

# **SOCIETY OF ST. PIUS X**

## **Church of the Transfiguration**

11 Aldgate Avenue  
**Toronto, ON, M8Y 3L4**  
416-503-8854 or 416-251-0499

## **Holy Face of Jesus Church**

181 Lake Street  
**St. Catharines, ON**  
905-704-0038 or 416-251-0499

## **Church of the Canadian Martyrs**

364 Regent Street  
**Orillia, ON**  
705-730-6730 or 416-251-0499

## **St. Peter's Church**

144 Huron Street  
**New Hamburg, ON**  
519-634-4932

## **Our Lady of Mount Carmel Academy**

2483 Bleams Road East  
**New Hamburg, ON, N3A 3J2**  
519-634-4932

## **St. Philomena Mission**

The Travelodge Hotel,  
1401 Paris Street,  
**Sudbury, ON**  
705-524-2243 or 416-251-0499

[www.ontario.sspcx.ca](http://www.ontario.sspcx.ca)



## **SOUTHERN ONTARIO**

**Served by the priests from**

**St. Michael's Priory**

**&**

**Our Lady of Mount Carmel Academy**

# **AUGUST 2020**

# DEBATE ON THE AUTHORITY OF VATICAN II

Dear Faithful,

Last month, we spoke about the ban on communion on the tongue, authoritatively imposed by several local bishops, including His Eminence Thomas Cardinal Collins, the Ordinary of Toronto, as a “sanitary measure”, supposed to prevent the spreading of the Covid-19.

Beyond the lack of a unanimous consent of the medical world about the “risk” of spreading the disease by means of communion on the tongue, our main concern is the Faith in the Real Presence, which is seriously undermined by the practice of communion in the hand.

Thus, it is for doctrinal reasons that we refuse to follow this directive from the Archdiocese of Toronto, and that we stick to the traditional practice of communion on the tongue.

Communion in the hand is one of the most visible signs of the radical changes introduced in the liturgy of the Roman Rite after the Council Vatican II (1962-1965).

But was not the Council Vatican II against these radical changes? Conservative people often quote the document of Vatican II on the liturgy which says: *“Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.”*<sup>1</sup>

But Archbishop Lefebvre answered those who claim that the ‘true’ Council Vatican II was clearly in favour of the traditional liturgy and particularly for the use of Latin language. *“During the Council, we were told that Latin must be kept in the liturgy, but this was a lure. As a matter of fact, all the changes introduced in the liturgy in the years that followed the Council, including the abandon of Latin, were all done in the name of Vatican II.”*<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, the debate on the communion in the hand is leading us to another debate, the one of the Council Vatican II. Could we follow the thesis of those who make a distinction between the “true Council” which, according to them, was genuinely in line with tradition, and the “Council of the media” which was, according to the same people, hijacked by liberals and modernists?

---

<sup>1</sup> Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy **Sacrosanctum Concilium** # 36.1

<sup>2</sup> Free quote from a Spiritual Conference given to the seminarians of Ecône, around 1979

Again, Archbishop answered that objection: “Some say the Council was good and has good, but only the reform is bad. But that is not true! Why? Because when Rome gave the (liturgical) reform, they always say that the reforms were done in the name of the Council. In the name of the Council! It is evident that all reforms came from the Council, and if such reforms are bad, it is impossible that the Council be good and that all reforms that followed are bad. Because that is the authentic interpretation of the Council by Rome!”<sup>3</sup>

For many years, a true and honest debate about the Council Vatican II was absolutely forbidden within the mainstream Church, but the studies of the late Msgr. Bruno Gherardini, and the courageous stand of Bishop Athanasius Schneider and of Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò start to make it possible.

In fine, following Archbishop Lefebvre, the founder of the Society of St. Pius X, we can say that "Without rejecting this Council wholesale, **I think that it is the greatest disaster of this century and of all the past centuries, since the founding of the Church.**"

The reader will find a selection of articles published recently on that topic. Our wish is that public debate will lead more souls to understand the stand of the Society of St. Pius X about the Council Vatican II and its reforms, particularly the New Mass.

