime, those very issues—should they arise at all—would arise first within a presbytery rather than in council. We prefer this because the issues would be less consequential when confronted in a presbytery than in council, for the effects of a presbyterial decision are not so far-reaching as a conciliar decision.

Presently, the various CRE churches subscribe to different confessions. This will continue until a glorious day in the future when the church is fully united in its confessional witness, a day we all long for. Until that day comes, the CRE will be confessionally diverse. In the committee's unanimous judgment, we believe that during our council's tender start, we should force our confessional diversity into the presbyteries and not leave it for the council to deal with alone.

IV. Follow-Up Proposal

Should presbytery approve recommendation no. 3 and, accordingly, appoint a committee to review the constitution, we propose the following to this presbytery:

This presbytery will allot some fixed amount of time (perhaps 30 minutes) to an open discussion on the questions the committee raises in *Appendix A* above.

Such a discussion would serve several purposes. First, it would gather wisdom from the presbyters, along with any questions or concerns, and thereby help the constitutional committee as it starts into its study of church polity. Second, it would begin the presbytery's work of striving for like-mindedness on church polity. And third, it would avert an unhealthy distance from arising between the new committee and the full presbytery.

There was much discussion on the relevant points of the report. How to implement? How do we go forward? Etc.

The motion passed unanimously.

Each of the action items are being considered in turn.

1. Prior to dividing into more than one presbytery, hold upcoming presbyteries outside the northwest. (Suggestion: 2003 in south-central United States, 2004 on east coast.)
To be decided at the end of this meeting.
2. Prior to dividing into more than one presbytery, appoint the writing of a history of the CRE. The author will narrate the story of why the CRE formed, who was involved in its formation, what the circumstances were at its formation, and what were its influences and founding principles. A completed draft of the history will be brought before presbytery as a proposed position paper.
Motion to appoint Chris Schlect as the author of the history of the CRE (Nixon, Hatcher)

- Mr. Strawbridge asked the question of whether we ought to have a more objective person be the author (Mr. Schlect was involved in the CRE from the beginning).
- Mr. Wilson pointed out that objectivity is not the issue.
- What will the date be for a draft proposal? Two years from today's meeting?
- Who owns the document that will be produced?

Motion amended to have the final document completed in two years (Nixon)

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Prior to dividing into more than one presbytery, appoint a committee to conduct a thorough review of the CRE Constitution. The committee is charged to (i) educate themselves in issues of polity that have arisen in church history and how they have been handled [see Appendix A], (ii) prepare reports and, if it deems appropriate, proposed constitutional changes to both the 2003 and 2004 meetings of presbytery [see Appendix B], (iii) communicate with the various sessions of CRE churches to gather input and reactions to drafts of their findings, and (iv) serve as an editorial board for the writing of the history of the CRE as per no. 2 above.

Motion to appoint a member of the three original member churches, and three members from three different churches to be the committee, six total churches (Hatcher, Nixon)

Motion amended to have the three founding churches appoint one other person from CRE churches (Hatcher, Detweiler)

- Mr. Harlow, J. asked if it is implied that there is a total of six churches.
- Mr. Tuuri was hoping to have Mr. Burke & Mr. Booth on the committee.

Motion amended to have the final document completed in two years (Nixon)

Motion failed.

Motion to appoint 1 delegate from each of the three founding churches and, in addition Mr. Booth, Mr. Shade & Mr. Vanderveen would be invited to join the committee. (Hatcher, Detweiler)

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Upon dividing into more than one presbytery for the first time, resolve to divide into no more than two presbyteries until at least two councils have met. The first council will convene immediately following the adjournment of the presbytery in which the two presbyteries are formed.
5. Upon dividing into more than one presbytery for the first time, leave no fewer than three churches in each presbytery.
6. In the initial dividing into two presbyteries, we wish to ensure the atmosphere of unity amidst the confessional diversity that currently exists among our churches. This is clearly a distinctive of our young denomination and we hope to encourage it even while 'sharpening iron' with one another at the same time. Therefore, in the first division (and only in the first division), we will require that there be at least two different confessions held by the churches making up each presbytery. [See Appendix C.]
7. Upon dividing into more than one presbytery, the assignment of the various CRE churches to their particular presbyteries requires unanimous approval of the presbytery that initiates the division.

Motion to divide the United States and Canada into two sections with the Mississippi being the divider (Wilson, not seconded)

The motion was withdrawn by Mr. Wilson.

XI. New Business

Motion to add to the agenda a discussion to form a committee to review the ordination procedures (Booth, Schlect)

The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to add to the agenda a discussion for the CRE to discuss the request for advice from Grace Covenant Church (Sechelt, BC) (Schlect, Vanderveen)

The motion passed unanimously.

A. Christ Church – Moscow

Proposed Constitutional Change:

“The Presbytery shall keep a Book of Procedures that details particular methods for carrying out the various constitutionally-sanctioned tasks of Presbytery. Presbytery is informed by the Book of Procedures, but not bound to it. The Book of Procedures may be altered or amended at any time by a simple majority of Presbytery. Maintenance and publication of a current Book of Procedures is the responsibility of the moderator.”

