

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

Vol. XXXIII

JULY, 1922

No. 4

THE CHARLESTON ASSEMBLY, 1922.

By the EDITOR.

How does this Assembly compare with other Assemblies that you have attended? This is a question which is frequently asked by the younger commissioners who have never attended an Assembly before. To be perfectly honest, all the Assemblies are very much alike, and act in very much the same way. The Charleston Assembly was no exception. It was a good Assembly, composed of a fine body of commissioners, but there was nothing unusual or remarkable about it.

THE PRE-ASSEMBLY EVANGELISTIC CONFERENCE.

For the past two years a pre-Assembly Conference has been held under the auspices of the General Assembly's Executive Committee of Home Missions. The Conference this year was of a very high order. A deep spiritual note ran through it from beginning to end. All of the speakers rose to the occasion. The Conference was a good preparation for the Assembly that was to follow and left one feeling that he wanted to do all of his work as a commissioner on a high spiritual plane.

There was one development that ought to be nipped in the bud. A few commissioners took advantage of this occasion to campaign for their favorite candidate for moderator. I heard them do this with my own ears and I heard others speak of it. It would be nothing short of high tragedy if a conference called for such high and holy purposes should develop into a happy hunting ground for those men who love to make moderators.

THE ELECTION OF MODERATOR.

The election of the moderator is usually the most exciting thing on the program of an Assembly. As one looks on at such an election he wonders if a more excellent way could not be discovered. To begin with there are too many speeches. There is no earthly reason why a dozen men should second a nomination in speeches of greater or less length. Much that is said is irrelevant. Worst of all, much that is said is positively fulsome. The words of Solomon come to mind: "Hast thou found honey? Eat so much as is sufficient for thee lest thou be filled therewith and—." The reader can finish the quotation. It is not becoming to praise any mortal man too highly in the house of God. It would be a great thing if a new standard could be set along these lines.

When it comes to voting for moderator there is always a discussion as to whether it should be done by standing or by roll call. As a matter of fact a vote by written ballot would be the fairest way and it would certainly be a quicker method than the roll call, if time is an element.

The Charleston Assembly was happy in its selection of a moderator. The choice fell upon Rev. R. C. Reed, D. D., LL. D., of Columbia Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C. Dr. Reed's gracious manner and fine spirit are a blessing to any Assembly.

THE APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES.

When the Moderator announced the names of the members of the standing committees he had a merry time trying to pronounce the names of many of the brethren. He frankly stated that he did not know a great many of them, but that he had tried his best to get every man on a committee. All of which reminds us that our present method of having the Moderator appoint these standing committees is a hit or miss method. No moderator can know all the commissioners or even the majority of them. The best he can do is to put as chairmen of the committees men whom he knows, and then to fill in the committees at random with men who are mere names to him, and without

any reference to their fitness for the particular committee to which they are assigned. A few brethren who want to be helpful have a way of handing to the Moderator-elect the names of men who would make suitable members of certain committees. The Moderator can generally take it for granted that the man who hands in such a list uninvited has an axe to grind. The Moderator has his own personal equation to deal with, and one Moderator has about as much of this as another and sometimes more. It is so easy for him to consciously or unconsciously to color the action of every committee and of the whole Assembly to suit his own notions in the appointment of the standing committees.

There ought to be a method devised by which the Assembly could elect these standing committees. A very simple method is used in some of the churches. There are about fourteen important standing committees. Let the commissioners be divided into fourteen equal groups, corresponding as nearly as possible to synodical groups. The members of each group as a rule would know each other and would know what committee each man in the group was specially fitted for. Let each group elect one man for each standing committee. This could be done in a half hour and the Assembly would have representative committees composed of men who were selected by men who know them. The Presbyterian Church rejoices in its representative form of government. Why not make it as representative as we can? Our present way of appointing standing committees is not representative. I am not finding fault with the present Moderator, but with the system. There is a better way and a more Presbyterian way.

REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

The reports of the General Assembly's Executive Committees and their agencies were full of encouragement, and made us feel that the past year was the greatest year in the history of our Church. As a rule the Assembly does not give enough time to the hearing of these reports, but by accident the Charles-

ton Assembly gave more time to them. It is the custom to have popular, or unpopular meetings on the nights of the Assembly. But somebody forgot to plan such a meeting for the first night. So those in charge of the reports of the Executive Committees were asked to present their reports in popular form on the first night. This they did well, and the audience seemed to be deeply interested. It is to be hoped that the Assembly will always forget to plan the so-called popular meeting for the first night, and ask the secretaries in charge of the reports to present the salient points of these reports in an interesting manner. In this way the commissioners can get a comprehensive survey of the work of the Church on the first day of the Assembly.

Speaking of the encouragement in these reports, we cannot refrain from quoting a paragraph along this line which has just appeared in the *Continent*. "Congratulations winged with Christian esteem and fraternal rejoicing should be sent flying to the Southern Presbyterian Church for the magnificently loyal financial support which it gave its missionary and benevolent agencies in the ecclesiastical year for which report was made at its late General Assembly. Every cause in the Church gained in the total revenues which it had at its disposal, making a record in missionary and educational finances which the denomination never touched before. When it is considered that the South during the period covered by these reports was suffering the most trying embarrassments of the business depression which in 1921 spread over the whole country. This outcome testifies to a Christian devotion among the Presbyterians of the South which is worthy of all praise and of unlimited emulation."

"Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia: How that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality."

During the year 24,002 were received into the Church on profession of faith. Our Church has a total membership of 411,-

854. There are enrolled in our Sunday schools 398,850 pupils and teachers.

The American Bible Society reports more Bibles sold last year than ever before in the history of the world.

All along the line the reports were encouraging. Let us thank God and take courage.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

The question of closer relations with other Presbyterian churches came up early in the Assembly, and probably occupied more of the time and thought of the Assembly than any other single subject. Like Banquo's ghost this is a matter that will not down. It would be an interesting study to go over the Assembly's Minutes for the past fifty years and see how much space is given to reports and actions on this subject. About one-seventh of Alexander's Digest is given over to excerpts taken from the Minutes of the Assembly on the subject of relations with other Presbyterian and Reformed churches.

The most recent negotiations along this line began in 1917 when the Northern Presbyterian Assembly, in session at Dallas, Texas, sent a telegram to the Southern Assembly, in session at Birmingham, asking that the Southern Assembly would appoint a committee to enter into negotiations with them in regard to the organic union of the two Churches. The Southern Assembly replied that it did "not regard organic union as practicable at this time," but that it would appoint a committee for the purpose of considering the federation of all "the Presbyterian Churches of our country upon some practical and effective basis."

The history of the negotiations that followed would make a long article in itself. Suffice it to say here that the committees representing the several Churches reported to their respective judicatories in 1920 a general plan of union which was adopted by all the judicatories. Our own Assembly meeting in Charlotte adopted it without a dissenting vote, to the astonishment of everybody present. This plan of union called for a United

Federal Assembly and for a Constitution for the federal union of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America. Our Assembly of 1920 appointed a committee to act with similar committees from the other Churches in framing this Constitution. Here is where the most delicate part of all the work in connection with these negotiations began. In fact, this Constitution proved to be the crux of the whole matter. What powers should be granted to the proposed United Assembly? What work should be committed to it? How should the Constitution be amended, by the unanimous consent of all participating Churches, or by a three-fourths majority? How should the laws of comity be enacted and enforced? These were some of the knotty problems. Finally a Constitution was completed in the spring of 1921 and agreed upon by the committees representing the several Churches and it was understood that this Constitution would be presented to the highest judicatories of the respective Churches. In the last moment on the day preceding the meeting of our Assembly in St. Louis in 1921, the committee representing our Church decided that there were one or two paragraphs in the Constitution that were ambiguous, especially those paragraphs relating to comity and to the method of amending the Constitution. In the meantime the committee representing the Northern Presbyterian Church had appended to the Constitution an explanatory footnote which seemed ambiguous. Our committee accordingly asked the St. Louis Assembly permission to withdraw its report presenting the Constitution, and asked to be continued for another year in order that they might perfect this Federal Constitution.

