



THE CODE OF CANON LAW A TEXT AND COMMENTARY

COMMISSIONED BY
THE CANON LAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Edited by
JAMES A. CORIDEN
THOMAS J. GREEN
DONALD E. HEINTSCHEL



PAULIST PRESS
New York/Mahwah

ARTICLE 2: THE CHANCELLOR,
OTHER NOTARIES
AND THE ARCHIVES
[cc. 482-491]

This article simplifies the norms found in the corresponding canons of the 1917 Code (*CIC* 372-384) yet maintains the Church's traditional care for the major documents of ecclesiastical governance. *Archives* began at an early stage of the Church's history. Even during the first three centuries, bishops preserved in their residences baptismal records called *diptychs*, and by the fourth century more developed forms of archives appeared. These were invaluable before the invention of mechanical printing since they safeguarded a record of not only the Church but the secular society within which it existed. As the diocesan curial system evolved, archives became indispensable tools of ecclesiastical governance, concerned with maintaining and indexing documents for future reference.

Notaries existed in the earliest days of the Church. The first notaries wrote the acts of the martyrs. Later, they were charged with transcribing and preserving documents for papal and diocesan archives. They were called by various names (*notarii*, *serinarii*, *chartularii*) and were accorded high dignity in the papal household. In subsequent centuries, notaries were used not only to transcribe writings but to sign certain documents, thereby certifying them as authentic.

The office of *chancellor* developed from a secular model, combining archival preservation and notarization. The *cancellarius* was the doorkeeper at the grille of the Roman law court who eventually assumed the duties of secretary to the magistrate. After the decline of the Roman Empire, a similar office of great dignity was held by the royal chancellor, the keeper of the king's seal. In the twelfth century the bishop's chancellery was developed particularly through the activity of the cathedral chapter. The office of chancellor (similar to that in the royal court) was assigned to a member of the chapter. He was responsible for signing and preserving the letters of the bishop. The title was soon applied in ecclesiastical circles to the figure who was in charge of the entire documentary system of the diocese as distinct from ordinary notaries or transcribers. During the thirteenth century, the chancellor assumed the regulation of teaching and lecturing in the newly founded universities. This academic function eventually evolved into a separate office of considerable importance and the title is used to the present day in both Catholic and secular universities. The Council of Trent made no mention of the office of chancellor, but it did confirm the right of the bishop to establish a notary in his curia.³² After Trent, the diocesan chancellor was rec-

ognized as the bishop's principal notary and, as such, the authenticator of legitimate documents. To this responsibility was soon joined that of custodian of the diocesan archives. This twofold office developed in particular legislation and diocesan practice, which "gradually attributed the name of *chancellor* to the one who was the notary of the episcopal curia, and specifically to that notary who had care of the safe-keeping of the documents drawn up by all the notaries of the diocese."³³ It was incorporated into universal legislation for the first time in 1917 (*CIC* 372). The 1983 Code has retained this notion in the second article on the diocesan curia.

The Chancellor

Canon 482 — §1. In every curia, a chancellor is to be appointed whose principal task is, unless particular law determines otherwise, to see to it that the acts of the curia are gathered, arranged and safeguarded in the archive of the curia.

§2. If it seems necessary the chancellor can be given an assistant, whose title is vice-chancellor.

§3. The chancellor and vice-chancellor are automatically notaries and secretaries of the curia.

Every diocesan curia must have a chancellor whose principal function is that of custodian and organizer of the official archives (§1). The archives are to maintain in systematic fashion the "acts of the curia." The canon omits the former Code's instruction to order such acts chronologically. In many cases, such a systematic arrangement would be imprudent. To determine which acts of the curia should be preserved in this manner is no easy task, especially when one considers the expanded notion of the curia found in canon 469. Certainly, curial acts which have a juridic effect should be deposited in the archives (c. 474) and retained at least as long as proof of the juridic effect is needed. Many curial acts, however, have no strictly juridic effect. For example, every diocesan bishop and his vicars send and receive numerous letters which, though not simply personal, deal solely with advice or encouragement rather than an official decision. Nevertheless, they should be preserved, at least for a reasonable period of time. Memoranda internal to the curia may have no juridic effect and are rarely notarized, but they may represent extremely important sources of verbal exchange and administrative policy.

