

the judgment made by an offended God against fallen man. It was a decree universal and impartial, permitting no favors, admitting no exceptions. Generation after generation of the human race have gone down before its sickle. Wave upon wave of humanity have been washed to the shore of the world, all to end alike. Empires, cities, towns and villages, systems of philosophy all have perished and collapsed before its power. All conditions of men are the same before it. Caesar and Charlemagne, and Constantine and Napoleon in its presence became weaker than the weakest child. Who was so wise as Solomon? Yet Solomon could devise no means to resist it. Who was so strong as Samson? Yet Samson in losing the pillars of the temple drew down death upon himself, as well as upon his enemies. Even the one person in all history who was stainless and pure, the holy mother of God, she too slept in death. Jesus Christ himself, the God-Man died the death of the cross.

Life is compared to a flower that blossoms and dies off. We must be impressed by its shortness and uncertainty. Yet it has a greatness, and that greatness depends upon the use we make of it. We should conform to the necessity and duty of shaping our lives, and moulding our actions, so as to walk before God all our days, in holiness and innocence. We must bear in mind that life is the great preparation for death and eternity.

But there is a light that gleams through all this blackness of death. It is the light of the Son of God. Jesus Christ came on earth to destroy death. By His death He killed death. Through the merits of Christ death loses its horrors; the grave becomes a holy place; it is no longer a charnel house, it is a place of hope; it is a seed-plot of the resurrection. Bishops and priests may pass away and crumble into dust, but will arise again glorified on that great morning of the resurrection. The body which is sown in corruption, will rise in incorruption; weakness will be transformed into power, dishonor into glory. Though this body pass away, though the soul be taken forth from its tenement, yet in the new life shall it have a new habitation not built by hands, a dwelling in the presence of the God of Glory and of Justice.

This hope, dearest brethren we may safely indulge in behalf of the venerable and holy priest, whose life has been so long spent in goodness and holiness amongst you. For thirty-seven years I have known him intimately, but the works of his ministry, much as I know of them were not known to me as they were to you. When he went to St. Paul's parish, he found disunion and dissension. But so ably did he labor and so effectually that the late Archbishop of Toronto created him Vicar General. In the year 1870 he came to this parish, a parish dear to my heart for many reasons. You all know the outcome of his priestly zeal and virtue. He loved always to be among his people, and could scarcely be prevailed upon to take a holiday. He built and paid for St. Helen's Church, St. Peter's Church and school, St. Francis' school, the presbytery and many other works, and last of all this great Church, which will ever stand as a monument to his priestly zeal and the generosity of a people who never failed him in charity and appreciation.

I cannot pass without some reference to his services to the cause of Catholic education. For thirty years Father Rooney was secretary-treasurer of the school board and for some years chairman of that body. That position involved him in those labors and trials, that disquiet and trouble which are still fresh in your memory. He did a great work for our schools in those days of struggle and labor.

There was one characteristic of the late Father Rooney which shone forth

conspicuously in all the years of his priesthood—his unswerving obedience to his ecclesiastical superiors. When the young priest knelt before his Bishop for ordination he promises in that most solemn moment of his life reverence and obedience to that Bishop. That promise Father Rooney never forgot. Never was he known to fail in that duty. To-day he has gone to his reward. The good priest sleeps in peace. Amid the tears of his people, surrounded by Archbishops and Bishops and priests from this and from other dioceses who have come to honor his memory, he rests from his labors. "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord." But lest even in such a character as his some venial imperfection still holds him withdrawn from the vision of the Heavenly Father, the Church here offers its august sacrifice in propitiation and we offer our humble prayers in his behalf and beg that He who raised him up a minister in His service will admit him speedily to his eternal reward.

The pall bearers were Fathers Harris, Bergin, Allaine, Duffy, Ryan and Kucullen.

