
48TH 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.

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 read carefully 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.

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
1	Amend BCO 8-7 Regarding Chaplains	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The “whereas” paragraphs do not provide any reason for <i>requiring as a matter of church law</i> endorsement only through the GA endorsing agency. Further, the second sentence of the proposed amendment should be eliminated. A rule that says something “should” be done is fatally ambiguous, as “should” can indicate obligation, or only the advisable. And in this case, if it is taken only as advisable, it is trivial, for the advice is only to “consider” endorsement. Finally, if there is to be such a paragraph added, the whole section should be renumbered, as the paragraphs treat distinct subjects.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>Commissioner Handbook (hereinafter CH)</i>, 281, A (unless otherwise noted, the CCB vote was unanimous).</p>	Potomac	OC, CCB
2	BCO 34-1 request for General Assembly to Assume Original Jurisdiction in Missouri Presbytery Issue On this subject-matter see also overtures 4 and 25	<p>NO COMMENT</p> <p>As I am a member of the SJC which is currently working on a response to the BCO 34-1 request it is inappropriate for me to express an opinion at this time.</p>	Central Georgia	SJC
3	Amend MTW Manual. On this subject-matter see also overture 14	<p>ANSWER BY REFERENCE TO ACTION ON OV. 14</p> <p>Overture 14 has the advantage of <i>brevitas et claritas</i>.</p> <p>NOTE: CMNA recommends AFFIRMATIVE, but to a much attenuated version of the Presbytery’s proposed language. <i>CH</i>, 713-715, item 11.</p>	Heritage	MTW

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
4	That the General Assembly Assume Original Jurisdiction of the Case Investigated by the Missouri Presbytery Referenced in Its Report Received at the May 18, 2019, Stated Meeting On this subject-matter see overtures 2 and 25	NO COMMENT As I am a member of the SJC which is currently working on a response to the BCO 34-1 request it is inappropriate for me to express an opinion at this time.	Savannah River	SJC
5	Amend BCO 20-4; 24-3; 24-4 Regarding Election of Pastor, Associate Pastor, and Officers	AFFIRMATIVE A well-framed, well-argued proposal. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 282, B.	Calvary	OC, CCB
6	Amend BCO 24-1 Allowing Some Session Discretion on the Timing of Portions of the Examination of Elder and Deacon Candidate Nominees	NEGATIVE CCB's judgment is sound, but its objection does not go far enough. Not only is there no <i>means for determination</i> set forth, there is also no <i>standard</i> as to what constitutes "qualified". Absent means and standards there can be no accountability. This is a recipe for abuse of power. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment "is constitutionally vague because it does not identify a means by which a nominee is deemed qualified or unqualified". CH, 282, C.	Covenant	OC, CCB
7	WITHDRAWN (by action of the Lowcountry Presbytery at its stated meeting, November 5, 2020.)		Lowcountry	N/A
8	Change the Presbytery Boundary Between the Catawba Valley Presbytery and the Central Carolina Presbytery	SEE Overture 11.	Catawba Valley	MNA
9	Amend RAO 15-6.s.2), 3) Regarding the Number of Members of the Overtures Committee Required to File a Minority Report	AFFIRMATIVE A reasonable solution to an otherwise worsening problem. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 282, letter E.	Ascension	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
10	Amend RAO 15-6.s by Adding New Paragraphs Dealing with the Content of Minority Reports	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>However, proposed RAO 15-6.s 4) needs some adjustment. Since failed motions are not recorded, how will it be known that a motion had been proposed and defeated? Further, why “Tabled,” a rarely used motion limited to peculiar circumstance? What of all the other ways of disposing with a motion? Perhaps better to put a period after “Committee” on p. 55, line 40 and strike the rest.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 282, letter F.</p>	Ascension	OC, CCB
11	Change Boundaries of Central Carolina Presbytery. SEE also Overture 8.	<p>AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.</p> <p>CMNA recommends AFFIRMATIVE. <i>CH</i>, 605, item 6.</p>	Central Carolina	MNA