During the year that followed our committee amended the Constitution and submitted these amendments and other amendments to a joint meeting of the committees representing all the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America. This meeting was held in Richmond, Va., on November 30th and December 1st, 1921. The Northern Presbyterian Committee declined to accept these amendments proposed by our committee and frankly said that it was interested only in organic union,

as the Council of the Reformed Churches which was already in existence would adequately cover the field of federal union. This was the last joint meeting of the committees. It adjourned without agreeing upon a Constitution, and each committee was left to make its own report to its Assembly or Synod as it might see fit. These negotiations had extended over a period of more than four years, everybody was tired and if there had ever been any enthusiasm for this plan it had oozed away.

Our committee made its report to the Assembly at Charleston by reciting the history of the negotiations from 1917 to the present and by exhibiting the several Constitutions and amendments that had been proposed. There was one terse recommendation in a line at the end of the long report, and that was that the whole matter be dropped. That was a good recommendation and right to the point. One member of the committee declined to join in this recommendation and presented a minority report, recommending the selection of a new committee, with the authority to take up the whole matter of closer relations *de novo*.

The interesting thing is that the Assembly adopted neither the majority nor minority report, but a motion that was moved as a substitute for both. In the next paragraph we will ask whether such a motion was allowable. The substitute which was adopted approved of the Constitution in its final form as amended by the committee of our Church and rejected by the committee of the Northern Church. The substitute further provided that this Constitution was "to become operative and effective, however only when it shall have been approved and adopted by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Northern), and at least one of the other Churches in this country holding the Reformed Presbyterian faith."

Some of us are still wondering as to the meaning of this particular action. Any one who knew the history of the negotiations for the past four years, even in a casual way, must have known that the Northern Assembly would never adopt

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

this Constitution. Their committee had rejected it point blank. Not only so, but everybody must have known that this Constitution would have to be adopted by three-fourths of our Presbyteries before it could become operative, and so far as I know there was no motion to send it down to the Presbyteries for their adoption or rejection. Our Church is certainly not committed to this Constitution until the Presbyteries adopt it, for our Book distinctly provides that three-fourths of the Presbyteries must approve of any union with any other Church. Besides there are items in this Constitution which would necessitate changes in our Book of Church Order. So I am still wondering what the Assembly hoped to accomplish by the adoption of the substitute approving of the Constitution submitted by our committee, but which had not been approved, as amended, by the committee of any other Church.

It took some little time to get the Northern Assembly to understand just what our Assembly had done, and it is no wonder. When the Northern Assembly did understand it made the following reply:

“We reaffirm our willingness to take any steps in the direction of the actual union of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches. In our judgment, however, this proposed Constitution secures no closer union than is already made possible by the Constitution of the General Council of the Reformed Churches, already adopted by the majority of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches and now in operation. We, therefore, believe that for the present we should endeavor to promote that co-operation already made possible through the Council of the Reformed Churches and its amended Articles of Agreement until such time as the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. is willing to proceed further and adopt measures which will secure actual organic union.”

To this our Assembly made this very courteous reply:

“The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America having expressed a preference for the General Council of the Reformed Churches in America over the Constitution of the Presbyterian Reformed Churches, which had been the subject of discussion between us for several years, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States accepts that decision. We renew our expression of most cordial admiration and affection for your venerable Church. We thank God for the great work you have done, are doing, and are destined to do.”

The man who wrote that paragraph is a master of Christian courtesy and knows how to promote good-will between two great Churches.

We understand that this ends the negotiations concerning closer relations which began at the Birmingham Assembly in 1917.

A PARLIAMENTARY TANGLE.

