Ecclesiastical Financial Management

The section of the Code of Canon Law which deals with the administration of property within the Church's organization may be one of the shortest treatises in the Code, but it surely is one of great relevance and complexity.

A combination of today's difficult economy and the presence of some outworn management policies in the old legal system makes the position of ecclesiastical administrators and managers quite difficult.

The old legislation, promulgated during the World War I, set more emphasis on land and property holdings which constituted most of the ecclesiastical patrimony at that time when money and liquid assets were considered less secured and of lesser value. Today the opposite seems to be the rule. While real state and buildings have often turned into a liability, especially in cases where such holdings are subject to heavy taxation and to political and social changes, the investment of money has become more productive in terms of interests or revenue and capital gains.

Furthermore, the Church's financial system, which has worked fairly well for centuries, is being challenged by modern and sophisticated management techniques and practices. To face this challenge and to protect its patrimony against adverse economic forces, the Church has updated its patrimonial law in the 1983 Code of Canon Law. In this study, we shall endeavor to examine

the new changes in the Church's financial system and to make a number of observations on the latest norms.

I. THE CHURCH'S FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

From its beginnings, the Church has adopted a policy of economic decentralization and operated on the principle of subsidiarity. In simple language this means that, within the Church, even the smallest unit is in charge of its economy and strives to be as financially self-sufficient as possible. This process has rendered the ecclesiastical patrimony less vulnerable to adverse economic factors and allowed it to grow and prosper.

The centuries-old policy of decentralization, however, was put to a test at Vatican II through several proposals seeking to reintroduce the *common patrimony* and the *centralized administration* system of the primitive church. The idea, however, was unacceptable to the conciliar fathers who thought the communion of goods was something close to impossible in practice. In short, decentralization and subsidiarity in the Church's economy were still considered good theology and right on target with Vatican II.[1]

But should not the Church set aside outworn management policies by centralizing its finances? Why should the Church which prides itself of unity in matters of faith and morals deliberately promote dis-unity in matters of administration and finance?

Truly, there are experts who believe that the Church should pool financial resources and centralize financial management. Others, on the contrary, assert that centralizing finances runs counter to orthodox policies and even increases risks. All agree, however, that decentralization can exact a terrible price on dilution of authority, lack of direction, duplication of efforts, while a centralized budget and administration can yield rewards in areas like bulk purchase of supplies, materials and services. In

[1] ROVERA, V., *De Structuris Oeconomicis in Ecclesia Renovandis*, Periodica, 1971, p. 201.

short, decentralization may be hurting more than helping the Church's economy.[2]

Indeed, the need and urgency of some kind of uniformity of administration are shown in various conciliar decrees. In fact, some sort of common administration would be necessary for the formation and management of the *support fund* and *equal remuneration system* for the clergy mandated by Vatican II. The creation of a *common fund* to provide for the needs of the various units and personnel within the diocese or region, requires likewise a common management (cc. 1274, 1; 1275). Episcopal Conferences are to establish diocesan, regional or even international agencies for the purpose of providing suitable insurance and health assistance for the benefits of the clergy (c. 1274).[3] Religious institutes are enjoined to adopt the common patrimony system and a uniform management.[4]

The cases picked up at random show that the Church, while maintaining in principle a system of individual management, still admits the possibility and acknowledges the need of at least a partially centralized system of administration.

II. BASIC CONCEPTS ON ADMINISTRATION

As stated above, within the Church's organization, any juridic person or unit, either public or private, has the capacity to acquire, hold, administer and dispose of temporal goods or property in accordance with law (c. 1255).

The ecclesiastical patrimony, however, is made up of the temporalities of public juridic persons only — dioceses, parishes, institutes of consecrated life — as the holdings of private juridic entities are no longer considered Church property (c. 1257, 1). Truly, a private juridic entity does not act, properly speaking, in the name of the Church and thus its patrimony can not be looked upon as *ecclesiastical*.[5] As a consequence thereof, the fiscal

[2] GOLLIN, G., *There's an Unholy Mess in the Churchly Economy*, Fortune, May 1976, p. 223-248.
[3] *Presb. Ord.*, n. 21.
[4] *Perfectae Caritatis*, n. 131; ROVERA, l.c., p. 207.
[5] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 391-392.

management of private property is no longer subject to common law regulations, as in the case of public property, and, as a matter of principle, managers would have instead to adhere to statutory or particular law (c. 1257, 2).[6]

Likewise the individual holdings of an administrator — *personal patrimony* — and the income derived from the pastoral ministry — *clerical patrimony* — are neither ecclesiastical property and their use is not regulated by common law prescriptions.