*Father Dominique Boulet*

***If you wish to support the church alive by using electronic means, there are three options:***

1. *For those who already subscribe, the PAG (preapproved giving) is certainly a good option*
2. *You may also send your weekly donations via e-transfer. Contact the secretary [Secretary.toronto@fssp.ca](mailto:Secretary.toronto@fssp.ca) who will instruct you how to proceed.*
3. *Finally, it is always possible to send a donation to the Society of St. Pius X using our online feature. You may use Credit, Debit or PayPal.*

<https://www.canadahelps.org/en/charities/the-society-of-st-pius-x-ontario/>

### **Websites:**

1. website for the SSPX in Southern Ontario: [ontario.sspcx.ca](http://ontario.sspcx.ca)
2. Official information website of the SSPX: <http://fsspnews/en>
3. Catechisms, sermons and more from SSPX priests: SSPX Multimedia resources: <https://sites.google.com/site/credo2019/>

---

<sup>3</sup> Spiritual conference, May 11, 1976

## ST. MICHAEL'S PRIORY - Tel: 416-251-0499

- Fr. Dominique Boulet [d.boulet@fsspx.email](mailto:d.boulet@fsspx.email)
- Fr. Jules Belisle [j.belisle@fsspx.email](mailto:j.belisle@fsspx.email)
- Fr. Raymond Lillis [r.lillis@fsspx.email](mailto:r.lillis@fsspx.email)
- **General Information, including bulletin emailing** [info.toronto@fsspx.ca](mailto:info.toronto@fsspx.ca)
- **Parish Secretary** [secretary.toronto@fsspx.ca](mailto:secretary.toronto@fsspx.ca)
- 

## OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL ACADEMY - Tel: 519-634-4932

- Fr. David Sherry [d.sherry@fsspx.email](mailto:d.sherry@fsspx.email)
- Fr. Marcel Stannus [m.stannus@fsspx.email](mailto:m.stannus@fsspx.email)
- Fr. William MacGillivray [w.macgillivray@fsspx.email](mailto:w.macgillivray@fsspx.email)
- Parish & Academy Secretary [stpeters@sspx.ca](mailto:stpeters@sspx.ca)

## Activities:

### • Church of the Transfiguration, Toronto:

#### • Special:

- **Fatima procession, Thursday August 13, after Mass.**

*Other activities may resume in September, as restrictions start to ease. Stay posted.*

## Eucharistic Crusaders Intention for August:

That our apostate societies may return to Christ the King.

## Our departed souls for August:

Agnes Affonso, Bob Rose, Rose Cichowski, John Curtis, Virginia Hallbach, Esther Ryan, Margaret Robinson, Elaine deJonge, Normand Sirois, Orlando Sison, Louis Vouriot, John Zoll, Rosalind Pouliot, Joyce Bronya Baker, Julia Rivera de Silva, Roger Lalonde, Francis McKervey, Rudy Stark, Larry Maheu, Kornel Molnar, Janice Cartmill, Jean H. Rose, Dale Davies, Joseph Hadaji

Also, please pray for the repose of the soul of Anthony De Mello, who died last month.

**Requiescant in pace!**

\*\*\*\*\*

## FOOD FOR THOUGHT

**1. The fruits of Vatican II, by Archbishop Viganò in 2020, Archbishop Lefebvre in 1966**

*In a response dated May 29, 2020, to a letter from a cloistered nun, Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò, a former apostolic nuncio to the United States, speaks of the current crisis in the Church as “the metastasis of the conciliar cancer.” This letter and Archbishop Viganò response were published on May 31 by Marco Tosatti on his blog Stilum Curiae, and translated by Jeanne Smits on her own blog on June 2.*

### **Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò**

The assertion of the Roman diplomat is found in the following paragraph: “I believe that the essential point for effectively conducting a spiritual, doctrinal, and moral battle against the enemies of the Church is the persuasion that the present crisis is the metastasis of the conciliar cancer. If we have not understood the causal relationship between Vatican II and its logical and necessary consequences over the course of the last sixty years, it will not be possible to steer the rudder of the Church back to the direction given by her Divine Helmsman, the course that she maintained for two thousand years.”