When a committee makes a majority report and a minority report the Moderator may as well be on the look out for a parliamentary tangle. It is almost sure to come, and when it does come it is a tangle of the first magnitude. At the Assembly of 1913 in Atlanta a situation arose in this connection that was so tense that an outstanding member of the Assembly threatened to throw up his commission and go home because of the ruling of the Moderator. At the Assembly of 1917 in Birmingham a substitute for the majority and minority reports created no little confusion. In New Orleans at the Assembly of 1920 there were two majority reports and two minority reports to deal with at the same time and the situation became not only tangled but positively humorous. The Assembly at Charleston this year did not escape this perennial source of trouble, and there was a lively discussion. It came about as follows:

The majority report of the Committee on Closer Relations was presented, and a motion was duly made and seconded that it be adopted. The minority report was then presented, and a motion was made and duly seconded that it be substituted for the majority report. Mr. George E. Price moved a substitute for both the majority report and the minority report. There the tangle began. As the debate proceeded Dr. J. Layton Mauze offered a substitute for Mr. Price's motion. At the first the Moderator ruled that Dr. Mauze's motion was in order, but later just as they were about to take the vote he ruled that Dr. Mauze's substitute was out of order. The vote was then taken upon Mr. Price's substitute and it was carried. There the whole matter ended and Mr. Price's substitute was declared to be the will of the Assembly. This has all now become history, but it is not parliamentary law or usage.

The rules of Parliamentary Order in the back of our Book of Church Order are very much condensed, but will cover the case in hand. The particular rule which is applicable to this case is as follows: "An amendment may be moved on any question, also an amendment to the amendment, which shall be decided before the original proposition; but two distinct amendments to the pending question shall not be entertained at the same time whether moved as substitutes for the whole matter or as changing any part thereof." According to this rule Dr. Mauze's substitute was clearly out of order at the time it was offered. Mr. Price's motion was offered as a substitute and the rule distinctly says that two substitutes for the same thing cannot be entertained at the same time. So the last ruling of the Moderator on Dr. Mauze's motion was the correct one.

But the real tangle in the whole matter seems to have escaped the attention of the Moderator of the Assembly. It was contrary to our parliamentary rule quoted above to accept Mr. Price's motion as a substitute at the same time for both the majority report and the minority report. The minority report was already a substitute for the majority report, and to accept Mr. Price's motion at that time as a substitute for the

majority report meant that two substitutes for the majority report were being entertained at the same time, which is contrary to parliamentary usage and contrary to the rule just quoted. According to our parliamentary law Mr. Price's motion could have been entertained as a substitute for the minority report only. A substitute for a substitute is allowable. Besides the minority report was the question immediately before the house. When Mr. Price's motion won it killed the minority report and took its place. According to our parliamentary law the contest was then between the majority report and Mr. Price's motion, which was now advanced to the position of substitute for the majority report. At this point a substitute could have been offered for Mr. Price's motion as one substitute was out of the way. Dr. Mauze's motion would have been in order here if regular usage had been followed. But as regular usage was not followed when Mr. Price was allowed to offer his motion as a substitute for both reports, there was never a time when Dr. Mauze could have offered his motion. Parliamentary law is very fair to all parties. But let us go back a moment to parliamentary law. The first vote on Mr. Price's motion only substituted it for the minority report. Having won as a substitute for the minority report it was then before the house as a possible substitute for the majority report and a vote should have been taken as to whether it was the will of the Assembly that it should be substituted for the majority report. If this vote had carried then Mr. Price's motion would have become a substitute for the majority report, but the end would not have been yet. The voting up to this point has not been as to whether the Assembly wished to adopt Mr. Price's resolution, but as to whether it wished to substitute his motion first for the minority report and then for the majority report. When it had attained its position as substitute for the majority report it would have become the one question before the house and was still open to amendment. Then a vote should have been taken as to whether the Assembly desired to accept or reject Mr. Price's motion as its final action upon this question.