It is to say the obvious that the right of administration flows from a more basic right: that of property. For the right of ownership includes the right to hold, use, enjoy and dispose of property, all of which imply acts of administration.

The administration of temporalities is often likened to the government of persons. This is as it should be, for as the proper functon of the government is to preserve the well-being of persons and to help them to attain their objectives in life, so the administration of property aims at preserving all the temporalities acquired, putting them to use in accordance with the preestablished goals which the property is intended to serve.

The administration of temporal property, therefore, should comprise the following functions:

— the preservation and improvement of the goods or assets;
— the natural or artificial production of fruits or income derived from such property or temporalities;
— the application of the fruits or income to the proper objectives.

Lastly, the fundamental right of the Church, both to own and manage, is based on, and limited by the finality which the patrimony is to serve. Therefore, the goals set by Christ's teachings and by the Church's own directives, especially the celebration of divine worship, the provision for a decent and respectable support for the clergy and other ministers and personnel and the exercise of the works of apostolate and charity, should serve as the guiding principle in the acquisition and management of eccle-

[6] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 398-399.

siastical patrimony.[7] For it is only in the pursuit of these goals that it is licit for the Church to possess temporal goods, to levy taxes and to seek the financial assistance of the faithful (c. 1263).[8]

III. ORDINARY AND EXTRAORDINARY ACTS OF ADMINISTRATION

In the actual work of management it is necessary to draw a clear distinction between ordinary and extraordinary acts of administration. Ecclesiastical law distinguishes acts of ordinary–day–to–day administration — as opposed to acts of extraordinary administration or acts of disposal. The juridical difference between the two types of administrative acts lies in the fact that while ordinary acts can be carried out in virtue of the office, acts of extraordinary administration require a special mandate from the respective superior (c. 1527, 1).

Ordinary administration includes whatever is necessary for the preservation and regular management of the property. These are acts which occur daily or periodically, monthly, quarterly, yearly, and are absolutely necessary for the customary transaction of business such as the payments of current bills and wages, the making of ordinary repairs, the collection or disposal of earnings or fruits, the deposit and withdrawal of funds, the collection of receivables, the making of required sales and purchases. All these actions and others of similar nature are a part of the normal functions of an administrator.

Extraordinary administration, on the contrary, refers to acts that are not included in the concept of ordinary management or exceed its limits and extent. Such acts do not occur regularly but rather in exceptional or even unforeseen cases and are of greater importance. Acts of this kind are, among others, the following: the construction and demolition of buildings, the purchase or sale of real estate and fixed assets or capital, making loans and mortgages, court litigation (c. 1288), the unjustified refusal of an important donation or gift (c. 1267, 2), and in general, all con-

[7] *Presb. Ord.*, n. 17; *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 42.
[8] *Presb. Ord.*, n. 17; *Apost. Auctuositatem*, n. 10.

tracts or transactions liable to depreciate or change substantially the patrimony of the Church (c. 1295).[9]

It is a rather difficult task to single out extraordinary acts of administration, namely, those which exceed the limits and methods of ordinary management. In the case of diocesan bishops, the job of determining those acts which are in fact *extraordinary* has been entrusted to Episcopal Conferences (c. 1277). In the case of inferior administrators working under the supervision of their bishops or ordinaries, the statutes of each juridic person should be followed. If the statutes contain no special provision on this matter, it is the responsibility of the diocesan bishop, after hearing the board of administration, to determine which acts are to be considered *extraordinary* for juridic persons under his jurisdiction (c. 1281, 2).[10]

IV. THE ROLE AND DUTIES OF THE ORDINARY ADMINISTRATOR

The task of an ecclesiastical administrator is rather an odd job of unusual complexity. In the first place, the very finality which the ecclesiastical patrimony is supposed to serve ought to remain all throughout the dominant factor setting the pattern within which the administrator must function. Furthermore, the administrator is bound to carry out his job with the solicitude and foresight of a real owner, which he is not, for the right of ownership, by a special fiction of law, devolves exclusively upon the juridic entity which acquired the property and holds possession thereof (c. 1256).