They catechized us with the hateful phrase ‘there is no going back’ with regard to the Liturgy, the Faith, moral teaching, penance, asceticism. Now, we hear the same expressions slavishly repeated in the civil sphere, through which the attempt is made to indoctrinate the masses that ‘nothing will be as it was before.’ Modernism and Covid-19 are part of the same brand. For people having their gaze towards the transcendent, it is not difficult to understand that the greatest fear of those who want us to believe that the race towards the abyss is both unavoidable and unstoppable is that we will not believe them, ignore them, and unmask their conspiracy. This is our task today: to open the eyes of many people, even those of clergymen and religious who have not yet recognized the big picture, limiting themselves to looking at reality in a partial and disordered way. Once we have made them understand the mechanism, they will also understand everything else.”

“Yes, we can go back; we can ensure that the good that has been fraudulently removed from us is returned to us: but only consistent with doctrine, without compromise, without yielding anything, without opportunism. The Lord will deign to grant us a part of His victory—even if we are weak and without material means—but only if we totally surrender ourselves to Him and to His Most Holy Mother.”

### **Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre**

On August 18, 1976, at the end of his preface to *I Accuse the Council* (Angelus Press, 1982), Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, founder of the Society of Saint Pius X, wrote: “The conclusion is inescapable, especially in light of the widespread turmoil which the Church has experienced since the Second Vatican Council. This destructive occurrence

for the Catholic Church and all Christian civilization has not been directed nor led by the Holy Ghost.”

“To denounce publicly the machinations of churchmen who sought to make this Council the Church’s peace of Yalta with her worst enemies, which is in reality a new betrayal of Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Church, is to render an immense service to Our Lord and to the salvation of souls.”

In the section, “A Note on the Title” of the book, Archbishop Lefebvre stated: “It is imperative, therefore, to shatter the myths which have been built up around Vatican II. This Council had wished to be a pastoral Council because of its instinctive horror for dogma, and to facilitate the official introduction of Liberal ideas into Church texts. By the time it was over, however, they had dogmatized the Council, comparing it with that of Nicea, and claiming that it was equal, if not superior, to the Councils that had gone before it!”

On December 20, 1966, in a letter to Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the French prelate wrote: “we can and we must unfortunately state that: In a more or less general way, when the Council has introduced innovations, it has unsettled the certainty of truths taught by the authentic Magisterium of the Church as unquestionably belonging to the treasure of Tradition.”

“The transmission of the jurisdiction of the bishops, the two sources of Revelation, the inspiration of Scripture, the necessity of grace for justification, the necessity of Catholic baptism, the life of grace among heretics, schismatics, and pagans, the ends of marriage, religious liberty, the last ends, etc. On all these fundamental points the traditional doctrine was clear and unanimously taught in Catholic universities. Now, numerous texts of the Council on these truths will henceforward permit doubt to be cast upon them. The consequences of this have rapidly been drawn and applied in the life of the Church” (p. 82).

So follow, from the pen of Archbishop Lefebvre, the practical, pastoral consequences of these doubts:

- “doubts about the necessity of the Church and the sacraments lead to the disappearance of priestly vocations;
- doubts on the necessity for and nature of the “conversion” of every soul involve the disappearance of religious vocations, the destruction of traditional spirituality in the novitiates, and the uselessness of the missions;
- doubts on the lawfulness of authority and the need for obedience, caused by the exaltation of human dignity, the autonomy of conscience and liberty, are unsettling all societies beginning with the Church—religious societies, dioceses, secular society, the family;
- doubts regarding the necessity of grace in order to be saved result in baptism being held in low esteem, so that for the future it is to be put off until later, and occasion the neglect of the sacrament of Penance;

- doubts on the necessity of the Catholic Church as the only true religion, the sole source of salvation, emanating from the declarations on ecumenism and religious freedom, are destroying the authority of the Church's Magisterium. In fact, Rome is no longer the unique and necessary Magistra Veritatis."

"Thus, driven to this by the facts, we are forced to conclude that the Council has encouraged, in an inconceivable manner, the spreading of Liberal errors. Faith, morals, and ecclesiastical discipline are shaken to their foundations, fulfilling the predictions of all the Popes" [before Vatican II] (p. 82-83).

It was 54 years ago. And already Archbishop Lefebvre had established this "causal relationship between Vatican II and its logical and necessary consequences" which Archbishop Viganò sees today as the cancerous metastases.

