

necessary, and it may give rise 10 p.m. to controversy as to what an ecclesiastic is. The term may be well defined in the Roman Catholic Church, for instance, it may be well defined in the Church of England, but other churches may have different ideas as to what is an ecclesiastic. I think if the minister left out that word and simply said priests and ministers, it would be good enough.

Mr. DOHERTY: With regard to the apprehensions of the hon. gentleman as regards the Parliamentary Counsel, if he has no other reason than those apprehensions, I think he might be willing to let this section,—which is just as it has been from time immemorial—stand. I do not think there will be any serious difficulty when you come to apply the statute in determining what is meant by an ecclesiastic. Of course, if there be religious denominations in connection with which there are no officers who are known as ecclesiastics, we shall have no difficulty with regard to them. With regard to the one religious denomination where I know of the expression being used, there will be no difficulty whatever in defining what is meant by an ecclesiastic. It would necessarily be somebody officially attached to the service of the church and religion. So far as I understand the functions of the Chancellor, they are rather in the line of the profession of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) and my own.

Mr. MCKENZIE: The statement of the Minister of Justice gives more strength to my contention. He says that an ecclesiastic is some person who is officially attached to the service of the church. Well, I would understand that a chancellor, who is appointed as a functionary in connection with any diocese, had something to do with the service of a church. I do not know how he is appointed. The church to which I belong has no such functionary as a chancellor, but the Minister of Justice says he is an official who has to do with the service of the church, who is "officially attached" to the church. If he made a mistake and that is not the proper definition, perhaps I will agree with him. A man who is appointed chancellor of a diocese has not simply to do with the congregation of the church he attends on Sunday, but his duties extend over the whole diocese, which may consist of several counties and comprise thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of people. He has to do with spiritual affairs. I would suppose that if ecclesiasticism is connected with spiritual affairs, an official who is so

[Mr. McKenzie.]

closely connected with spiritual affairs as a chancellor would be an ecclesiastic. If the minister says it is a man in holy orders I will recede, of course, from my contention.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have to admit that I am not familiar and cannot speak with authority as to the functions of a chancellor, but if my conception is correct, he is the position of a legal adviser. My hon. friend, if he should be consulted by the authorities of his church and give them an opinion, would hardly plume himself thereafter as being an ecclesiastic. I speak subject to correction, but what I apprehend by an ecclesiastic is somebody who takes part in the actual religious services, not somebody—to carry my hon. friend's argument to the extreme—who furnishes bread to the incumbent. You would not say that he could be looked upon as an ecclesiastic because he was furnishing something to the church, and I think the man who furnishes the law is no more to be looked upon as an ecclesiastic.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the minister and myself are really rushing in where angels fear to tread in discussing the functions of a chancellor of a diocese. I would point out to the minister that Mr. Gisborne, whom we all respect, and who I hope will occupy this position for many years because there is none more worthy, preached a sermon in the Anglican Church last Sunday. I understand that it was an excellent sermon and that multitudes saw the light and were saved. Now, surely, the chancellor of a diocese, if he is worthy enough to preach a sermon, must be performing ecclesiastical functions, as I understand them. If that be so, in order that there should be no question at all about his appointment, I think the Government would be well advised to strike out the word "ecclesiastic" from this subsection.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: As a member of the Church of England I may say that my hon. friend's fears are very largely groundless. It is open to any layman to get into any pulpit into which he is invited, and I fancy that if the chancellor appeared in the pulpit last Sunday he did so on the invitation of the clergyman, not on his own invitation. It is no unusual thing for a layman, whose business is not to preach, to give advice occasionally in a religious way. The chancellor has been very well defined by the Minister of Justice. He is an adviser to the Synod, a legal adviser largely. He is also an adviser with regard to the canons of the church and the so-called by-laws, and of