12	Amend <i>BCO</i> 31-2; 32-2 to Clarify that Investigation Shall Precede Process	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The language proposed for <i>BCO</i> 31-2, “initiate an investigation” is vague. It is not at all clear what is required by the new language that was not obligatory under the unamended text. The language proposed for <i>BCO</i> 32-2 puts the cart before the horse. There is no good reason to amend a provision of long standing that has been ably construed by our courts. Overall, the Overture does not appear to grasp the point of the concurring opinion that it claims to rely upon.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 282, G.</p>	Philadelphia Metro West	OC, CCB
13	Endorse Lifeline Children’s Services	<p>AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners.</p> <p>CMNA recommends AFFIRMATIVE. <i>CH</i>, 605, item 7.</p>	Mississippi Valley	MNA
14	Revise MTW Manual On this subject-matter see also Overture 3.	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>Presbytery’s rationale is compelling and its proposal is well-crafted, particularly in its evident commitment to <i>BCO</i> 14-1.7, “The Assembly’s committees are to serve and not to direct any Church judicatories. They are not to establish policy, but rather execute policy established by the General Assembly.”</p> <p>NOTE: CMNA recommends answer by reference to action on Overture 3. <i>CH</i>, 716, item 13.</p>	Evangel	MTW

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
15	Revise RAO 11-2 to Disallow Electronic Communications Regarding Voting at the General Assembly	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Appropriately, RAO 11-12 is a rule governing what the Assembly may or may not do. The proposed amendment illicitly makes the rule govern what others may or may not do as well. Further, the placement of the amendment in the text separates the conditional of the following sentence from its object in what was the previous sentence, thereby making it incoherent.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution, “but [is] not germane to the RAO chapter for which it is proposed”. <i>CH</i>, 283, H. 7-1-0</p>	Session of New Covenant PCA	OC, CCB
16	Amend BCO 7 by Addition to Disqualify Same-sex Attracted Men from Ordination. On this subject-matter see Overture 23	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The insertion of the paragraph in a chapter entitled “Church Officers-General Classification” seems oddly out of place. This appears to be a rule desperately looking for a home. However, it is not clear to me that the proposal is in <i>conflict</i> with the BCO, as its provisions regularly specify what qualifications must be met by all candidates without undermining the rights and responsibilities of the lower courts. Beyond that, I cannot comment, as the substance of the matter is being adjudicated before the SJC.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict “with BCO 12-5.b, 13-9.a, 21-4, and 24-1, which state it is the right and responsibility of the lower courts to determine if the candidate is qualified. The Committee notes that the 48th General Assembly cannot amend the <i>Book of Church Order</i> but begins the process laid out in BCO 26-2. <i>CH</i>, 283, I. 6-2-0</p>	Westminster	OC, CCB
17	Revise RAO 9-3 to Clarify Funding for Ad Interim Committees	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>Clearly, the current language is needlessly complicated, and has caused confusion. However, the proposed change could be made even more clear by striking the text on p. 71, lines 18-19, from “The General Assembly” through “However,” capitalizing the word “No” and adding “such” thereafter, so that the new opening sentence would read “No such committee may be funded. . . .” The matter of the first sentence in the proposal is adequately addressed in RAO 9-1 and -2.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 283, J.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
18	Amend BCO 24-1 to Clarify that a Session Has Discretion on the Timing of Some Parts of the Exam of Officer Nominees	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The proposed language does not appear to solve the alleged problem, so long as the sentence “<u>After the close of the nomination period</u>, nominees for the office or ruling elder and/or deacon shall receive instruction. . . .” (p. 75, lines 13-15) remains in the text. The proposal is in need of revision if it is to clarify and make more flexible the procedure.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 283, K.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