The canon wisely allows for local adaptation in fulfilling this responsibility ("unless particular law determines otherwise"; also cf. c. 491, §3). In larger dioceses it may be impossible for the chancellor to retain and order all the acts of the curia as it is now defined—for example, the material generated by offices dealing with catechesis, Catholic education,

³²Sess. XXII, *de ref.*, c. 10.

³³Prince, 35.

construction, central purchasing, and other administrative areas. While such departments will individually maintain extensive active and research files, they should also send to the chancellor their more important documentation for storage in a central place for long-term preservation or the coordination of policy with other pastoral agencies. Since so many determinations about archives are left to diocesan policy, it is important for the diocesan bishop and the chancellor to study the situation carefully and to set down in writing the process which the latter will follow to fulfill the task of the acts of the curia being "gathered, arranged and safeguarded."

The second paragraph of the canon retains the option of appointing a vice-chancellor to assist the chancellor (the alternate title, *vice-tabularius*, is dropped). Although nothing is said about the office, certain conclusions can be drawn. The close connection between chancellor and vice-chancellor implies that the qualifications for both are the same. They are both appointed by the diocesan bishop⁴⁰ and can be freely removed by him (c. 485). Their rights and duties are parallel except that the vice-chancellor, as an assistant, acts at the direction of the chancellor. These are separate offices rather than two persons appointed to the same office *in solidum*. Although the canon uses the singular, there is no prohibition against the appointment of two or more vice-chancellors to assist the chancellor.

The quasi-equality of the two offices is supported by the third paragraph of the canon which speaks of both officeholders as notaries and secretaries of the curia by reason of the law itself.⁴¹ The word *secretaries* (which was added to the text of the 1917 Code) is meant simply to clarify their work as notaries, not to imply an additional function.⁴²

One of the most important changes in canon 482 is the abrogation of the requirement that the chancellor be a priest (*CIC* 372, §1). The revised Code permits the diocesan bishop to appoint any person—lay, religious, or cleric—to the office. While

this canon does not specify that the candidate must be a Catholic, full communion with the Church is required in accord with canon 149. A lay or religious chancellor, however, cannot exercise the office of notary in cases involving the reputation of a priest; such cases are reserved to a priest-notary (c. 483, §2). While the broadened eligibility for the office of chancellor may seem striking to some, one must bear in mind that, in universal legislation, the office involves little, if any, exercise of ordinary governmental power. In some dioceses, particularly in the United States, the chancellor exercises considerable authority but only in virtue of delegated power; the faculties are not intrinsically attached to the office itself.⁴³

The delegation of broad powers of governance to the diocesan chancellor is alien to the concept of the office found in the Code. It is contrary to the emphasis on the ordinary power of governance and harmful to the system of vicars which the Code promotes and, in fact, requires. The possibility of appointing deacons, religious, and lay persons as "simply" chancellors (archivists-notaries) may have the beneficial side-effect of separating in practice the exercise of overall governance from the office and returning it to the vicar general or episcopal vicar. In cases, however, where the title is retained for a position of governance, it must be admitted that the offices of vicar general and chancellor are not incompatible and a priest or bishop could be appointed to both, thus permitting the "chancellor" to exercise ordinary power of executive governance (i.e., as "vicar general"). This solution, however, may, in retaining a title, have the undesirable effect of obscuring the office of chancellor as official notary and archivist.

Notaries

Canon 483 — §1. Besides the chancellor other notaries can be appointed, whose writing or signature establishes the authenticity of any acts whatsoever, of judicial acts only or of the acts of a certain case or transaction only.

§2. The chancellor and the notaries must be of good character and above reproach; a priest must be the notary in cases in which the reputation of a priest can be called into question.

This canon reproduces substantially the prescriptions found in canon 373, §§1-4 of the 1917 Code. Notaries differ from the chancellor and vice-chancellor in two points: (a) they receive the office of notary by episcopal appointment while the chancellor and vice-chancellor receive it from the law itself; and (b) the chancellor and vice-chancellor are au-

⁴⁰C. 482 neglects to identify the authority who appoints the chancellor. From the parallel with the appointment of the vicar general (c. 475, §1) and the finance officer (c. 494, §1), the omission is most likely an unintentional oversight in simplifying *CIC* 372. The diocesan bishop is the proper authority to appoint the chancellor and vice-chancellor and to remove them from office (cc. 157, 470, 485).