C. Y. L. L. A.

On Friday evening last Miss Caroline M. C. Hart of the Kindergarten training school of Baltimore, Maryland, lectured under the auspices of the Society, on the relationship of the Kindergarten to art. Nearly all those who in the city are interested in Kindergarten work were present, and listened with appreciative attention. On the platform were Lady Smith, Mrs. Grant McDonald, President of the Local Council of Women, Mrs. M. E. Digman, Mrs. Scales, Mrs. Hugh Ryan, Mrs. Thos. Long, Mrs. Patrick Hughes, Miss Lane, Miss M. L. Hart.

Mrs. John McGann opened the entertainment with a vocal solo. Miss Hart was then introduced by Mrs. W. Kavanagh, Honorary President of the Society. The lecture occupied about forty five minutes. We shall have an opportunity of publishing somewhat of its contents. Mrs. Percival Greene sang "Oft in the Stilly Night," accompanied on the piano by Mrs. Austin Smith, which brought the entertainment to a close.

Affairs in Hungary.

Nothing has been more striking of late than the vicissitudes through which the political affairs of Hungary are passing. Dr. Wekerle's resignation has been expected over and over again. The consent of the Emperor to the ecclesiastical bills was an uncertain quantity. "First he said he would, and then he said he wouldn't," as the song goes. Finally Francis Joseph gave in, and the powerful Minister triumphed over his royal master. But the resignation will come yet, and very soon. Dr. Wekerle has made the great mistake of vaunting his victory, a slight the pride of the Emperor will take the first favorable opportunity of resenting. When the news was published the Liberal party seemed to have lost their heads. Demonstrations, banquets, bonfires, Bengal fires and torch-light processions are scarcely calculated to soothe the troubled spirit of the ruler, who signed the odious anti-Christian bills in sorrow and anguish of spirit. Dr. Wekerle is reproached in many quarters outside Hungary for the illiberal and ungenerous response he has thus made to the imperial concessions. But time proves all things, and for the present the Hungarian Premier is sitting under the sword of Damocles.

A January thaw is always more productive of colds and coughs than a January freeze. Then is the time Ayer's Cherry Pectoral is needed and proves so extremely efficacious. Ask your druggist for it, and also for Ayer's Almanac, which is free to all.

ANGLICAN ORDERS.

Their Claims Further Examined.

The Form of Consecration

We have seen that the Anglican claims cannot be maintained from a historical standpoint, and that the historical facts necessary even on the Anglican theory of valid Orders are highly questionable. They have never yet been proven. Until they are, Anglican Orders must be held as historically doubtful, and for all practical purposes dealt with as if they had no existence.

We shall now go back to the early ages of the church, and from a theological point of view see wherein the Anglican rite for the administration of the Sacraments differs from that used by the Ancient Church. As far back as A.D. 398 the Fourth Council of Carthage, Canon II. decreed: "When a bishop is ordained, let two bishops place and hold the copy of the Gospels over his head and neck, and while one is saying over him the Benediction, let all the other bishops touch his head with their hands." This Benediction is given in all the liturgies of the Western church, begins with the words *Propitiare Domine* and continues *Deus honor omnium*, as we find in the Roman Pontifical of to day. And to lay stress on its significant importance, accompanied with the imposition of hands, it is styled the Consecration. So essential is this portion of the rite to the matter and form of the sacrament that even its accidental omission in the case of a Catholic Bishop, would according to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, (Benedict XIV. de Syn. 1, 8, c.) necessitate his being consecrated conditionally over again. This being so, how much more reason would there be for doubting the validity of the sacrament, if the omission was culpable. It is a patent fact in the case of Anglicans, on set purpose, and on doctrinal grounds the omission was intentional, and consequently is much more serious. For according to a general theological principle, he who purposely mutilates a sacramental rite must be understood not to intend to do that which the church intends to do when she makes use of that rite, and hence the conclusion must be drawn, under such circumstances, that the sacrament is not conferred. How could the Anglicans, then, be said to confer sacraments validly, when they mutilated, and for doctrinal purposes almost destroyed the ancient rite for the administration of sacraments handed down from Apostolic times?