Motion to accept the above paragraph into the CRE Constitution as Article III, Section Z (Schlect, Niell)

- Hatcher asked a clarifying question regarding this inclusion into the book of procedures, and Mr. Schlect pointed out that the subcommittee will address that question.
- Mr. Ramsey asked a question regarding constitutional inclusion of the language.
- Mr. Tuuri asked whether the Book of Procedures is binding on the Presbytery.

The motion passed unanimously

Motion to move the section from the 2001 minutes regarding ordination exam into the Book of Procedures, with the Moderator being responsible for the order of documents into the Book of Procedures (Schlect, Strawbridge)

The motion passed unanimously

B. Christ Church – Moscow

Proposed Procedures for Inclusion in the Book of Procedures:

1) Procedures for Conducting a Presbyterial Trial:

I. Explanation

We believe it wise to develop procedures for handling controversy before a real controversy arises. Thus, now is the time to do this and not later. Therefore, we propose the following section be included in the Procedures of Presbytery.

II. Procedure for Judicial Trials

Preface: In order to maintain Christian fellowship amidst controversy, Presbytery agrees to follow orderly trial procedures. Thus we suggest a general procedure below. We offer this procedure being mindful that *procedural* order is too often pursued as an ungodly substitute for *biblical* order. God forbid that this presbytery should conduct trials and

hearings in a manner that violates biblical orderliness: parties in a dispute are, most importantly, brothers and not adversaries; strong advocacy of both sides is not a biblical goal, whereas like-mindedness and fellowship is; biblical wisdom measures the relevance and competence of all testimony and evidence, and such wisdom is not reducible to rules.

1. Establishment of Judicatory
All presbyters are voting members of the judicatory with the exception of those who, to set aside conflicts of interest, are removed from the judicatory by a three-fourths majority of presbytery. Should the moderator be removed in this way, presbytery will elect a moderator pro tempore to moderate the hearing.
2. Introduction to the case
 - a. A written complaint (including any charges or specifications), provided by the Complainant, is published to each member of the judicatory and read by the Moderator.
 - b. Here or at any later point in the introduction to the case, any member of the judicatory may interject a motion to dismiss the case. If the motion carries by a three-fourths majority, the hearing will not proceed and the matter will be regarded as settled. *The presbytery will not hear frivolous matters.*
 - c. The Moderator invites the Complainant to introduce the matter.
 - d. The Moderator invites the Respondent to introduce the matter.
3. The Moderator (or his designee) charges the parties, witnesses, and the judicatory from the Scriptures, and then opens the hearing with prayer.
4. Presentation of Complainant's Case
The Complainant calls a witnesses directs him by questioning and the judicatory may follow up with questions of their own. The witness may then be examined by the respondent, followed by another invitation to questions from the judicatory. Next, if the Complainant wishes to redirect the witness, he may do so, but the same opportunities for follow-up questions must be provided. The Complainant may present any documentary or physical evidence during the course of his presentation. When the Complainant concludes his presentation, the judicatory may again pose final questions to the Complainant or to any of his witnesses.
5. At this point, any member of the judicatory may interject a motion to dismiss the case. If the motion carries by a three-fourths majority, the hearing will end and the matter will be regarded as settled.
6. Presentation of Respondent's Case
Respondent's presentation is patterned after the Complainant's presentation as described above.
7. The Moderator invites judicatory to ask any further questions of any available witness.
8. Deliberation and Judgment
Deliberation begins with prayer. Judgment requires a ~~three-fourths~~ simple majority of the judicatory. Minority opinions, if formally offered, must be received into the record.
9. Closing prayer offered by the Moderator or his designee.

Motion to accept the above section (Agenda XI, section B, article I, sub-section II) into the Book of Procedures (Schlect, Hatcher)

- Mr. Schlect gave a brief overview.
- Mr. Booth asked for clarification of charges being brought.

Motion amended to change the language in section II, sub-section 8 to read simple majority, instead of three-fourths (Schlect, Shade)

The motion passed unanimously.

- Mr. Tuuri had some follow on questions regarding type of evidence.

2) Procedures for Examining A Candidate Ordained Outside the CRE:

I. Explanation

Our Constitution provides for a procedure for examining a minister who has been ordained outside the CRE. Paragraph VI.D reads,

If a minister or teacher has been ordained within the CRE, he may not be required by presbytery or council to undergo another examination. Such an examination may occur if both the calling church and the candidate agree to it. If a man has been ordained outside the CRE, then procedures may be modified by the presbytery to suit the circumstances.

Our delegation would like to bring All Saints Presbyterian Church of Lancaster, Pennsylvania into full membership. As part of this process, we request a presbyterial examination of the pastor of that communion, Gregg Strawbridge. Because Pastor Strawbridge has been ordained outside the CRE, we request a different and less laborious examination than the examination we require for new pastors. Trinity Church of Wenatchee, WA is in the same situation. Their delegation would like to bring Emmanuel Presbyterian Church of Fallon, NV into full CRE membership. Emmanuel is currently pastored by Tim Tucker, who was also ordained outside the CRE. We have discussed our proposal (in principle and in basic outline, but not in specific language) with the delegation from Trinity Church.