⁴¹The revised text remedies a lacuna in *CIC* 372; §3, which failed to name the vice-chancellor as a notary by law. This led to a discussion about whether the vice-chancellor was to assist the chancellor in only his archival responsibilities unless he was explicitly appointed a notary by the bishop.

⁴²This interpretation is supported by the consistent and unopposed use of the phrase "notarii seu secretarii Curiae" in all the schemata. The word "seu" was changed to "et" after the final plenary session of the Commission, presumably for the sake of Latin style. The word "secretary" does not completely describe the function of the "notary" (which "seu" would suggest). It clarifies *pari* of the chancellor's task as a notary, a part for which not every notary is responsible.

⁴³The phrase requiring the moderator of the curia to be a priest was added to c. 473, §2 specifically to address the situation in the U.S. (*Comm* 13 [1981], 122. Cf. also cc. 129 and 228.)

thorized by law to notarize all curial acts while notaries may be restricted to judicial acts, or a specific type of case or transaction, or even a single case or document. The notary's letter of appointment should state his or her competence and should be signed by the bishop and notarized (cc. 156, 474).

Notaries need not be clerics; they must, however, be Catholic (c. 149). Since their primary function is to certify the authenticity of curial acts, they should be chosen for their honesty, integrity, and exemplary reputation in the community, qualities which should exceed even the requisites for ecclesiastical offices of other types (§2).⁴⁶ It is often helpful for an ecclesiastical notary to become a notary public so that certain church documents may be easily certified in a manner acceptable in civil law.

Cases involving the reputation of a priest (§2) would include matters such as the imposition or declaration of an ecclesiastical penalty, the instruction of a petition for laicization, or the administrative removal or transfer of a pastor. If no priest holds the office of notary, one can be appointed to function in this capacity even for an individual case. Since the use of a priest as notary is not a requisite for validity and is intended principally to protect the reputation of the priest in question, he is permitted to waive the privilege, especially when the obligation of secrecy assumed by accepting the office of notary (c. 471, 2°).

484 — The duties of notaries are:
 write the acts and instruments relating to dispositions, obligations and other tasks of them;
 record faithfully in writing what has taken place and sign the record with a notation of the day, month and year;
 with due consideration of all requirements, to return acts or instruments to one legitimately requesting them from the files and to declare copies to be in conformity with the original.

This canon repeats canon 374 of the 1917 Code verbatim and is self-explanatory.

1. Removal of Chancellors and Notaries

Canon 485 — Chancellors and notaries can be freely removed from office by the diocesan bishop, but not by the diocesan administrator except with the consent of the college of consultors.

The diocesan bishop needs a just reason to remove the chancellor, vice-chancellor, or notary; the decree of removal should be in writing and notarized (cc. 193, §§3-4; 474). When the episcopal see is vacant, the diocesan administrator cannot validly

remove chancellors and notaries from office without the consent of the college of consultors. If a chancellor is exercising the power of governance by delegated authority, his powers remain in effect *sede vacante* (c. 142, §1). If a priest received such delegated powers because he was chancellor, his valid removal from office by the diocesan administrator would also cause his delegated powers to cease. Such removals must be in writing, signed by the diocesan administrator, notarized, and based on a just reason (cc. 193, §§3-4; 474). When the offices of chancellor, vice-chancellor, and notary are occupied by lay persons, civil contracts of employment should be worded in accord with the canonical right of removal expressed in this canon.⁴⁵

Archives

The last six canons of the article treat three types of diocesan archives: the general archives, the secret archives, and the historical archives. Diocesan archives seem to have been formally instituted by Charles Borromeo in the first provincial Council of Milan (1565). Legislation for Italy was promulgated by Benedict XIII (1727)⁴⁶ and for the vicariate of Rome by Pius X (1912).⁴⁷ The 1917 Code incorporated the fundamental obligation to maintain diocesan archives (CIC 375) and specified several details about archival content, use, and methods of preservation (CIC 376-384). The revised Code, while retaining some specific norms, simplifies the canons by expressing general principles and leaving specification to individual diocesan policy.