*Source FSSPX.News*

## **2. Bishop Schneider lists problems in Vatican II documents that lead to 'relativism'**

*By Dorothy Cummings McLean*

"I think that one day the Church should formally correct (expressions in) Lumen Gentium 16, in Nostra Aetate and also (one) in the Ecumenical Decree on Non-Christians that (says) the Holy Ghost is using them as instruments," Bishop Athanasius Schneider told Dr. Taylor Marshall in an online interview posted Sunday.

Schneider, 59, also discussed problematic phrases in Dignitatis Humanae and in Sacramentum Concilium, the Second Vatican Council's document on the liturgy.

Marshall introduced the theme of the Second Vatican Council by saying both priests and laity are becoming aware that the current crisis in the Church relates to "problem passages" in the Council's documents. Marshall listed such issues as syncretism, false ecumenism, and adulatory descriptions of Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism.

Schneider said the majority of the texts of the Second Vatican Council are good, and those that are ambiguous can be interpreted within the tradition of the Church "in a benevolent way." However, the bishop also pinpointed a few expressions in the documents that have had "very bad consequences."

"The greatest problem with these (problematic) texts can be reduced to one topic: relativism," Schneider said.

The bishop said that these few “expressions” relativize the Lord Jesus Christ, the Gospel, the incarnation, the work of redemption, and the Catholic Church. “All these expressions that you mentioned ultimately have their roots in relativism,” he told Marshall.

### **The Problem in Lumen Gentium 16**

Schneider pointed first to a phrase in Lumen Gentium that incorrectly erases an important distinction between Christian and Muslim worship of God. In the sentence, “In the first place amongst these there are the Muslims, who, professing to hold the faith of Abraham, along with us adore the one and merciful God, who on the last day will judge mankind”, the bishop took strong issue with the phrase “with us,” “nobiscum” in Latin. “This is wrong,” Schneider said firmly.

He explained that Lumen Gentium 16 errs in suggesting that Christians and Muslims participate together in the same act of adoration. It errs because Muslims worship on a natural level, at the same level of anyone who adores God with the “natural light of reason,” whereas Christians adore God on a supernatural level as His adopted children “in the truth of Christ and in the Holy Spirit.”

“This is a substantial difference,” Schneider observed. He explained that the use of the phrase “with us” represents a relativization of the act of adoration of God and also of Christians’ “sonship.”

### **The Problem in Dignitatis Humanae**

The bishop then cited a problem in a statement about religious freedom in Vatican II’s Dignitatis Humanae. Schneider praised the document for observing that nobody can be forced to believe, but then he critiqued its statement that human beings should not be constrained from worshipping according to their conscience.

Schneider said that this was equating the right to worship idols to a right stemming from human nature, i.e. believing or not believing. “When something is a right of human nature, it is positively willed by God,” he explained. “If you say it is a right of your nature, you are saying that it is positively willed by God that no one should be hindered to practice and to spread, let us say, idolatry.”

Schneider observed that many people are “convinced in their conscience” that they must practise idolatry and that this is opposed to divine revelation. He noted also that the problematic phrase is “substantially the same as the phrase of the Abu Dhabi document which says that the plurality or diversity of religions (...) is the wise will of God.” “We have to be sincere and intellectually honest: this is not acceptable” the bishop said. “And these two phrases, in Lumen Gentium and in Dignitatis Humanae, too, are the root from

which stemmed and developed all the relativism which we experienced in the last five decades in the life of the Church.”

Schneider recalled the controversial World Day of Prayer convoked by St. John Paul II in Assisi in 1986 and the veneration of the “Pachamama idol” in St. Peter’s Basilica during last October’s Synod on the Amazon. He pointed out that the logic of not hindering the conscientious worship of idols applies to the worship of Pachamama — even within Vatican City itself. “If it is the positive will of God that a group of Amazonian Indians — pagans, I mean — who venerate Pachamama not be hindered in spreading their cult, then the pope (must say) ‘I cannot hinder them because it is a right of human nature, and when it is a right of human nature, it is the positive will of God. And when God positively wills that the Amazonian Indians venerate their idol Pachamama, I cannot prohibit them because this is their right that God gave them. I can admit them even to St. Peter’s,’” Schneider explained.