19	Amend BCO 38-1 and 42-2 to Allow Appealing a Censure in a Case without Process REVISED	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>The current language of the provision denies the subject of the proceeding due process in that the remedies available with respect to a successful complaint are considerable narrower than those for a successful appeal. The proposed amendment wisely corrects this significant defect.</p> <p>The language for BCO 38-1 would be better put “A person so censured has the right to appeal (BCO 42),” thereby narrowing the focus.</p> <p>The remedy for CCB’s concern about conflict is to answer Overture 34 in the negative!</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. “CCB notes that if the amendments proposed by Overture 19 and Overture 34 are both adopted, they would be in conflict regarding the right of appeal or the right of complaint.” CH, 283, L.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
20	Amend BCO 31-10 and 33-4 on Pre-trial Non-Disciplinary Suspensions	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>The case for the change is well made by Rationale. A more felicitous phrasing for BCO 31-10 would be: “When a member of a church court is under process, <u>by a three-fourths (3/4) majority</u> all his official functions may be suspended at the court’s discretion; but this shall never be done in the way of censure.” A more felicitous phrasing for BCO 33-4 would be: “When it is impracticable immediately to commence process against an accused church member, the Session may, if it thinks the edification of the Church requires it, <u>by a three-fourths (3/4) majority</u> prevent the accused from approaching the Lord’s Table until the charges against him can be examined.”</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 284, M.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
21	Amend BCO 42-6 and Vote Required for Maintaining Censure during an Appeal	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>The case for the change is well made by Rationale. A more felicitous phrasing for BCO 42-6-10 would be: "Notice of appeal shall have the effect of suspending the judgment of the lower court until the case has been finally decided in the higher court. However, the court of original jurisdiction may, for sufficient reasons duly recorded, <u>by a two-thirds (2/3) majority</u> prevent the appellant from approaching the Lord's Table, and if an officer, prevent him from exercising some or all his official functions, until the case is finally decided (cf. BCO 31-10; 33-4). This shall never be done in the way of censure."</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 284, N.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
22	Amend BCO 32-20 Regarding Time Considerations for Offenses REVISED	<p>REFER TO SJC FOR ADVICE</p> <p>The Overture addresses a very important defect in our Rules of Discipline, but the language proposed is not fully adapted as a remedy. The concept of a statute of limitations is a matter of considerable complexity, fraught with possibilities for doing more harm than good. A full and careful consideration of the matter by the SJC over the coming year would greatly enhance our likelihood of success. Note that the rationale for the overture grants the possible profit of this course, item 10, p. 87, lines 40 and following.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 284, O.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
23	Amend BCO 17 by Adding a Clause Which Prohibits Ordination for Men Who Self-Identify as "Gay Christians," "Same-sex Attracted Christians," "Homosexual Christians," or Like Terms. On this subject-matter see Overture 16	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The insertion of the paragraph in a chapter entitled "Doctrine of Ordination" seems oddly out of place. This appears to be a rule desperately looking for a home. However, it is not clear to me that the proposal is in <i>conflict</i> with the BCO, as its provisions regularly specify what qualifications must be met by all candidates without undermining the rights and responsibilities of the lower courts. Beyond that, I cannot comment, as the substance of the matter is being adjudicated before the SJC.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS in conflict "with BCO 12-5.b, 13-9.a, 21-4, and 24-1, which state it is the right and responsibility of the lower courts to determine if the candidate is qualified. The Committee notes that the 48th General Assembly cannot amend the <i>Book of Church Order</i> but begins the process laid out in BCO 26-2." CH, 284, P. 6-2-0</p>	Gulf Coast	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