But what difference does it make? First of all, the method that was followed made it impossible for Dr. Mauze or anybody else to offer a substitute after Mr. Price had offered his. The way was absolutely blocked. The regular parliamentary method would have made it possible for any member to have offered a substitute if he had waited for the proper time. This method gives everybody an opportunity and makes it possible to discover the most excellent way. In the second place, when a substitute is offered at the same time for two motions it is difficult for the voter to decide in a clear-cut way between two motions on one side and one motion on the other side. He can give a clearer decision if he has just two motions to decide between. As a matter of fact the Assembly was never asked in a clear-cut way to make a decision between the majority report and Mr. Price's motion. It is not at all certain that an Assembly will finally adopt a motion moved as a substitute for both the majority report and the minority report. A substitute for the majority report and the minority report was offered at the Birmingham Assembly and carried by a good majority. The attention of the Moderator was then called to the very rules I have been stating above, and he ruled that the substitute could only take the place of the minority report, and before the discussion was over this substitute which had carried by a good majority was defeated by another substitute which was offered in its place. Besides, it may be worth while for us to try to think our way clearly through this particular point in order that we may reduce parliamentary tangles along this line to a minimum in the future.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED CHURCHES IN AMERICA.

This Council was formed in 1907 and is composed of representatives of all the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America. Up to the present time its main function has been to promote good-will and comity among the constituent churches. It has done very little constructive work. A few years ago the

Council submitted to the supreme judicatories of the constituent churches a revised constitution for their adoption. As there was a separate movement on foot for closer relations, as described above, our General Assembly postponed action on this revised constitution. Other churches went ahead and adopted the revisions. According to the original constitution of the Council, an amendment to the constitution becomes effective when it has been approved by two-thirds of the constituent churches. The Council at its meeting in March, 1922, declared that the amendments to the constitution had been approved by the necessary two-thirds of the constituent churches. Our Assembly in Charleston took the following action: "That the Assembly approve of the action of the Council in adopting the amended constitution or plan of union, in spite of some apparent irregularities attendant upon the canvass of the returns of the constituent bodies of the Council."

This revised constitution declares itself to be a "Plan of Federal Union." It gives to the Council power to establish boards or agencies for carrying on such work as may be committed to them by the constituent churches. The idea is that the constituent churches may in years to come desire to turn over to these boards a part or all of their work, which is now done through the boards and Executive Committees of the constituent churches. The constitution gives no large power to the Council, but it is elastic, and its possibilities are right large.

This Council is to meet at least biennially. Our Church is at present entitled to 32 representatives to be chosen as our General Assembly may determine. The General Assembly has never made any definite ruling as to how these representatives shall be elected, and as a matter of fact it is not generally known who they are, as there is no complete list printed at any one place in our Assemblies' Minutes. With the adoption of this new constitution the time has come for the Assembly to formulate some definite rules for the election of these representatives and some rules as to their term of office. It should be made a truly representative body.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN
AMERICA.

The large majority of the Protestant denominations in America belong to this Council. Its purpose seems to be to bind the churches together for co-operation in various forms of Christian service. There is no doubt that its leaders and commissions do many things that are contrary to the historic position of our Church. For example, it used its name and influence to bring pressure to bear on the the United States Senate to adopt the treaties prepared by the International Conference on Reduction of Armaments, which met in Washington city at the call of President Harding. Those treaties may have been very good in themselves, but they are distinctly outside the sphere of the Church's business. At the same time the Council is profoundly interested in evangelism and all forms of missions and many other matters that belong distinctly to the Church.

It is no wonder that the Council provokes a warm discussion in our Assembly every year. It was warmer than usual this year. The Assembly finally decided to stay in the Council, but declined to vote any money for its support. This may sound like a contradictory position for a great Church to take, but the reasons given are valid ones. If we are going to stay in this Council the Assembly should make some definite rules as to the way in which our representatives shall be elected and as to the length and their terms of service.

COMITY.