Schneider criticized texts suggesting that Buddhists and Hindus can attain illumination on their own, without “the grace of Christ,” as a heresy. “It’s Pelagianism and relativism (saying) that Christ is not the only source,” he said. “So you see these texts cannot be accepted as they are.”

Regarding Sacrosanctum Concilium, Schneider praised it for its defense of traditional liturgy, to which the Novus Ordo and the “ad populum” celebration of Mass are a “plain contraction,” he said. He believes that it, too, has problematic sections, saying it weakened the theology of specific sacraments by asking that their rites be reviewed. However, the bishop also believes that the current “Ordinary Form” of the Mass should be reformed according to the principles laid out by Sacrosanctum Concilium.

*Source LifeSiteNews*

### **3. Fake news? No, historical truth**

*By Roberto de Mattei, July 14, 2020*

On his blog *Settimo Cielo* of July 13, the Vatican reporter Sandro Magister was highly critical of Bishops Carlo Maria Viganò and Athanasius Schneider, hurling an accusation at them for spreading “fake news”.

The term “fake news” was used also in reference to Monsignor Schneider’s theses, whereby the Church, in Her history, has corrected doctrinal errors committed by precedent ecumenical councils, without, in this manner, “undermining the foundations

of the Catholic faith.” Magister accuses Schneider of historical incompetence, citing, as evidence, a brief intervention by Cardinal Walter Brandmüller on the Council of Constance, which in reality refutes nothing of what was affirmed by Monsignor Schneider.

The facts are these. On April 6, 1415, the Council of Constance issued a decree known as *Haec Sancta*, wherein it was stated solemnly that the Council, assisted by the Holy Spirit, received its power directly from God: hence every Christian, including the Pope, was required to obey it. *Haec Sancta* is a revolutionary document which raised many questions as it was first interpreted in continuity with Tradition and, subsequently, reprobated by the Pontifical Magisterium. It had its coherent application in the decree *Frequens*, of October 9, 1417, which called for a Council five years later, after seven years another one and then one every ten years, *de facto* attributing to the Council the function of a permanent collegial body, alongside the Pope and *de facto* superior to him.

Cardinal Brandmüller notes that: “the assize which issued those decrees was in no way an ecumenical council authorized to define the doctrine of the faith. It was, instead, merely an assembly of the followers of John XXIII (*Baldassarre Cossa*), one of the three “popes” contending at that time for the leadership of the Church. That assembly had no authority. The schism lasted until the council of Constance unified with the other two parties, i.e. the followers of Gregory XII (*Angelo Correr*) and the ‘*natio hispanica*’ of Benedict XIII (*Pedro Martinez de Luna*), an event that occurred in the autumn of 1417. Only then did the ‘council’ of Constance become a true ecumenical council, even if still without a pope, who eventually was then elected.”

All true, but Martin V, elected ‘the true’ Pope in Constance on November 11, 1417, in the Bull *Inter cunctas* of February 22, 1418, acknowledged the ecumenical nature of the Council of Constance and all that it had decided in the previous years, albeit with a generically restrictive formula: «*in favorem fidei et salutem animarum*». He therefore did not repudiate *Haec Sancta* and applied the decree *Frequens* with rigour, fixing the date of a new general Council, which was held in Pavia-Siena (1423-1424) and the city of Basil he designated as the seat of the subsequent assembly.

The Council was opened in Basil on July 23, 1431. Martin V’s successor, Eugene IV, with the Bull *Duduum Sacrum* of December 15 1433, ratified the documents that the assembly had issued hitherto, among which was the *Haec Sancta* the “conciliar” Fathers of Basil had proclaimed as their *magna charta*.

Eugene IV, in the Decree of the Council of Florence, which on September 4, 1439, condemned the Fathers of Basil, “to save” the Council of Constance, resorted to that, which, in modern terms might be defined a “hermeneutic of continuity” today used with regard to the Second Vatican Council. He, in fact, sustained that the proposition of the superiority of the Councils over the Pope, affirmed by the Fathers of Basil on the basis

of *Haec Sancta*, was “a bad interpretation (***pravum intellectum***), made by the Basilians, which *de facto* reveals itself to be contrary to the authentic sense of Holy Scripture, of the Holy Fathers and of the Council of Constance itself.” The Fathers of Basil, according to the Pope “interpreted the declaration of the Council of Constance in a wicked and reprehensible sense, totally alien to sound doctrine. Today we would say: an abusive interpretation of the Second Vatican Council, distorting the documents.