24	Reduce Registration Fee for Ruling Elders to \$250 On this subject matter see Overture 39.	NEGATIVE Any decrease in funding would be ill-considered given that the budgetary needs of AC are not now being properly meet. Here is a text from the <i>BCO</i> worthy our meditations with respect to this subject: 10-6, “The expenses of ministers and ruling elders in their attendance on the courts shall be defrayed by the bodies which they respectively represent.” I have served in two congregations that began as mission works. Both budgeted, from their beginning, to send a TE and a RE commissioner to the GA. NOTE: AC recommends answer in the negative offering lengthy reasons to that end. <i>CH</i> , 308, item 4.	Tennessee Valley	AC
25	<i>BCO</i> 34-1 Request to Assume Original Jurisdiction over TE Greg Johnson On this subject-matter see Overtures 2 and 4	NO COMMENT As I am a member of the SJC which is currently working on a response to the <i>BCO</i> 34-1 request it is inappropriate for me to express an opinion at this time.	Southeast Alabama	SJC
26	Amend <i>BCO</i> 10 to Permit Telecommunication Meetings	AFFIRMATIVE A well argued proposal the need for which has been amply evidenced by a year gone viral! The words “Some examples of” should be replaced with the more felicitous “Among the” (p. 112, line 15). NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment “creates a conflict with RAO 1-1 that requires General Assembly to open with a virtual celebration of the Lord’s Supper.” <i>CH</i> , 284, Q. 5-3-0	Philadelphia Metro West	OC, CCB
27	Amend <i>BCO</i> 36 to Require Public Excommunication	AFFIRMATIVE Another case ably made in the arguments offered. However, I’m not entirely clear on what the phrase “peculiar and special reasons” (p. 117, line 34) signifies. Presumably “peculiar” reasons alone would not suffice, and “special” reasons alone would not suffice? Work at perfecting the language of the proposal would be welcome. Further, OC should attend to the observation of CCB. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment “ would create a conflict , in that the amended <i>BCO</i> 36-2 allows for the censure to be performed before the church or announced to the church while the proposed amendment to <i>BCO</i> 36-6 allows only that the censure be performed before the church.” <i>CH</i> , 284, R.	Platte Valley	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
28	Amend <i>BCO</i> 31-2 to Describe Sequence of Discipline Investigation	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The lovely chaste language of the 19th Century overcome by a barrage of sections and subsections. So large a feast is indigestible!</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment “is in conflict” at multiple points with the Constitution. These include but are not limited to a removal of the “great discretion” provided to courts in <i>BCO</i> 31-2; conflict with representation at the discretion of the accused (<i>BCO</i> 32-19); conflict with obtaining response from the accused that is not required; and conflation of later elements of the Rules of Discipline.” <i>CH</i>, 285, S.</p>	Philadelphia Metro West	OC, CCB
29	Add <i>BCO</i> Appendix of Investigation Suggestions	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Appendices are the bane of constitutional documents. Are they a part of the document? Do they set forth regulations or suggestions? Lately it became necessary to head the “Appendices” portion of the <i>BCO</i> with this “Editorial Note: None of these Appendices has constitutional authority. They are provided for information.” Will that not apply to this proposal, retroactively? Further, given our regular itch to amend the <i>BCO</i>, this lengthy document would need to be amended as well, at the cost of time and money.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment “is in conflict” and responds to it in reference to Overture 28.” <i>CH</i>, 285, T.</p>	Philadelphia Metro West	OC, CCB
30	Amend <i>BCO</i> 21 & 24 to Clarify Moral Requirements for Church Office On this subject-matter see Overture 37.	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The current standard, in <i>BCO</i> 21-4, “his acquaintance with experiential religion, especially his personal character and family management (based on the qualifications set out in 1 Timothy 3:1-7, and Titus 1:6-9). . . .” and the like language in <i>BCO</i> 24-1, has been, and will continue to be, sufficient to set forth concisely the examining court’s responsibility.</p> <p>The placement of the proposed provision in <i>BCO</i> 21-4 is problematic. For example, does item d., which naturally refers to the matters above (i.e., c. (1)-(4) apply to the new item e.? If the new text is to be included at all, surely it should be a subdivision of 21-4. c. (1) (a).</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. “CCB notes that if Overture 30 is adopted, it would require amendment to <i>BCO</i> 13-6 to update the re-lettering of <i>BCO</i> 21-4.” <i>CH</i>, 285, U. 6-2-0</p>	Lowcountry	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