The question of getting on with other people and co-operating with them in every good work is one of the big problems of life. The question of getting on with other churches and co-operating with them is a bigger problem still. Since the Cumberland Presbyterian Church united with the Northern Presbyterian Church in 1906, there has been much overlapping of the work of our Church and the Northern Church in the border States. In fact, the sum total of their membership

in these border States is nearly equal to the sum total of our membership in these same States. There have been some irritating and even exasperating cases of friction. In fact, there have been several outstanding breaches of comity which seemed almost unpardonable. Committees on Comity representing our Church and the Northern Church have been busy trying to straighten out the tangles. A great deal has been accomplished and it is hoped that the causes of irritation and friction can be entirely removed. The Assembly constituted our Executive Committee of Home Missions a permanent Committee on Comity. This is a wise move, as most of the friction occurs in Home Mission territory. We believe that if Dr. S. L. Morris, our Executive Secretary, and Dr. John A. Marquis, the Secretary of the Home Mission Board of the Northern Church, will put their heads and hearts together they can do much to remove the causes of irritation and much to promote a real spirit of comity and cooperation between two great branches of the Presbyterian Church.

THE OFFICE OF DEACON.

The Assembly enacted into law the Revision of the Section of the Book of Church Order that relates to the office of deacon. The Presbyteries voted almost unanimously for the revision. There is nothing radical about this revision, and yet it is a decided advance over the old section. It puts the deacon's office on a higher spiritual plane and gives the deacons larger room for initiative in their work. The section as revised will be found complete on pages 188-189 of the Assembly's Minutes of 1921.

The revision seems to commit all the temporal affairs of the Church directly to the deacons, and to give them the authority to take the initiative in planning all financial campaigns in the Church, subject of course to the review and control of the session. Provision is made for organizing the deacons into a Board of Deacons. It also provides for appointing deacons as treasurers and trustees in the higher courts of the Church.

The session is given the authority, as in the unrevised section, to select godly women to assist the deacons in their work for the sick and needy, and "they may also aid the deacons in collecting and distributing the offerings of the people." This is a distinct advance over the old section and puts the work of these godly women more in line with the work of the deacons. The late Dr. John F. Cannon, of St. Louis, one of the clearest thinkers and one of the most conservative men our Church ever produced, believed firmly that the office of deaconess is a Scriptural office. Our observation leads us to believe that an increasing number of men in our Church are coming to that conviction.

It is interesting to note that while our Assembly was enacting this bit of new law, the Northern Presbyterian Church was putting a section in its Book of Church Order distinctly providing for the office of deaconess. This had been approved by an overwhelming majority of their Presbyteries. In the meantime the Assemblies of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland and England provided that hereafter from 15 to 25 per cent. of the members of their administrative committees and boards should be women.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER

Here is a rather significant sentence on page 73 of the Assembly's Minutes for 1922: "There are 88 Presbyteries, and of this number 24 made no answer to any of the amendments." Why were the 24 Presbyteries silent? Did they overlook the proposed amendments, or did they have "no zeal in the matter?" It certainly looks as if it were the duty of a Presbytery to say "Yes" or "No" to any and every proposition sent down by the Assembly. This raises a question. Is it necessary according to our law, for a Presbytery to vote on a proposition prior to the meeting of the following Assembly? In other words, if these 24 Presbyteries were to proceed now and vote for the amendments which they failed to vote on would that be legal? This is the law: "The Book of Church Order may be

amended on the recommendation of one General Assembly, when a majority of the Presbyteries advise and consent thereunto, and a succeeding General Assembly shall enact the same." Note that the law says when "*a* succeeding General Assembly," and not when "*the* succeeding General Assembly." As a rule no limit is put on the time as to when a State may adopt a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The separate States may act over a period of years, and when the requisite number has been secured the article is declared adopted.