It was left to the genius of Cranmer to devise a new ordinal according to his Calvinistic ideas, and in so doing, he swept away the whole of the rite prescribed by all the Western liturgies, by which alone the bishops of the Church of England had been consecrated up to the fourteenth century. When the difference in form between the two rites is brought home to the minds of our Anglican friends, they aver very modestly of course, that "there is no essential difference between the Church of England before the Reformation and after; at the Reformation the Church merely threw off the authority and corrupt doctrines of Rome." Then, there is "no essential difference" between "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" and "the pure religion of the Gospel," "no essential difference" between the true Church of Christ, as the old Church of England claims to be, and the reformed Church of England, whose Homilies say that the former "had been drowned in damnable idolatry for the space of eight hundred years or more!" Surely there is no sense, much less reason, in this. If there be "no essential difference," where, then, was the necessity of "reforming," and what right had the reformed Church

to create a schism which separates them from the old Church ever since." Let one of their own defenders, the Anglican Bishop of Worcester, declare the "No (?) essential difference" in meeting a charge made on Cranmer's ordinal, June, 1533. "There is," he says, "perhaps, no formulary or document which marks more clearly the essential difference between the office of a minister of the Church of England." He goes on to point out the necessary change that had to be made in the old rite for consecrating bishops in order to bring it down to the level of Calvinistic ordinal, and very reasonably concludes that the powers conferred by these rites, which were made to differ essentially and intentionally, must be essentially different. He is perfectly sound and logical in his deduction. It is the argument of the great Doctor of the schools, St. Thomas, who lays down that where there is a question of the Sacraments, if a person purposely alters the form which the Church uses when she confers her sacraments, he must be taken not to mean to do that which the Church does when she uses that form, and hence the sacrament is not conferred. (Summa Theologica, p. 8, quest. 60, a. 7.) The same line of reason is maintained by Cardinal Newman, who, speaking of the Church's sacramental rite, says, "It is a concrete whole, one, and indivisible, and acts per modum unius, and having been established by the Church, it cannot be cut up into bits, be docked and twisted into essentials and no essentials, genus and species, matter and form, at the heretical will of a Cranmer or Ridley, or turned into a fancy ordinal by a royal commission of divines, without a sacrilege perilous to its validity."

That faithful recorder of historical events, the learned Sanota Clara, who has been claimed by some to look with favor upon Anglican Orders, coincides with the same theological principle, as the following testifies: "Since they have changed the Church's forms de industria (on purpose) and declare that they do not what the Church intends, . . . and have solemnly decreed against the power of sacrificing and consecrating, that is, in the sense of the old and present Catholic Church, of changing the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ Our Lord, as appears in the twenty-eighth and twenty-first Articles, it evidently concludes that they never did nor could validly ordain priests, and consequently, bishops; having, as I said, expressed clearly the deprivation of their intentions, in order to the first and principal part of ordination, which consisted in the power super corpus Christi verum of consecrating and sacrificing His true Body by them professedly denied, and the sacrifice declared a pernicious imposture." (Escourty Anglican Ordinations, p. 285.)

If we wish for further proofs to ascertain the mind of the Church in this important matter we may read the Fourth Canon of the first General Council of Nice, wherein is laid down the universal law of the whole Christian Church for a lawful consecration. Here we have it clearly defined that for a valid consecration three bishops were required who were bishops of the province, and whose consecrations were beyond the probability of doubt. Now does the consecration of Parker stand this test? Assuredly not. No three bishops validly consecrated would have anything to do with him. Barlow, as we have seen, as far as history teaches, was only a bishop-elect, and Scory and Coverdale, acknowledged by all had never been consecrated by the rite of the old English Church, but by Cranmer's ordinal which even Anglicans have since rejected as invalid. Hodgkins it is claimed was a true bishop, though at the time ex-