We offer the following procedure for inclusion in the presbytery's book of procedures, and propose that this procedure be followed by Presbytery as they make determinations about All Saints Presbyterian Church and Emmanuel Presbyterian Church and Emmanuel Presbyterian Church.

II. Procedure for Examination of a Minister who has been ordained outside the CRE

The purpose for examining a minister who has been ordained outside the CRE is to foster in the Presbytery both familiarity with and confidence in a man who may soon be counted among their number at Presbytery, and who would be entrusted to shepherd one of their sister churches.

A minister who has been ordained outside the CRE will normally be examined by Presbytery when a CRE church is considering whether or not to call him. When a church is being considered for CRE membership, and a minister in that church was ordained outside the CRE, Presbytery will examine the minister as part of the deliberation over whether to receive the church into membership.

Throughout the examination procedure, the Presbytery will display respect the ministerial office and the dignity of ordination in other communions. Presbytery will also show respect to the local church's ability to discern the outcome of the minister-candidate's life.

The examination will be conducted in open presbytery. The minister-candidate will introduce himself and publish to the Presbytery a brief written summary of his education, ministerial training and experience, and confessional commitments. Members of Presbytery may then inquire about his experiences in ministry in order to confirm his gifting, and about the regularity of his doctrine and his confessional adherence. When considering the extent and depth of questioning, Presbytery will also be mindful of the minister-candidate's experience, accomplishments, and reputation. Concerns raised in initial questioning may be pursued with follow-up questions.

Presbytery will normally follow such an examination with determinations regarding the candidate, such as: (a) sustain the minister-candidate's ordination and commend him to his church, (b) advise a CRE member church not to install the minister-candidate, and for clearly-stated reasons, (c) receive the church in which he ministers into CRE membership, or not.

Motion to accept the above section (Agenda XI, section B, article 2, sub-section II) into the Book of Procedures (Schlect, Nixon)

- Mr. Hatcher questioned the title of the procedure.
- Mr. Butaud asked for clarification of the scope of this section

Motion amended to change the title to Procedures for Evaluation of a Ministers Credentials. And to change the word examination to evaluation (as the Moderator sees fit) (Schlect, Harlow, J)

- Mr. Iverson asked for the scope of ones ordination. Mr. Wilson pointed out that the issues lies in our inconsistent view of the offices in the church (2 offices, 4 offices).
- Mr. Strawbridge asked whether the CRE ordains.

Motion to send this issue to the committee (Iverson, no second)

The motion passed unanimously.

C. Subcommittee on ordinations

Motion to appoint a subcommittee to review all ordination examination & procedures and to make a recommendation for changes at the next Presbytery (Booth, Schlect)

- Some discussion around Mr. Booth & Mr. Strawbridge to be on this committee.
- Mr. Shade asked Mr. Booth what the motivation for this subcommittee is.
- Mr. Butaud asked if there was any contemplation of changing the ordaining body.
- Mr. Ramsey asked if there would be recommendations on what the local session might ask.
- Mr. Nixon volunteered for the subcommittee.

The motion was amended to add the names: Mr. Booth, Mr. Strawbridge, and Mr. Nixon as the subcommittee.

The motion passed, with one nay (Shade).

D. Request for assistance by Grace Covenant Church (Sechelt, BC)

Motion to appoint a commission to investigate & help Grace Covenant Church work through the pastoral issues (Schlect, Iverson)

- Discussion of what a commission is, versus a subcommittee.
- Mr. Wilson suggested that the moderator should be the one to help out as the moderator has the authority to speak for the CRE when it's not in session.
- Mr. Schlect had some concerns regarding a one man statement versus the weight of the Presbytery.
- Mr. Wilson suggested Langley, EEF, Trinity, or Christ Church be the commission so geographical issues are minimized.
- Mr. Strawbridge questioned who can establish a commission.
- Mr. Booth suggested that the moderator include other men.

The motion was withdrawn.

Motion to charge the moderator to look into the situation at Grace Covenant Church and involve other churches as the moderator sees fit (Wilson, Detweiler)

- Mr. Spratt raised the concern that one man won't add the value that the Presbytery will. Mr. Schlect pointed out that the moderator isn't one man, rather, the mouth piece for the Presbytery.

The motion passed unanimously.

E. Date and Location of 2003 Presbytery Meeting

Motion that we have the 2003 Presbytery meeting in Dallas, TX, on October 16th & 17th, co-hosted by Grace Covenant Church – Texarkana, TX and Grace Covenant Church – Nacogdoches, TX (Booth, Wilson)

- Mr. Booth suggested that the moderator include other men.

The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn the meeting (Nixon, Schlect)

No discussion

The motion passed unanimously.

XII. Psalm Singing: David Erb – Eastside Evangelical Fellowship

David Erb led the assembly in singing Psalm 110.

XIII. Closing Prayer – Eric Sauder