On May 11, the Feast of Ss. Philip and James, 3 seminarians received First Clerical Tonsure (Michael Sellner—Minnesota, Carlos Zepeda—Guadalajara, Joseph Appelhanz—Colorado); 4 other seminarians received the last two minor orders of Exorcist and Acolyte (Tien Le—California, Jeremy Saunders—Canada, Stephen Sandquist—Nebraska, Bradley Parker—Australia); 1 received the Subdiaconate (Frater Philip Davis, CMRI—Colorado); and 3 were ordained to the Diaconate (Frater Augustine Walz, CMRI—Wisconsin, Fray Juan Jose del Nino Jesus—Guadalajara, Fray Pio de Jesus Crucificado—Guadalajara)
The handing over of the chalice and paten in the ordination of the Subdeacon

First Clerical Tonsure: “The Lord is the portion of my inheritance and of my chalice: It is Thou that wilt restore my inheritance to me.” (Ps. 15, 5)

Investiture with the Surplice: “May the Lord clothe thee with the new man, who is created according to God in justice and true holiness.”

The new acolytes touch the candlestick and candle and cruets
A special thanks to the priests who flew in to assist at the ordinations, especially Fr. Kryssov from Moscow, Russia

The imposition of hand—the matter of the Diaconate

The Bishop gives a final exhortation to those ordained
Drunkenness, a sin against sobriety, is the inordinate and voluntary use of intoxicating liquor for the sake of pleasure. It is complete if the use of reason is taken away; it is incomplete if it does not go to this extent, but nevertheless lessens the control one has on himself. Ordinarily complete drunkenness is a mortal sin; incomplete drunkenness is a venial sin. The malice of drunkenness consists in the fact that, without a sufficient reason, a person in a violent way deprives himself of the use of the noblest of his faculties.

It is difficult to distinguish in practice between complete and incomplete drunkenness. It is not requisite for complete drunkenness that one be rendered utterly stupid and helpless. The essential factor seems to be that one does things that are inordinate which otherwise he would not do—e.g., blasphemy, wild driving, uncontrolled temper, etc. In other words, “he is not himself.” A person is guilty of imperfect drunkenness when his speech becomes somewhat thick, when he gets excessively humorous, when he repeats the same jokes over and over again, etc. It should be noted that a person may be guilty of grave scandal even by venially culpable drunkenness.

The basic malice in drunkenness is not that one deprives himself of the use of reason, but that he does so in a violent manner and merely for the sake of pleasure. Consequently, it is not a sin when a person deprives himself of the use of reason by the use of a drug when he has to undergo an operation. Indeed, if no other anesthetic were available, one could render himself insensible by alcoholic liquor to mitigate great physical pain or to undergo an operation.

The use of narcotics, such as opium, etc., is to be judged by the same norms as the use of alcoholic liquor. Such drugs should not be used when a person is dying, except in as far as is necessary to mitigate great pain, because the last hours should be spent in acquiring merit. However, if a person is in great agony, a drug could be given him to relieve him, even though he would die unconscious—provided he has been prepared spiritually for death.

A person who deliberately becomes intoxicated, foreseeing that in that condition he will commit certain sins—e.g., blasphemy, impurity—is guilty in cause of those sins. For this prevision certainty is not required. It suffices that one judge with good probability that this will occur. On the other hand, a merely remote probability that one will commit some serious sin will not add another sin to the sin of drunkenness.