Subsequently, in the letter *Etsi dubitemus* of April 21 1441, Eugene IV condemned the “diabolical founders” of the conciliarism doctrine: Marsilius of Padova, John of Jandun and William of Ockham , but regarding *Haec Sancta* he took a hesitant stance, along the lines of the “hermeneutic of continuity”. The same Eugene IV ratified the Council of Constance in its entirety, and its decrees, «*absque tamen praesudicio juris, dignitatis et praerogativae Sedis apostolicae*» as he writes on July 22, 1336 to his legate: a formula that clarified the sense of Martin V’s restriction, condemning implicitly, in the name of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, all those who referred to the Council of Constance in affirming the superiority of the council over the Pope.

Consequently the thesis of “continuity” between *Haec Sancta* and the Tradition of the Church was abandoned by theologians and historians, and among them Cardinal Brandmüller, who rightly expunges *Haec Sancta* and the decree *Frequens* from the Tradition of the Church. Even at the time of the Counter-Reform, Father Melchor Cano states that *Haec Sancta* should be rejected as it did not have the dogmatic form of a “decree obliging the faithful to believe or condemn the contrary” . Similarly, Cardinal Baudrillart, in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, retains that the Council of Constance, in issuing *Haec Sancta* did not have the intention of promulgating a dogmatic definition, and it is also for this the document was subsequently repudiated by the Church. The Church historian August Franzen affirms the same. Thereby, in raising the question of the ecumenical nature of the Council of Constance, Father Joseph Gill one of its foremost experts, writes that: «*les historiens s’accordent à le considérer comme oecuménique, mais dans des proportions variables*».

Why exclude then that a day will come when even the Second Vatican Council may be repudiated, in part, or *en bloc*, as happened with the Council of Constance and its decrees?

Translation: Contributor Francesca Romana

*Source: Rorate Caeli Blog*

*Note from SSPX Ontario: we skipped the footnotes.*

# MASS TIMES FOR AUGUST 2020

	Toronto	Orillia*	St. Catharines	New Hamburg	Sudbury
<b>Sunday Mass</b>	<b>8am, 10am, 12pm, 4pm, 6pm</b>	<b>10am &amp; 5pm</b>	<b>8am &amp; 10am</b>	<b>8am &amp; 10am</b>	Sat. Aug. 29, 6pm
Weekdays (some exceptions)	Mon-Fri 7:15am Sat. 8am	Mondays 9am	Saturdays 9am	Call OLMC	Sun. Aug. 30, 10am

## Notes:

- **The time and location of Sunday Mass in Orillia could be subject to change under short notice.** For updated information on a specific Sunday, send an email [info.toronto@fsspx.ca](mailto:info.toronto@fsspx.ca) or call 705-730-6730.
- For the complete schedule of weekday Mass, consult our weekly e-bulletin.

## Further information for the Church of Transfiguration, Toronto

- Our YouTube channel [SSPX Church Of The Transfiguration - YouTube](#)
- Confessions will not be possible on Sunday, but only on the weekdays.
  - Mon-Fri, use our App [Church of the Transfiguration - Toronto | SSPX](#)
  - Saturday, confessions without appointments, from 2 to 4pm.
- Sunday Mass Registration is strictly required to secure a seat for Mass. <https://outlook.office365.com/owa/calendar/SSPXOntarioSeatBooking@fsspx.email/bookings/>

*Note that online registration for Mass on a specific Sunday opens on the preceding Tuesday, and then closes on Saturday. We try our best to accommodate the specific requests for health reasons, send an email to [info.toronto@fsspx.ca](mailto:info.toronto@fsspx.ca) but keep in mind that the demand exceeds the offer of seats available. **We need a bigger church!***

- According to a City of Toronto bylaw, the use of face mask is mandatory in all indoor public gatherings. However, the decision to follow or to not follow this bylaw is left to the individual who may have legitimate reasons to wear a mask, or to claim for an exemption. In any case, it is not the job of the priest to police the said bylaw. In all things, Charity!