

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

VOL. XXXVII.

JANUARY, 1926.

No. 2.

EDITORIAL STAFF—EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, EUGENE C. CALDWELL; ASSOCIATE EDITORS, W. ARNETT GAMBLE, JR., AND T. LAYTON FRASER; MISSIONARY EDITOR, S. HUGH BRADLEY; BOOK EDITOR, ERNEST T. THOMPSON; REVIEW EDITORS, EDWARD MACK AND W. TALIAFERRO THOMPSON.

Entered at the Post-Office at Richmond, Va., as second-class mail matter. Published quarterly during the year—October, January, April, July—by the professors and students of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia in the interests of the whole Southern Presbyterian Church.

Change of address, discontinuance, or failure to receive THE REVIEW promptly and regularly should be reported to the Business Manager.

Subscription, \$1.50 a year in advance; foreign, \$1.75; single copy, 40 cents.

HORACE L. VILLEE,

Business Manager.

LESLIE H. PATTERSON,

Asst. Business Manager

Each contributor is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article.

*THE PERMANENT CONTRIBUTIONS OF GENEVA AND JOHN CALVIN TO CHURCH AND STATE IN AMERICA.

BY REV. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,

*General Secretary, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ
in America.*

Dr. Macfarland's eloquent tribute to the influence of John Calvin in America will deeply interest the readers of the Review. Some, however, may not agree with him in all of his applications of Calvin's teachings to certain momentous questions now being vehemently discussed. On these points men, equally intelligent and equally Christian, disagree. Whether or not in agreement with the author, our readers will be grateful to him for his able and thought-provoking article. Remember, Dr. Macfarland is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article.—Editor.

*An address under the auspices of the University of Geneva and the John Calvin Society, in John Calvin's Church in Geneva.

THE PRESBYTERIAL TREASURY.

THE SOLUTION TO PRESENT PROBLEMS IN CHURCH FINANCE.

BY ROBERT B. WOODWORTH,
Burlington, W. Va.

Mr. Woodworth is well fitted to discuss the question of Church finance. For years the treasurer of a United Presbyterian Church in Pittsburg and later an elder and its clerk of Session, a tither active in all movements to increase church revenues, he is familiar with Presbyterian polity. For twenty-four years associated with the Carnegie Steel Co., he is familiar with the business methods of large corporations. He served on the Stewardship Committee of the last General Assembly, is chairman of the Stewardship Committee of Winchester Presbytery. He is also a member of the permanent committee on Stewardship of the Synod of Virginia.—Editor.

The introduction of the Budget System was a long step forward in church finance. It has not removed all the difficulties in the collection and distribution of benevolent funds, nor works with entire satisfaction. It needs now to be supplemented by a better system of bookkeeping and accounting.

A. AIMS OF THE BUDGET SYSTEM. The chief aim of the Budget System is the application of sound principles of business administration to church finance, but specifically—

1. To systematize beneficences and to eliminate leakage of benevolent funds into side ditches; to insure a contribution for each approved cause from every congregation.

2. To canvass the financial needs of approved causes and ascertain funds necessary for adequate maintenance and desirable for wise extensions.

3. To determine for each approved cause its proportion of the total probable benevolent contributions, and to allocate to each Synod, Presbytery and congregation its full and reasonable quota.

4. Through sane and approved methods of promotion, so to make the situation clear to each individual, that he will gladly admit, assume, ascertain and achieve his full responsibility towards the maintenance and advancement of the whole work of the whole Church.

B. PRESENT STATUS OF BUDGET SYSTEM. While the Budget System is good, all its aims and ideals are not yet

achieved; in many congregations it functions admirably, in others not at all. Complaints arise from three main sources.

Executive committees, agencies and institutions complain:

1. That some causes, by reason of designations, get more than their allocated proportion; that Synods and Presbyteries take liberties with percentages set by the Assembly; that some congregations do not contribute to some causes at all.

Publication and Sunday-School Work reports "less than 50 per cent of the churches and only 60 per cent of the Sunday schools make a contribution to our cause and not 20 per cent of Woman's Auxiliaries and Young People's Societies." Of amounts allocated for year ending March 31, 1925, Publication and Sunday-School Work received 96 per cent, Foreign Missions 79, Home Missions 66, and Christian Education and Ministerial Relief but 51.