Thus, the administrator as the only representative of the owner — the juridic person, a fictitious being unable to perform any managerial functions — must manage the temporalities under his care with the full powers of an owner. This has been quite aptly stated in the latin saying commonly used to express the managerial powers of the ordinary or direct administrator: *ius disponendi de re.* That is, he can dispose of and manage the patrimony in the same manner the true owner would do, never

[9] ROCCA, F. della., *Manual of Canon Law*, Milwaukee, 1948, p. 244.
[10] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 417.

losing sight of the fact, however, that the temporalities under his stewardship are not really his.

Who is then the direct administrator of Church property? The direct administration of any juridic person in the Church — the diocese, parish, rectory, seminary, religious house — is the responsibility of the person who happened to be the immediate superior of the entity to which the goods or assets belong — the bishop, pastor, rector, religious superior, director — unless particular law, statutes or customs decree otherwise (c. 1279, 1).

The ordinary or direct administrator in no way enjoys unlimited powers. In fact the extent and scope of his managerial functions are clearly determined and often restricted by general or statutory laws. Thus administrators act invalidly when they exceed the limits and methods of ordinary administration (c. 1281, 1). They must work at all times and in all instances under the supervision of their respective superior (c. 1276, 1) and manage the patrimony under their care in the name of the Church and in accordance with law (c. 1282).

Moreover, the law itself hastens to identify the basic duties incumbent upon each administrator (cc. 1283, 1284). Thus parish priests, rectors of churches, superiors, directors and others charged with the administration of property are enjoined to:

— guard the goods and assets entrusted to their care with the solicitude of a real owner and, in so far as possible, secure insurance policies to achieve this goal;

— observe the prescriptions of canon and civil laws and the special provisions imposed by the founder, donor or other legitimate authority;

— collect accurately and promptly the revenue and income of the goods, keep them safely and spend them in accordance with the intention of the donor or legitimate norms;

— meet, in due time, the interests on loans and notes and repay, in a reasonable period of time, the capital debt itself;

— with the consent of the superior, use in behalf of the church or institute the money which is left over after expenses and can be effectively disbursed;

— keep well organized books of receipts and expenditures;

— draw up a report of administration at the end of each fiscal year and submit it to the Ordinary or respective superior;

— organize and file in a safe place the documents and instruments that establish the rights of the church or institute under the administrator's care;

— draw on and retain accurate and distinct inventories of the church's goods and of the administrator's personal property kept in the church. The inventory should be reviewed at fixed times for the sake of accuracy, and copies of both the original and the amended inventories should be preserved both in the parochial and in the diocesan archives (c. 1283). Unless otherwise indicated in the inventory it will be presumed that all goods are the property of the church;

— execute a last will and testament after taking office in order to provide after death the disposition of the personal property of the administrator. Such last will and testament should conform with the formalities prescribed by civil law, that is, it must be in the form of a notarized will or a holographic one.[11]

It would not be amiss to add that in most places the best method to follow in controlling the administration of ecclesiastical property is the one applied by responsible and honest accounting firms.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY POWERS OF DIOCESAN BISHOPS AND ORDINARIES

The diocesan bishop, as head of his church, assumes direct responsibility both over the pastoral needs of his flock and over the wordly affairs of his diocese (cc. 369, 3 3). In the latter case, he is the administrator of temporalities of the diocese (c. 1279) and the supervisor or guardian of all ecclesiastical property of public juridic persons operating within his territory and with his jurisdiction (c. 1276).

As the new law does not seem to sanction administration by one person — even parishes are required to have at least two

[11] *Acta et Decreta Primi Conc. Plen. Ins. Phil.*, Manila, 1956, n. 60.

financial consultors (c. 1280) — the bishop is not left alone in the discharge of his managerial functions. He is given the Board of Financial Administration and the Board of Consultors to aid him and even to check on his fiscal activities. Thus, he will have to consult with the above mentioned Boards before going into acts of administration of "greater importance" for his diocese.[12] Again, if and when he wishes to incur "extraordinary" expenses, the bishop needs the advice of the Financial Board and the consent of the Board of Consultors, except in cases wherein common or particular laws decree otherwise (c. 1277).