In this area, the sparse canonical obligations must be understood in the light of practical norms developed by modern archival science. The task of *gathering* requires the development of an effective records management program that provides reasonable schedules of retention and disposal of current records at the level of the individual diocesan agencies. Before records can be *arranged*, an organizational chart of the diocese and its various departments and agencies must be created. Records should be arranged according to groups that reflect the functions of these departments or agencies so that, by observing the archival arrangement, one can easily see a fairly accurate reflection of the diocesan organizational chart. Records are not *safe-guarded* simply by being stored. They should be kept in acid-free folders, in acid-free boxes, on steel shelving, with proper environmental controls of temperature (approximately 68° F) and relative humidity (about 45%), and in a secure location equipped with adequate smoke detection devices. These, and many other norms developed by archi-

⁴⁵Rel, 114.

⁴⁶*Maxima vigilantia*, June 14, 1727, *Bullarium Romanum* XXII, 560-567.

⁴⁷*Etsi nos*, AAS 4 (1912), 5.

⁴⁶Cf. *Comm* 13 (1981), 112-113 on the suppression of c. 282, §1 of the 1977 schema.

vists, will be important aids in drawing up the diocesan policy needed to concretize the principles of the Code.

Canon 486 — §1. All diocesan and parochial documents must be protected with the greatest care.

§2. In every curia, there is to be established in a safe place a diocesan archive or storeroom in which the instruments and writings which refer to both the spiritual and temporal affairs of the diocese, properly arranged and diligently secured, are to be safeguarded.

§3. There is to be an inventory or catalog of the documents contained in the archive, with a brief synopsis of the contents of each one.

The first paragraph expresses the general principle that all documents dealing with the diocese and its parishes must be safeguarded. This is a serious obligation ("custodiri debent") which binds not only the diocesan bishop but the pastor as well (cf. cc. 491, §1; 535, §4). At times, it may be prudent to copy and retain on the diocesan level certain documents deposited in parish archives in order to provide a duplicate system of preservation.⁴⁸ For example, some dioceses may wish to make microforms of parochial sacramental records in order to facilitate the issuance of documents and at the same time minimize the physical handling of aging registers.

The second paragraph specifies that a diocesan archives should be located in each curia, a phrase not found in canon 375, §1 of the 1917 Code upon which the canon is based. It also states that the archives should be situated in a safe place, a slight change from the former Code's "safe and convenient place." No rationale is given for these changes by the Code Commission. They may have been made in order to explicate the importance of physically locating the archives in the building which houses the diocesan curia. This interpretation was given to the 1917 Code.⁴⁹ The revised Code supports it by replacing "convenient" ("commodo") with "in every curia" ("in unaquaque curia"). Nevertheless, the principal obligation affirmed by the canon is the constitution of a diocesan archives, not the choice of place, which should admit of accommodation to local circumstances.

The third paragraph repeats substantially canon 375, §2 of the 1917 Code, calling for a cataloging system to permit information-retrieval and accountability for deposited documents. The technological breakthroughs of microprocessing facilitate the fulfillment of this obligation considerably. Rather elaborate indexing systems, which would have been impossible by hand only a short time

ago, are now quite simple. In recognition of advances in this field, canon 376 of the 1917 Code concerning yearly inventories, transfer of files, and the technical care of paper documents has been deleted.

Canon 487 — §1. It is necessary that the archive be locked and that only the bishop and the chancellor have a key to it; no one may licitly enter it without the permission either of the bishop or of both the moderator of the curia and the chancellor.

§2. It is a right of interested parties to obtain personally or through their proxy an authentic written copy or a photocopy of documents which are public by their nature and which pertain to the status of such persons.

This canon revises canon 377 of the 1917 Code. The latter stated that only the chancellor should possess the key to the archives and that permission to enter must be granted by the bishop or the vicar general and the chancellor. The meaning of this phrase was debated, with some authors concluding that the permission of the chancellor was always needed even if the bishop himself had given permission.

It may happen that the bishop or vicar-general has given permission unaware of certain circumstances connected with the party to whom it was conceded, which circumstances, being known to the chancellor, strongly prompt him to refuse. In such an event the chancellor would have to be guided by the grave obligation of guarding the archives which is placed upon him directly by the Code and which he must regard as one of the principal duties of his office.⁵⁰

While the revised wording does not settle the question definitively, it seems to support the notion that the permission of the chancellor is needed only when the moderator of the curia grants permission. If the diocesan bishop grants permission, the chancellor's additional permission is not required. This interpretation is supported by the insertion of the word "simul," the parallelism with the more clearly worded canon 488, and the decision to place the key to the archives in the custody of both the diocesan bishop and the chancellor. If the chancellor objects to the entrance into the archives of a particular person who has episcopal permission, he can, before complying with the request, consult the diocesan bishop to make certain that all pertinent information about the person has been shared with the bishop. The vicar general or episcopal vicar is not authorized to grant permission, nor can the

⁴⁸Comin 13 (1981), 123.