2. That the funds actually received do not come in promptly or regularly. The stream of contributions runs almost dry in spring and summer, at normal levels in the fall, and reaches flood stage in March.

For instance, Christian Education and Ministerial Relief reports for year 1925:

First quarter, \$21,188.13. Third quarter, \$39,663.34.

Second quarter, \$24,474.14. Fourth quarter, \$99,507.54.

More than one-third of the total came the last month of the year.

Contrariwise, the congregations complain:

3. That, in spite of the Budget System and Every-Member Canvass daggers in the Assembly Minutes, they are still pestered with stir-up letters from Executive Committees which exasperate faithful officers and constitute, in effect, special appeals for preferential treatment.

4. That in the insistence on monthly remittances and the proportionate distribution of funds among so many causes (16 in Winchester Presbytery), an onerous burden of detail rests on Congregational Treasurers of Benevolences. To remit direct requires 192 checks per year, not to mention contributions from subsidiary organizations, separate account of which should be taken.

5. That to split up sums of less than one hundred dollar multiples into the designated fractional percentages means real labor and patient care, to distribute and post accurately. Perforce, the Congregational Treasurer, if he remits direct, is not much to blame if he waits until funds accumulate.

Furthermore, complaint is made by Secretaries of Stewardship and others who use statistics of contributions:

6. That under present methods it is impossible to determine just what amounts have been contributed to any particular cause; that special campaign funds vitiate the educational institutions' column; that endowment and maintenance cannot be segregated; that reports of churches and committees do not agree and cannot be reconciled; that available space in the Minutes will not permit publication of all detail desired for stewardship work.

7. That even if printed statistics were accurate and complete, they are not sufficiently timely for most effective use. Quotas for year 1927 are adopted in September, 1925; Every-Member Canvass made in March, 1926. Where churches remit direct, solid results are not known until July, 1927; that is, too late to galvanize inefficient churches and treasurers into action. Stewardship work is done in the dark and on suspicion.

There is also the general complaint, discussed privately, sometimes expressed publicly:

8. That the burden of overhead expense is too great and should be reduced, and that by the elimination of much of the present detail substantial economies in personnel, supplies and equipment might be effectuated.

(The 1926 Manual P. P. P., page 61, estimates the overhead at 10 per cent "for all our church agencies combined." The writer figures 12.8 per cent for the three main agencies, Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Christian Education and Ministerial Relief. For instance, Foreign Missions disbursed \$1,380,270 in year 1925, of which \$1,194,504 were for the missions proper and \$185,766 were disbursements for administration, promotion, united work, educational and interest charges; expenditures on the fields increased \$28,932, overhead \$23,933, part only of which is increase in interest on loans. Just what amounts are expended by the agencies in keeping books of account with 3,591 churches and their subsidiary organizations, the writer does not know; but he does know by large experience that kind of detail costs money and is confident the agencies should be relieved of it.)

C. REMEDIES. The Budget System has not broken down. It merely needs to be supplemented by a better system of collecting, disbursing and accounting, the essential requirements of which are:

1. It shall conform to Presbyterian ecclesiastical procedure.
2. It shall be simple and, above all, economical.
3. It shall free Congregational Treasurers from detail and thus remove any excuse for delayed or desultory remittances.
4. It shall free Executive Committees, etc., from the detail of accounts with churches and thus reduce overhead.
5. It shall be elastic enough to serve any congregation.
6. It shall, by direct contact with Congregational Treasurers, insure, as far as practicable, a steady and uniform stream of contributions to agency treasuries.
7. It shall insure to each cause from each congregation its due proportion of all benevolent funds in accord with the percentages finally established for the churches.
8. It shall provide those responsible for the Approved Budget, by means of frequent reports, full information as to the progress made in the collection and distribution of benevolent funds, and thus permit timely and appropriate action.

A separate treasury for benevolences in each Presbytery, with all the churches and all their subsidiary organizations within the Presbytery clearing through that treasury, satisfies all these general specifications and is the only satisfactory solution of the problem. Other remedies have been suggested:

Mr. James B. Spillman in 1919 proposed the establishment of a single central treasury to act as a clearing house through which all benevolent funds should pass, with the requirement that "all church treasurers should remit all benevolent funds monthly to the clearing house to be divided by it and remitted on the 10th and 25th of each month to the Assembly, Synodical and Presbyterian Treasurers of Benevolences. Quotas for each church in the Assembly to be computed [in effect *determined*] by the Clearing House Treasurer."