Though the bishop would seemingly become the final judge in determining the transactions of "greater importance" to his diocese, he can not do so without looking into the general state of diocesan finances. A commn rule for all dioceses on the matter will not work. For obviously, transactions which may have a great impact on the finances of poor dioceses, may turn out close to meaningless in cases of affluent ones.

On the other hand, the task of defining expenses which might be considered "extraordinary" is left to the Episcopal Conference of the region or country. The law adopts here an objective criterion and the bishop, instead of being the final arbiter on the matter, is asked to adhere to the rules issued by the Bishops' Conference (c. 1277).

At the diocesan level, the bishop, like any other Ordinary, exercises control and guardianship over all local administrators under his jurisdiction (c. 1276, 1). While the direct management of the patrimony remains the exclusive concern of the immediate or direct administrator, the Ordinary retains the right to supervise and to issue fiscal policies to insure that all administrative functions within his territory and jurisdiction are executed effectively and in accordance with law. The extent and scope of these supervisory powers of the Ordinary are most aptly expressed in the old latin saying *ius curandi ut administratio sit bona.*

Without any need to interfere in the direct management of temporalities of entities under his jurisdiction, the Ordinary may

[12] *Communicationes*, 1980, 414.

exert his powers to insure the wholesome and wise administration of church property within his territory through the exercise of the following rights:

— *ius rationem exigendi.* He has the right to demand accurate accounts, updated financial reports, supporting evidence of all transactions carried out by administrative functionaries (c. 1287, 1).

— *ius visitandi.* Visitation rights which allow the Ordinary to inspect the properties, official books and other pertinent documents, to check on the observance of rules and laws, conduct of administrators and other personnel, etc. (c. 1276).

— *ius praescribendi modum administrationis.* The right to issue rules conducive to an effective administration (c. 1276, 2). Yes, the Ordinary may impose his will on inferior administrative officers through the issuance and enforcement of particular norms as long as they are within the framework of general and statutory law. Thus, the Ordinary can forbid, among others, the erection of shops, parking places, amusement centers, mortuaries or crypts within the church grounds or premises. It is well within his powers to prescribe the manner of making bank deposits and withdrawals, inventories, last will and testaments. He may require that all transactions be signed by several persons, that administrators submit to the respective superior updated copies of their personal properties. But he will definitely be barred from acts which are against or beyond established norms and regulations except in cases of negligence on the part of the immediate administrator (c. 1279, 1).[13] Thus without the approval of the administrator, the Ordinary will not act validly in ordering the disposal of property, e.g., the sale or rent of apartments, farms, fishponds, etc. These are functions exclusively reserved to the person who enjoys in law the right of disposal, namely, the direct administrator. The diocesan bishop, however, may impose taxes upon all juridical entities and even physical persons under his jurisdiction to the extent they are in accordance with law and necessary for the good of the diocese (c. 1263)[14].

---

[13] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 415.
[14] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 401-402.

VI. THE COUNCIL OF ADMINISTRATION AND THE DIOCESAN OECONOMUS

As shown above, the administrative task of the diocesan bishop is rather one of great complexity. He is asked to "diligently supervise the management of all goods under his jurisdiction"; to "issue special instructions to regulate the entire field of administration" (c. 1219).

This is a tall order for any man and a job that demands special skill and expertise. In order to assist the diocesan bishop in the discharge of his duties as comptroller and guardian of all ecclesiastical property, he must set up, under his chairmanship, a Board or Council of Administration consisting of at least three members capable of performing such task (c. 492, 1).

This Council is not a new entity but rather a counterpart of the Board of Administration of the 1917 Code (c. 1520, 1). However, the new law makes an explicit reference to the "economic competence" and "outstanding integrity" of its members who can be either male or female. The bishop himself is to appoint the members for a five-year term of office with the possibility of a reappointment for an equal period of time (c. 492, 2).

Among its varied functions, the Council, under the guidance of the bishop, is to prepare each year a budget or forecast of the income and expenditure expected for the governance of the entire diocese for the coming year; moreover, at the close of each fiscal year, the Council is to approve the report of receipts and expenses (c. 493).

The bishop must always hear the Council on matters of "greater importance" for the dioceses (c. 1277). However, the opinion or advice of the Council is purely consultative, unless otherwise mandated by law (cc. 1277; 1292, 1).