31	Amend BCO 22 Process for Assistant to Associate Pastor	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>A plausible solution to a problem that is, happily, more frequent in its occurrence.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. [B]ut the committee notes that the proposed amendment would implicitly require the use of a pulpit committee for a congregation to elect an associate pastor who has not served as an assistant pastor for at least one year, which is not currently required by BCO 20-2 and 22-1.“ CH, 285, V.</p>	Northwest Georgia	OC, CCB
32	<p>Form Study Committee for Biblical Ethics in Digital Media</p> <p>On this subject-matter see Overture 43.</p>	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>In general, to paraphrase a US President, study committees are not the solution, they are the problem. The matters that occasion their appointment seem to be lagging just slightly behind the latest hot topics in the news cycle, and tend to reduce the Assembly to a mere interest group clamoring among a crowd of competing voices, rather than uphold its stately position as “the bond of union, peace and correspondence among all its congregations and courts,” a grand agent of the Great Commission. Folks have a tendency to use study committee reports to the neglect of (or to undermine) the Constitution of the PCA. Historically study committees have been proposed as a stealth way to give minority views a greater hearing than they deserve. So too, they are sometimes a means to avoid the difficult labor required to pursue debate and resolution with people, we suppose to be opponents, face to face. Such committees are quite expensive, their work-product is widely varied in value, and if committee members cannot agree, the effect of the conflict between a committee report and a minority report can be divisive. It has not been uncommon in Presbyterian history that the fruit of such labors is either a sentimentalizing collection of platitudes that compromise Scripture teaching, or a hammer-and-tongs majority vs. minority report that divides the Assembly.</p> <p>There are a few legitimate, and Constitutionally safe, grounds for appointing study committees, e.g., when the Assembly has determined that a change in the Constitution is desirable, and seeks an able and broadly representative committee to study the best means to that end, to prepare a recommendation, and to prepare a rationale for the church. Such was the case, for example, with the Ad Interim Committee on Judicial Procedures. Rarely such committees may be needed to bring Scripture light to some novel and complex matter that is a threat to the whole body, for example, the Ad Interim Committee on Human Sexuality. In the main, however, the best resources for our folk are not Assembly study committees, but the intellectual and spiritual wealth we have in our ministers, teachers, and scholars through academic institutions, conferences, publications, broadcasts, recordings, journals and magazines.</p>	Central Indiana	OC, AC

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
33	Amend BCO 38-1 re Confession Document for Case Without Process	<p>AFFIRMATIVE</p> <p>A needed solution to significant defect in our Rules of Discipline. Note, however, that the closing sentence would need to be brought into conformity with Overture 19 should it pass.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 285, W.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
34	Amend BCO 38-1 re Confession Timing for Case Without Process	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>The proposal evidences a failure to understand the historical rationale of a case without process, thus making it the virtual equivalent of a guilty plea.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. "CCB notes that if the amendments proposed by Overture 19 and Overture 34 are both adopted, they would be in conflict as to the right of appeal or the right of complaint." <i>CH</i>, 286, X.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