A comparison of the Spillman plan with the above general specifications shows its defects. Specifically:

1. It adds immediately to the overhead expense of the Church, by the creation of a new organization of the very kind that costs money.

2. It cuts across the well-defined lines of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, leads to centralization, substitutes Episcopacy for Presbytery.

3. It has no real contact with local conditions in the Presbyteries, not to say in the congregations. Quotas are determined by rules of arithmetic, not by rules of reason; are fixed by a Grand Central Treasurer, not by Presbytery.

4. Funds flow to clearing house and back again to Presbyteries. In our industrial cooperations, funds *needed* in the mills, shops and offices of operating subsidiaries remain near mills, shops and offices as collected; they are not *first* sent to the treasury of the holding company and then relayed back again. Benevolent funds belong to individuals, congregations, Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly in that order.

5. In our banking system there are clearing house arrangements in every city and in every Federal Reserve district, not in New York only. Reason same as above, for convenience, to avoid delay and needless transportation of funds to and fro. Spillman plan contemplates one only; Presbyterial Treasury plan, 90.

6. It precludes prompt and accurate reporting. Presbyterial officers have to get what under the Presbyterial Treasury System their treasurer would already have, timeliness suffers from distance, not to mention the mechanical difficulties (only to be overcome by installation of elaborate and expensive tabulating machinery) involved in frequent reporting to many organizations.

Very similar objections lie against the system of Synodical treasuries. Besides, Synod's causes represent but a small proportion of total benevolences.

The Church is gradually groping its way to the right and final solution. By independent action growing out of similar conditions and difficulties in the practical execution of the Budget System, like results have been reached in our own Church and denominations of our faith and order. In 35 Presbyteries some benevolent funds are handled by some sort of Presbyterial Treasurer; contributions to Assembly causes are reported in 1925 from Central Treasurers in 22 Presbyteries; in 15 or perhaps 16 Presbyteries the large bulk of *all* benevolences was *cleared* through Presbyterial Treasurers. The treasurers do not all function in the same way and standardization is a desideratum.

In the formulation of a standard system, three main considerations should guide:

1. It need not conform to preferences of beneficiaries; their real and full interests are served when they get solid dollars regularly remitted from any source whatsoever.

2. It need not be drawn particularly to suit the large churches; any good system can be worked by a competent treasurer in a large church. But lack of cooperation by the large churches in the execution of any plan inaugurated by Presbytery more or less means shipwreck for that plan.

3. It should be drawn particularly to fit the needs of the medium or small-sized church; that is, the needs of the 2,343 churches with fewer than 100 members rather than those of the 1,221 (1924 Minutes).

Many years of actual and intimate experience with the Presbyterial Treasury System, first, in the United Presbyterian Church, and, second, in the Presbytery of Winchester, lead the writer to the conclusion that the Presbyterial Treasury, when rightly conducted, is a Godsend to the smaller churches, a blessing to the larger, a real help to agencies and institutions, and a distinct success where all the churches and organizations in a Presbytery cooperated, and the most economical method of collective handling of benevolent funds.

D. THE PRESBYTERIAL TREASURY—DEFINITIONS.

THE TREASURER OF A CORPORATION is an officer who receives and disburses funds as designated by remitters or as instructed by the Board of Directors. He pays no monies to any one, not even his own salary, without warrant, voucher, specific or general instructions. Ex-officio, he makes no sales and collects no monies; to make sales and collect payments is the business of advertising, sales, credit and accounting departments.

A CONGREGATIONAL TREASURER is an officer of a congregation who receives funds contributed within a congregation and disburses them as designated by contributors or as instructed by Session or Board of Deacons. He collects no funds, the deacons do that; the promotion of the church's benevolent work is not his duty, the pastor, Session, Congregational Secretary, etc., do that. In fact, he need not know one iota about the great work of the church. An "educated treasurer" is one that can keep books well, make clear and prompt statements and obey instructions.