The office of the diocesan Oeconomus or Business Manager is a new creation of law, and its establishment, functions and terms of office are clearly determined in c. 494.

In the 1917 CIC the diocesan Oeconomus was not an official of the Curia. The bishop was expected to manage the patrimony of the diocese with the assistance of the Board of Administration

(c. 1521). It was only when the see was vacant that the law required the appointment of an oeconomus to manage the finances of the diocese under the Vicar Capitular (1917 CIC, c. 432, 1).

The positive experience of local churches as well as the complexity of modern financial management are to be credited for the existence of the new office of the diocesan Oeconomus. At present it is compulsory for each diocese to have an Oeconomus to manage the diocesan temporalities under the authority of the bishop and in accordance with fiscal policies set by the Council of Administration (c. 494, 3).

The Oeconomus is to be appointed by the bishop after consulting with the Board of Administration, and must be a person truly skilled in economic affairs and absolutely distinguished for his honesty (c. 494, 1). His functions are, among others, the following: to meet diocesan expenses legitimately authorized by his bishop or any delegated authority (c. 494, 3); to prepare a yearly report of income and disbursements for the perusal of the Financial Board (c. 494, 4); to aid the bishop in the supervision of property management within the diocese (c. 1276, 1); to assume the management of public juridic persons which lack an administrator of their own (c. 1279, 2).[15]

The Oeconomus as well as the members of the Council of Administration have five-year terms of office with another possible five-year renewal. The intent is obviously to stabilize fiscal administration as demanded by modern management techniques. Thus, the Oeconomus may be removed from office by the bishop only for grave cause and after hearing the Board of Administration and the Board of Consultors (c. 494, 2).

Lastly, the Oeconomus is accountable to his bishop and to the diocesan Board of Administration which is to set the guidelines for the financial management of the diocese (c. 494, 3).

VII. LAY ADMINISTRATORS

In the primitive church deacons were placed in charge of the temporalities to allow priests and bishops more time and oppor-

[15] AUSTIN, B., *The Law Regarding Church Possessions*, CLSA Proceedings, 1980, p. 175.

tunities to use their spiritual skills and training in spiritual matters. Through the centuries, specially trained laymen have attended to these matters under the supervision of ecclesiastical administrators.

The 1917 CIC, while placing the administrative responsibilities mostly on clerics, did not exclude lay persons from an active and at times even direct participation in the management of the church finances. As a matter of fact, laymen were found sitting in administrative boards (1917 CIC, c. 1520), or running the financial affairs of lay associations (cc. 684-689), pious foundations (cc. 1515, 1544), and other institutions which were under the control or supervision of the Church (cc. 1521, 2; 1525).

Vatican II laid down no new laws on this matter. However, its directives seem to be geared towards a greater participation of the laity in the management of temporalities in accordance with that greater degree of co-responsibility required by ecclesiological principles. Laymen together with bishops, priests and religious are co-responsible for the mission of the Church because they are the Church. This mission is expected to be carried out by the laity in the exercise of their apostolate in the temporal as well as in the spiritual order.[16] And it is particularly in the areas of finance and management that laymen can make their most significant contribution to the Church. It is in this field that lay people are often better trained than priests.

The Council, taking cognizance of this fact, highly recommends, though it does not impose, the cooperation or assistance of the laity in the management of the ecclesiastical patrimony:

> "Priests are to manage ecclesiastical property with the help, as far as possible, of laymen."[17]

> "By their expert assistance, they (the laymen increase the efficiency of the care of souls as well as the administration of the goods of the Church."[18]

In unmistakable terms the Council shows that, unless otherwise provided for in law or particular statutes, the priest remains

[16] *Apost. Actuositatem*, n. 5.
[17] *Presb. Ord.*, n. 17.
[18] *Apost. Actuositatem*, n. 10.

the administrator of ecclesiastical property, while the role of the lay people is carefully limited to the task of providing help or assistance.[19] The Council hastens to add the reason for the retention of the priest at the manager's desk:

> "They, the priests, are to apply this property always to those purposes for the achievement of which the Church is allowed to own temporal goods. These are: the organization of divine worship, the provision of better support for the clergy and the exercise of the work of the apostolate, especially for the benefit of those in need."[20]

Laymen could perhaps be more skilled than priests in the fields of finance and management. But a priest will surely be more conversant with the finality of the ecclesiastical patrimony and the needs to be met.[21] Besides, the knowledge of law, economics and finance is not sufficient for the handling of the Church's temporal affairs. There are theological, historical and pastoral problems that must be dealt with by persons familiar with and sensitive to the ethical problems that are very much a part of modern economy.[22]

The new Code sets the responsibility of ecclesiastical management on the immediate superior — ecclesiastical or lay person — of the juridic person to which the patrimony belongs (c. 1279, 1). Furthermore, all administrators — clerics and lay persons alike — who by legitimate title take part in the management of ecclesiastical property, are bound to discharge their duties in the name of the Church and in accordance with its laws (c. 1282).