⁴⁹Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonikum*, vol. 2 (1923), no. 647.

⁵⁰W.F. Louis, *Diocesan Archives. A Historical Synopsis and Commentary*, *CanLawStud* 137 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1941), 62.

chancellor alone grant permission unless delegated to do so by the diocesan bishop. If there is no moderator of the curia in a particular diocese and the vicar general fulfills a similar role without use of the title, it seems reasonable that he should be able to grant permission together with the chancellor. The diocesan bishop can grant general permission to those working in his curia to have access to the archives; he may also attach specific conditions to such access. One approach would be to grant to all department heads who have a need to know the permission to consult the diocesan archives, provided that both the chancellor approves and the consultation is in accord with the chancellor's directions. The permission of the bishop or the moderator of the curia can be reasonably presumed in ordinary circumstances. The diocesan bishop could also delegate the chancellor outright to grant permission without the corresponding permission of the moderator of the curia.

Although the paragraph uses the word "key," any modern method of security may be employed. If index information is stored in a computer, the "key" may be the entrance code. A safe may be used in which the combination is known only to the diocesan bishop and the chancellor. Prudence should be exercised in this matter since at times neither the bishop nor the chancellor may be available. Certainly, the moderator of the curia, the vicars general and episcopal vicars, and the vice-chancellors should have access to the "key" even if they do not possess it normally. The intent of the canon is to promote security, not to frustrate use of the archives.

This goal is exemplified in the second paragraph which recognizes the documentary service archives should perform. This represents a different attitude from the 1917 Code in which the archives were seen foremost as depositories and quite secondarily as active instruments of information-retrieval. It should be noted that the paragraph refers solely to public documents concerning a person's ecclesiastical state. This would include, for example, letters of appointment or sacramental information such as a certificate of ordination or a laicization decree. Whether a party can be considered to have an interest in the document in a technical sense must be determined by the chancellor before responding to a request. This question sometimes arises in regard to genealogical searches of baptismal and marriage records. The use of the word "authentic" implies that the copy, whether written or photocopied, should be certified by a notary before release.

Canon 488 — It is not permitted to remove documents from the archives, except for a brief time only and with the consent either of the bishop or of both the moderator of the curia and the chancellor.

The canon reproduces canon 378 of the 1917 Code in more general form. Instead of specifying three days for the use of a document and stating the ordinary's right to extend the time period, it prescribes that a document may be absent from the archives for "a brief time only." The detail about requiring a receipt is omitted. The word "writing" ("scripturas") is changed to "documents" ("documenta") as a more all-inclusive term. As in the previous canon, if no moderator of the curia has been appointed in a particular diocese, the vicar general who fulfills such a coordinating function could grant permission together with the chancellor for the temporary removal of archival documents. The diocesan bishop can grant such permission on his own. The permission of the bishop or the moderator of the curia can be reasonably presumed in ordinary circumstances, and the bishop can also delegate the chancellor to grant permission without his consent or that of the moderator of the curia. General permission to use documents can be given to curial officers such as, e.g., the director of priest personnel and his secretary regarding the files of individual priests. With the ease of photocopying today, there is little call for the removal of documents except perhaps to consult a file during working hours. For longer use, the originals should be retained in the archives and copies sent to the interested party (notarized if necessary).

Canon 489 — §1. There is also to be a secret archive in the diocesan curia or at least a safe or file in the ordinary archive, completely closed and locked which cannot be removed from the place, and in which documents to be kept secret are to be protected most securely.

§2. Every year documents of criminal cases are to be destroyed in matters of morals in which the criminal has died or in which ten years have passed since the condemnatory sentence; but a brief summary of the case with the text of the definitive sentence is to be retained.

The detailed legislation of the 1917 Code concerning the secret archives (CIC 379-382) has been reduced to two canons (cc. 489-490). Every diocesan curia must have a secret archives, at least in the form of an especially secure safe or file cabinet. The canon does not specify all of the documents which should be stored in this archives although the second paragraph mentions one category, i.e., criminal cases involving questions of morals.³¹ The acts of such "penal procedures"³² should be destroyed when the guilty person has died or the case has

³¹"Penal procedures" is a more accurate term than "criminal cases." (Cf. cc. 1387, 1390, 1394, 1395, 1398.)