A PRESBYTERIAL TREASURER OF BENEVOLENCES is an officer of a Presbytery that receives benevolent funds from Congregational Treasurers and organizations in a Presbytery and disburses them as designated by remitters or as instructed by the Presbytery, *Ex-officio*, his office is not a bureau of promotion or an agency of collection; promotion belongs to the Stewardship Committee, collection to congregational agencies.

To receive funds, keep them safely, disburse them only on instructions when and as told, and to keep and render strict account are the functions of any treasurer. Much of the confusion in the minds of men, and most of the loose criticism of the Presbyterial Treasury system of church finance, is due to ignorance or neglect of these simple propositions.

E. THE PRESBYTERIAL TREASURY—FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES. Some endorse any old plan so long as it brings home the bacon. To the writer no plan is good or likely to be permanently satisfactory which is not based on sound postulates. These have to do with the principles of law and order involved and with the routine work of the distribution of funds, both matters of administration.

I. Presbyterial Order. A good sound system for Presbyterians must conform to Presbyterian ideas of procedure.

1. Each court in the Presbyterian System has full jurisdiction over its own constituents, but, except by some form of reference, no jurisdiction over the constituents of the lower.

2. The Session has supervision and final jurisdiction over the members of a congregation, and no higher court can exercise control over any member except through the Session.

3. The Presbytery has supervision and final jurisdiction over its constituent congregations, and no higher court can exercise control over churches except through Presbytery.

4. Except by way of reference from Presbytery, neither Synod nor General Assembly deals with church members, churches or sessions at all. The Assembly is made up of ministers and ruling elders elected by Presbyteries; the Synod is made up of ministers and ruling elders from churches; but neither can, *ex-officio*, exercise any direct control over ministers or ruling elders or churches.

5. No agency whatsoever of Presbytery, Synod or General Assembly can rightfully exercise any supervision, control, authority or jurisdic-

tion not inherent in, or, by reference, delegated to the court which created it.

The broad principle is that just government is by consent of the governed, the rulership of rules in the formulation and administration of which the ruled do themselves participate.

6. If any improvement is to be had over present methods, if all the churches are to come up to prescribed standards, pressure must be brought to bear upon the sessions of individual congregations to induce them, their subordinates and the congregations to greater diligence. Synod and General Assembly may *recommend* plans; only Presbytery has the right to interrogate churches as to their execution and to call them to account.

7. This right of Presbytery to exclusive control, jurisdiction and episcopal authority over churches should be recognized in any scheme of spiritual or financial administration and respected by higher courts, their agencies and institutions and the churches alike. It is respected in spiritual matters, and should be in financial.

8. Direct dealing of said agencies and institutions with the churches violates this principle; the churches that welcome such direct dealing and continue, for instance, to remit funds direct to agencies or institutions, *when other provision is made by Presbytery*, are participators in the violation, themselves sinners against the rule made by a government in which they had a voice.

This does not mean that agencies may not inform the churches of their work, aims and needs by legitimate methods of promotion, but that they have nothing whatever to do in the churches with the collection and disbursement of funds; no warrant, for instance, to write to any Congregational Treasurer, "Ten months of the church year have passed and our records show no receipts from your church for our cause, perhaps, etc"—(that letter the writer threw into his waste-basket; *he had remitted every month to that cause through his Presbyterial Treasurer*).

II. Distribution of Funds. For the guidance of *Presbyteries and Synods* in the distribution of benevolent funds the 1925 Assembly (Minutes, p. 75) laid down two principles:

1. It is the province of Presbytery or Synod to determine what proportion of its benevolent funds shall be used for its own work; and to distribute that portion according to its own judgment.

2. It is the province of the Assembly to determine how that portion of the Church's benevolent contributions assigned the Assembly's causes shall be distributed among its own agencies; and a *Presbytery*

or Synod does not have the right to alter the percentages which the Assembly itself has fixed to govern this distribution.

On that basis, the Assembly requests *Synods, Presbyteries* and *Sessions* to maintain the rates expressed in the Assembly's percentages, and that *each committee be given its proportion and rightful share* that the work of *all the committees* may be *uniformly advanced*.