VIII. REPORTING TO THE FAITHFUL

Another related matter concerns the right of the faithful to be informed of the possessions or temporalities of their respective churches and the corresponding method of management. In other words, should bishops, pastors, rectors of churches and directors

---

[19] ROVERA., l.c., p. 203.
[20] *Presb. Ord.*, n. 17, ROVERA, l.c. p. 202.
[21] *L'Osservatore Romano*, 25, VI, 1970.
[22] HOLLENBACH, D., *Corporate Investments, Ethics and Evangelical Poverty*. Theological Studies, 1973, p. 265-274.

of ecclesiastical institutions report to the faithful about their stewardship on fiscal matters?

The faithful, when not a part of management, can not demand an accounting of the material assets and/or liabilities of their parish, diocese and on the management system thereof, as a matter of right.

The situation will, of course, change whenever funds or means used for a given project have been raised by or provided for by the faithful themselves. In cases such as these, a spirit of openness and a demand for accountability are called for. "Administrators should report to the faithful about goods offered by them to the Church in accordance with norms and methods to be specified in particular laws" (c. 1287, 2).[23]

Indeed, failure to report to the people directly concerned by reason of their personal involvement in certain pastoral projects could hardly be justified. In some instances, this lack of reporting has not only discouraged the faithful from further participation, but has even served to cover up for a weak system of financial administration.[24]

Commonly, however, most of the faithful do not feel close enough to their pastors and churches nor are they familiar with the objectives of diocesan, parochial projects to find a financial report of much interest to them.[25] However, in a spirit of Christian brotherhood and with the intent and for purposes of greater cooperation and more effective support, administrators will do well in keeping the faithful fairly posted on the material resources of the various institutions and churches, of the needs to be met and of the manner in which the money raised to meet them has been administered.

CONCLUSIONS

Taken as a whole, the new law on the administration of ecclesiastical property has experienced a marked improvement over the old law. In general, it can be said that old norms have been greatly simplified and at times even eliminated from the text. New laws and modern methods of management have been introduced to re-

[23] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 421.
[24] AUSTIN, B., l.c., p. 176.
[25] *Communicationes*, 1980, p. 421.

place discarded concepts and practices. In particular, the following observations could be made about the new law:

— the new law replaces in part a system of financial management which was mostly based on the economics of real property and makes its way into a new system of credit and indebtedness;

— while retaining in principle and to a great extent the unit system of management an effort is made to break into the shell of the individual administration system by creating institutes devised to function under a centralized system;

— a more rigid system of controls is now introduced in the area of fiscal administration. Management by one person only, no matter how great his experience and expertise, is no longer countenanced by law. Transactions of an extraordinary nature or of great importance for the juridic person need now to be checked or sanctioned by the higher authority or financial boards. The need for accountability is not limited to the yearly submission of a financial report;

— universal legislation is greatly reduced to give way to an enlarged local legislation. The general provisions of the new law are so broad in scope that can be easily adapted to the particular needs or characteristics of local churches. The norms are framed in such a fashion as to serve as directives to bishops and Episcopal Conferences in drafting the legislation for their respective churches;

— a greater reliance on civil law is noted. Ecclesiastical property can not always be adequately protected by canon law, hence the need to secure the patrimony, whenever possible, through civil law. An effort should be made to harmonize civil and ecclesiastical laws on fiscal matters.

In a nutshell, the new treatise on Church Financial Management is a most interesting piece of legislation. It brings modern business concepts and practices into Church law. Its effective implementation, could save the Church from mistakes, loss of credibility, and, of course, money. Administrators have a valid reason to welcome the new law and to rejoice over its promulgation.

F. TESTERA, O.P.
University of Santo Tomas
Manila