An *Ad-Interim* Committee, acting under instructions from the Assembly of 1921, proposed further amendments to the Book of Church Order. The Assembly heard the report, re-committed it to the committee, and then directed the committee to go over the whole Book of Church Order and suggest further revisions to the next Assembly. The committee is in doubt as to whether the Assembly thought that report was so poor that it ought to be done over, or that it was so good that the Assembly would be pleased to see more just like it.

The Assembly has asked Presbyteries and individuals to send suggested amendments to the chairman of the committee, Rev. Walter L. Lingle, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond. All such suggestions will receive a hearty welcome, for it is a large task which the Assembly has laid upon this committee. Suggestions concerning the quorum of a session, with or without a pastor, would be especially welcome.

OTHER AD-INTERIM COMMITTEES.

An *Ad-Interim* Committee was appointed by the Assembly to thoroughly investigate the whole matter of the proposed Presbyterian Foundation and to report to the next Assembly. It has been suggested from a number of quarters that it would be a great thing for our Church to have incorporated a board known as the Presbyterian Foundation, whose functions would be to receive gifts and bequests and to distribute them, or the income from them, among the various causes and institutions

of the Church. This proposed board is to have large powers in the handling and distribution of such funds. The idea of having a Presbyterian Foundation is very close akin to the idea our fathers had when they elected the Trustees of the General Assembly and had them incorporated under the laws of North Carolina. They had large ideas as to the place these Trustees would fill in the life of our Church, but the Assembly's Executive Committees have been incorporated and have taken over much of the work which the fathers had in mind for the Trustees. As a result, the work of the Trustees has never bulked large in our Church.

The main difference between the proposed Foundation and the Trustees of the Assembly is that the managers of the Foundation will have power to distribute funds according to their own judgment, while the Trustees distribute funds only under orders from the Assembly. The possibilities of such a Foundation are great, but the rules governing it should certainly be formulated with great care.

An *Ad-Interim* Committee was appointed on Closer Cooperation of the Assembly's Executive Committees of Home and Foreign Missions. There is a thought back in the minds of some that these two great committees might be consolidated, or at least that they might be brought in such close co-operation as to make the work of both more effective. These two committees were located in the same place and co-operated in the closest way between the years 1864 and 1886. Our impression is that the plan did not work as well as it might have done. The committee will find some interesting reading on this subject in the "Recollections" of Dr. Richard McIlwaine. Those who are charged with working out this question should certainly study those twenty-two years with care. Sometimes one wonders why there should have ever been made any distinction whatever between Home Missions and Foreign Missions, but the distinction has been made, and it would be exceedingly difficult to unmake it. But the Church does well to study anything that will make for the closest co-operation of any of its agencies, for

they are certainly all a part of the one Church. Much progress in co-operation has been made since the Permanent Committee on Systematic Beneficence was first appointed in 1910.

Another *Ad-Interim* Committee was appointed to formulate Rules for Conducting the Business of the Assembly. It is a strange thing that nobody ever thought of that before, or at least that the Assembly never appointed such a committee before, for I suppose that a great many people have thought about it. It is a stranger thing that our Assembly has been able to conduct its business with any degree of efficiency for these sixty-two years without any rules of procedure whatever. We believe that a few wise rules will add greatly to the efficiency of the Assembly. This committee has a great opportunity to render a large and lasting service to all future Assemblies. If there were absolutely unlimited space for this article I might even venture a few suggestions concerning these rules.

Still another *Ad-Interim* Committee was appointed on the Bureau of Vacancy and Supply. This is one of the big questions in our Church. How can we help a vacant church get the right minister as speedily as possible? How can the minister move without embarrassment when he is convinced that the time has come to change his field? These are perennial problems. One committee after another has tried to solve it. We are wishing better success to this committee. The whole Church would welcome a solution.

And many other things were done by the Charleston Assembly which will be found duly recorded in the Minutes of 1922. The Minutes have already been published and are a credit to Dr. J. D. Leslie, the new Stated Clerk. They make interesting reading. To those who have never tried it before, I venture to suggest that they take a day off and read the Minutes of the Assembly through from cover to cover. It would be a profitable day.