Why drag in the Sessions? Because, through the operation of *designations* and *direct remittances* it is in the hands of 3,591 churches and 457,093 church members to knock into a cocked hat the most beautiful scheme of distribution mortal man ever conceived. They have done it, are doing it right now. See Complaint No. 1 above. There are thus two additional factors in the problem:

3. It is the right of the individual to determine for himself how his contributions shall be applied.

4. It is the right of the congregation to determine for itself how benevolent funds raised in its bounds shall be distributed.

5. These rights are inalienable and undisputable. Peter recognized them in the famous case of Ananias and Sapphira, and the Assembly can but trail. The Assembly desires each cause to receive its fair share of total benevolences and devised the Budget System to list the approved causes and determine their proportionate needs; the individual plays favorites, designates funds for the best-known causes, sometimes redesignates on behest of piteous pleaders. The individual determines what the congregation receives; the congregation determines what shall be spent on its own work and what is to pass outside its bounds. *Presbytery stands between the congregations and the causes.*

6. The Budget System is the salvation of the less-known causes. Under it they do now receive a much greater share of total benevolences than under the haphazard method of unlimited, unguided, individual designations. The salvation of the Budget System lies in the fact that most individuals and congregations *choose* to be guided by the wisdom of the higher courts, *choose* to obey the rules they have themselves formulated, *choose* not to designate.

III. Equalization of Funds. How now can these rights of individual and congregational determination be respected and yet the beneficiaries get their respective proportions of total be-

nevolences? Answer: By the use of free or undesignated funds to counter-balance the designated; that is the way industrial corporation treasurers have to do it. And where shall adjustment be made so that the wish of the individual member or congregation may not defeat the will of the General Assembly? Answer: As far down the line as possible, but as far up as designations have appreciable effect.

The necessity and desirability of equalization by balancing designated funds by undesignated is expressly recognized and commanded by the Assembly (so far as it has the power)—Recommendation 3, 1925 Minutes, page 72. If done on the large scale necessary for complete equalization, certain consequences follow:

1. The pooling of funds destroys their identity, an identity which need not be restored until required for annual statistical reports. Once a year is sufficient to work out for individual congregations the exact distribution of their funds to the 16 more or less causes.

2. The pooling of funds and computation of particular distribution but once a year precludes disclosure to beneficiaries on every remittance of original sources from which funds come. That should not be required; it means unnecessary labour, serves no really useful purpose, encourages useless bookkeeping in executive and institutional offices, and is none of their business anyhow. The churches contribute to the Approved Budget, not to the causes as such. (The United Presbyterian Church is severely logical; contributions to Assembly causes are not segregated, but appear in its Minutes lumped in one column, "Payments on the Budget.")

3. As a corollary, the local congregational budget need not be split up among the causes at all. It suffices to conduct Every-Member Canvass for benevolences in one lump sum; better, indeed, because that emphasizes the Whole Work of the Whole Church, distinguishes sharply between For Ourselves and For Others, discourages designations. Splits or distribution to causes can be computed at any time from the percentages.

The 1925 Assembly makes it the province of congregational officers thus to balance undesignated funds against designated, so as to maintain the final desired proportions. The writer believes this impractical except in perhaps the very large congregations, because, firstly, individual designations are quite

frequently, in the smaller congregations, too large a proportion to be thus offset, not to mention specials from Sunday schools, etc.; secondly, the whole congregation may be biased in some direction, such as the support of a missionary; thirdly, the job of dividing undesignated funds into monthly remittances among sixteen beneficiaries, according to fractional percentages, is enough, often too much, for the treasurer handling the small amounts of the average church, let alone so accounting for designations that at the end of the year he shall have distributed the total exactly as instructed by Presbytery.

Note: The average per church for all benevolences is but \$114 per month, including all specials, all individual benefactions, all income from investments—*everything*. Here is the secret of delayed remittances, when sent direct from church to causes.

F. THE PRESBYTERIAL TREASURY—A PRESBYTERIAN CLEARING HOUSE. In a group of churches, designations tend to balance each other; and the greater volume of funds makes practicable exact distribution, balancing of undesignated against designated, and prompt remittance each month to each cause of its due, exact and agreed proportion of total benevolences. The average per Presbytery per month is \$4,557; so what a Congregational Treasurer cannot do, in that he is weak through the flesh, a Presbyterial Treasurer can do to the queen's taste, and without prejudice either to any cause or to any right of individual or collective designation; but he cannot do it perfectly if large congregations or subsidiaries are permitted to remit direct. Direct remittances by individuals, congregations or subsidiary organizations queer the accounts.