³²Cf. cc. 1717-1731.

been completed for ten years.³³ Until they are destroyed, the acts are retained in the secret archives; after they have been destroyed, a summary of the case with the definitive sentence should be kept in the secret archives. Other confidential documents are also normally stored in the secret archives: matrimonial dispensations in the non-sacramental internal forum (c. 1082); the register for secret marriages (c. 1133); dispensations from impediments and irregularities to orders (cc. 1047, 1048); decree of dismissal from a religious institute (c. 700); and documents relating to the loss of the clerical state by invalidity, penalty, or dispensation (cc. 290-293). Very few canons explicitly require storage in the secret archives. It is left to the discretion of the diocesan bishop to determine which matters should be placed in the general archives and which relegated to the secret archives. This task will normally be delegated to the chancellor. In this area, it is important for dioceses to investigate the civil laws of their particular region in order to protect all their archives, especially this secret archives, from subpoena and other legal invasive strategies.

Canon 490 — §1. Only the bishop may have the key to the secret archive.

§2. When the see is vacant the secret archive or safe is not to be opened, except in a case of true necessity by the diocesan administrator himself.

§3. Documents are not to be removed from the secret archive or safe.

The detailed norms concerning two separate keys for the secret archives are omitted (*CIC* 379-381); they are replaced by the simple statement that the diocesan bishop alone should have the key to the secret archives (§1). The implication of the second paragraph is that the key would normally be given to the diocesan administrator *sede vacante*. The third paragraph explicates the inference of canon 379, §4 of the former Code that no document should be removed from the secret archives even for a brief period of time. The diocesan bishop can dispense from these universal disciplinary norms (c. 87). Thus, he might wish to consign a duplicate key to the vicar general or the chancellor with authority to permit access to the secret archives for legitimate reasons. A distinction should be drawn between documents deposited in the secret archives because of the requirement of law (e.g., matrimonial dispensations in the internal forum) and those placed there at the discretion of the bishop or chancellor. The prohibition against removal of the latter from the archives should not be interpreted as strictly as the removal of the former. Photocopying is equivalent to removal since the intent of the norm is not

simply to preserve the original (as in c. 488) but to avoid dissemination of the information contained in the document. Nonetheless, if necessity warrants it, the diocesan bishop may permit certified copies to be made for legitimate confidential use. In such cases, however, the copies should be returned to the chancellor for filing or destruction.

The principles of the Code concerning general and secret archives need accommodation and concretization. The canons address only two levels of confidentiality (normal records and secret records). In fact, however, there are many grades of confidentiality attached to the various documents preserved in curial archives. While the canons provide flexibility through the use of authoritative permissions, a curia with an organized system will need to draft written policy and procedures for the many levels of access and information-sharing which administration requires, possibly adopting in some cases even the governmental model of variously "classified" documents.

Canon 491 — §1. The diocesan bishop is to see to it that the acts and documents of the archives of cathedral, collegiate, parochial and other churches in his territory also are diligently preserved; also, inventories or catalogs are to be made in duplicate, one of which is to be kept in the church's own archive and the other in the diocesan archive.

§2. The diocesan bishop is also to see to it that there is an historical archive in the diocese in which documents having an historical value are diligently preserved and systematically arranged.

§3. In order to inspect or remove the acts and documents spoken of in §§1 and 2 above, the norms established by the diocesan bishop are to be observed.

The first paragraph states more clearly than did canon 383, §1 of the 1917 Code that the diocesan bishop is responsible for the establishment and upkeep of archives in those juridic persons which are subject to him, particularly parishes. The canon does not require that copies of the documents in such archives be sent to the curial archives, but it does demand that an inventory of these documents in the form of a catalog or index be kept on file at the diocesan level. This is an area of parochial responsibility which can be of great importance for a parish and yet one which may often be sadly neglected or poorly implemented. The universal law does not constitute a separate archival officer at the parish level, and there are frequent changes of administration in parishes. There is more likelihood, therefore, that parish records will be treated haphazardly. The canon provides for norms to be issued by the diocesan bishop concerning the inspection and removal of documents (§3). Such norms would do well to include guidelines for par-

³³The 1917 Code had specified destruction by burning (*CIC* 379, §1).