35	Amend BCO 38-1 re Counsel for Case Without Process	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>This allowance is inconsistent with the idea of a case without process. To allow formal representation introduces process. The error of a presbytery alleged to have occasioned the proposal was self-evident. The <i>BCO</i> does not need to be amended whenever one acts foolishly.</p> <p>See the "General Note" on pages 142-43 for a collation of all the <i>BCO</i> 38-1 proposals.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. <i>CH</i>, 286, Y.</p>	Pacific Northwest	OC, CCB
36	Appoint Study Committee re White Supremacy	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>See comments on Overture 32.</p>	Chesapeake	OC, AC
37	Amend BCO 21-4 and 24-1 Clarifying Moral Requirements for Church Office On this subject-matter see Overture 30.	<p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>See comments on Overture 30.</p> <p>NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. "CCB notes that if Overture 37 is adopted, it would require amendment to <i>BCO</i> 13-6 to update the re-lettering of <i>BCO</i> 21-4." <i>CH</i>, 286, Z. 6-2-0</p>	Eastern Pennsylvania	OC, CCB

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
38	Commend Human Sexuality Report	AFFIRMATIVE In my estimation, this is an outstanding piece of work, perhaps the most cogent and useful GA study I have ever read. And, I have no doubt that it would be profitable for every member of the PCA to read it, as we face increasing cultural chaos on these subjects. As I wrote to the Committee Chairman, "I am grateful for our Lord's providential care for you men in your labors, and for our denomination in the outcome. I must admit, in my weak faith, I absolutely feared the worst. I thought the outcome was but a roll of the dice. But I forgot that "The lot is cast into the lap, but its every decision is from the Lord."	Calvary	OC, CDM
39	Reduce Registration Fee for Ruling Elders to \$250 On this subject-matter see Overture 24.	NEGATIVE See comments on Overture 24.	Fellowship	AC
40	Amend BCO 32-13 and 35-5 to Allow Victim Protection Provisions	RETURN TO THE PRESBYTERY, WITHOUT PREJUDICE An extraordinarily well prepared overture. In the main, it seeks adjustments to our procedures that are deeply informed by compassion, and a desire for justice. That being said, it is impossible to imagine a procedure, such as written testimony, that allows a reasonable path for cross-examination, since an essential element of cross-examination is for the judges to be able judge, firsthand, the credibility of the witness. This overture should be returned to presbytery, for further refinement. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. CH, 286, AA.	Tennessee Valley	OC, CCB
41	Amend BCO 35-1 to Expand Potential Witness Eligibility	NEGATIVE The case imagined could have been true in the 18 th Century. Yet our Forefathers were persuaded that, since we cannot read the heart, credible witnesses, before our courts, must at least believe that God can do so, and will judge them accordingly. I see nothing that has changed since then, and thus there is no reason to adjust our standards. NOTE: CCB finds that the proposed amendment IS NOT in conflict with other parts of the Constitution. "CCB notes that adopting Overture 41 would create the possibility of a witness being qualified, but refusing to take the vow outlined in BCO 35-6." CH, 286, BB.	Tennessee Valley	OC, CCB
42	Adjust Boundaries of Susquehanna Valley Presbytery	AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners. There is no recommendation, as yet, from CMNA in CH.	Susquehanna Valley	MNA

#	SUBJECT	POSITION	PRESB	COC
43	Form Study Committee for Biblical Ethics in Digital Media On this subject-matter see overture 32.	NEGATIVE See comments on Overture 32.	Hills & Plains	OC, AC
44	Transfer Berks County, PA, to Philadelphia Metro West	AFFIRMATIVE, if approved by Committee of Commissioners. There is no recommendation, as yet, from CMNA in CH.	Philadelphia Metro West	MNA
45	Seek Asian American Flourishing	NEGATIVE This is, in principle, a request for a study committee. See comments on Overture 32.	Metro Atlanta	OC, CDM, AC
46	Seek Asian American Flourishing	NEGATIVE This is, in principle, a request for a study committee. See comments on Overture 32.	Metro NY	OC, CDM, AC
47	Form Study Committee on Critical Race Theory	NEGATIVE See comments on Overture 32.	Chesapeake	OC, AC
48	Repudiate Anti-Asian Racism	NEGATIVE In everything that the overture legitimately seeks from a church court, the PCA is already, boldly, plainly, and Constitutionally committed to. With respect to the rest, it is beyond the scope of the Assembly's jurisdiction to address such matters.	Korean Capital	OC