He can do more: he can furnish, *at any time, accurate* statements of disbursements to any or all causes, single months or accumulated. If he handles all benevolences, he can do for his Presbytery exactly what treasurers of great corporations do for operating heads, lay before them at any time an exact resumé of their financial situation.

I. Rationale. It is just plain common sense that the body

which fixes percentages and assigns quotas should be the one to see that quotas are raised and percentages of distribution maintained, and if not, why not?

That body is PRESBYTERY, AN ASSOCIATION OF CHURCHES. It alone *rightly* determines final percentages, allocates quotas, exercises original jurisdiction over churches, the highest court in which churches participate in mutual counsel and government, the lowest body whose volume of funds makes practicable adjustments between designated and undesignated, the body that stands between churches and causes. The Presbyterian Treasurer is the servant of the churches, elected by them in Presbytery assembled; his function is to receive funds, transmit designated as designated, and to distribute undesignated as instructed by Presbytery in view of its instructions from Synod and Assembly.

2. Winchester Presbytery Plan. By the elimination of all non-essentials, as suggested, overhead can be reduced and congregational, agency and institutional treasurers relieved of burdensome and expensive detail. The Winchester Presbytery Plan, worked out by Rev. Charles D. Gilkeson, D. D., is simplicity itself and *entirely sufficient*:

Congregational Treasurers of benevolence receive *all* benevolent funds collected in the congregation and once each month remit in lump to Presbyterian Treasurer, without regard to distribution of any but designated funds. Remittance blank, carbon retained, gives that detail, also sources. Presbyterian Treasurer distributes to beneficiaries and remits without disclosure of sources. Each quarter he sends to pastor and Congregational Treasurer a statement, which checks the remittances, and is both a receipt and a quarterly statement to be read to the congregation. At end of year he sends to Clerk of Session a detailed statement of funds received, organizations to which credited and distribution to beneficiaries. From this statement Clerk of Session makes up annual statistical report, which must be correct as it checks with both Congregational and Presbyterian Treasurer.

At each stated meeting Presbyterian Treasurer reports to Presbytery; in the fall, totals; in the spring, a complete report of funds received by types of organizations, funds disbursed by beneficiaries, without disclosure of individual congregations. His data are available at any time on request in almost any detail to Stewardship Committee.

3. Gains and Losses: No one loses anything of value. The agencies and institutions do not receive funds direct from churches, but each one receives its allotted proportion regularly

and promptly. Sessional reports are not affected and the Minutes show contributions of each church in usual detail. The large church does not lose; it designates as it desires and designated funds still go as designated; its treasurer is saved all the detail, however—contrariwise, the gains are many:

a. Complaints. Ground for the complaints above enumerated is taken away as far as practical. There will always be settle-up periods, in spite of the nation.

b. Cost. The work of a Presbyterial Treasurer for 54 churches is little more than that of a Congregational Treasurer over 54 members; men will usually undertake it without compensation for the standing it gives at the bank, or the Secretary of Stewardship may add it to his duties, without additional remuneration. Interest on daily bank balances cares for postage, stationery, etc., and a small adding machine is only needed equipment. Congregational Treasurer makes 12 remittances, saves time, labor and postage on 180 remittances and 188 return receipts; Executive Committees need to keep account with 90 Presbyteries and not with 3,591 churches and their subsidiaries; Synod of Virginia institutions with 8 Presbyteries and not with 431 churches, etc.

c. Fair Play. If a church contributes anything at all, each cause gets its due proportion of that *amount*, even though designated for some one cause and so reported in the Minutes.

d. Regularity. The plan encourages the small contributor; there is no excuse for tardy remittances. For instance, a small Sunday School in Winchester Presbytery remits 68 cents regularly *each month* and it is distributed to the 16 causes. Divide that into 16 parts by half per cents and remit direct, if you please.

e. Promptness. The Congregational Treasurer remits each month whatever he has in hand; the Presbyterial Treasurer disburses.

f. Auditing. All monies flow to Presbyterial Treasury through Congregational Treasurers; there is an absolute check and no room for errors. If extended to all Presbyteries, the system provides accurate and simple means for auditing the receipts side of agency and institutional ledgers, for which there is now no independent provision.

g. Aids the Budget. It emphasizes the fact that the work of the Church is one work, the whole work of the whole Church to be regarded and supported as a whole and not in sections.

h. Logical Corollary of Budget System. The plan provides business methods at the receiving and disbursing end, just as Budget and Every-Member Canvass do at the soliciting end.

G. OBJECTIONS TO PRESBYTERIAL TREASURY SYSTEM. Objections come, in the main, from agencies and institutions, rest on misconceptions of the nature of the system, and on the confusion of ideas above definitions and explanations were intended to remove.

1. "Presbyterial Treasury Should Be a Real Bureau of Promotion."

Answer: Salesmanship is not a treasurer's forte; his place is at the rear end of the line; Stewardship Committee and Every-Member Canvass forces are to do promotion.

2. "Presbyterial Treasury cuts communication with the churches; institutions and agencies cannot go direct, and do not know what churches contribute, etc."

Answer: The *Budget System* does that and not any system of bookkeeping and accounting afterwards. Presbyterial Treasury should be praised, not blamed, because it insures each institution its due share of all funds collected, and is the only system that does.

3. "Presbyterial Treasury excludes institutions from educating Congregational Treasurers to be real centers of promotion."

Answer: Same objection as No. 1, but one step lower down. The best Congregational Treasurer is a good bank officer (Presbyterial Treasurer, ditto). If a good Christian, he will become conversant with the work of the church; but pastor, Session and Congregational Secretary are the persons to educate, as they have to do with promotion.

4. "To adopt Presbyterial Treasury would mean to set up more machinery, more overhead expense and more salaries."

Answer: See what is said above about cost. The saving in postage alone on remittances and receipts, it is estimated, would provide \$200 each per year for 90 treasurers.

5. "We in our church will not hand over our money to be distributed or prorated by some one other than our own treasurer according to our own budget."

Answer: This seems to be the stumbling block of many a large church; its logical conclusion is the complete supervision of ultimate expenditures even in far Cathay. It violates Gal. 6:2 and Rom. 15:1; it is Congregational in theory and not Presbyterian; if the distribution in "our own budget" is not that set by Presbytery, it is a repudiation of the action of its own representatives in Presbytery; if it is, Presbyterial Treasurer can do the job better than "our own treasurer"; if not, it sets its wisdom above that of Presbytery, Synod and Assembly, and, if it knew it, is contrary to its own best interests. But it misses the main point. Presbyterial Treasurer has no control over

funds; he must transmit designated funds as designated and can only prorate undesignated as instructed by Presbytery. In effect, all the large church is asked to do is to pool its undesignated funds with others to be used in equalization so that all the causes may share alike (2 Cor. 8:13-14), and desires of Presbytery, Synod and Assembly realized; to let Presbytery do for it what the Assembly says it should do for itself, but which Presbytery, through Presbyterial Treasury, can do a whole lot better.

If the Presbyterian Church in the United States wishes relief from high overhead and like results of haphazard methods it must *whole-heartedly* adopt some sound plan of bookkeeping and accounting and make it *absolutely uniform* in every congregation and Presbytery. The Presbyterial Treasury System is that safe, sane and sound plan.

A CHINESE BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Edited by Henry M. Woods, D. D. The Commercial Press, Ltd., Shanghai, China. Four volumes. Pp. 2458

By REV. MAXCY SMITH, *Soochow, China.*

For many years the greatest single need in the way of literature for the Chinese Church has been a Bible Encyclopedia, at once comprehensive in its scope and accurate in its scholarship. Each passing year has emphasized the urgency of this need. Earlier works along this line, useful in their way, were too restricted in scope and too elementary in treatment to be of much help to pastors and Bible students puzzled by the increasing number of books and newspaper articles calling in question the Reformed Theology, and reflecting upon and sometimes boldly attacking the integrity and authority of Holy Scripture. The appearance some years ago, under the auspices of the Christian Literature Society, of an abridged translation of Hastings Bible Dictionary, containing many articles based