

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

Northbury Hotel, 50 Brady St.
Sudbury, ON
705-524-2243 or 416-251-0499

www.ontario.sspcx.ca

SOCIETY OF ST. PIUS X



SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Served by the priests from

St. Michael's Priory

&

Our Lady of Mount Carmel Academy

JULY 2020

COMMUNION ON THE TONGUE

Dear Faithful,

On June 10, His Eminence Cardinal Collins issued a letter to the clergy and the faithful of the Archdiocese of Toronto, to present extended regulations called “**Archdiocese of Toronto - Return to Church – WorshipSafe Guidelines.**”

On one hand we understand the concern of Church authorities, to make sure that the reopening of churches will be done in a safe manner, and that all reasonable measures be taken to prevent the spreading of the Covid-19 virus.

But we have some serious concerns about the guidelines related to the distribution of holy communion, which says: *“Upon the strong recommendation of medical authorities, Holy Communion is received only in the hand at this time. (Since each communicant has the right to receive communion either on the tongue or in the hand, the traditional practice of the option of receiving on the tongue will be restored as soon as the public health situation allows for that).”*

Now, we heard that such prohibition is made mandatory in several dioceses of Southern Ontario - Toronto, Hamilton, and London - as far as I know. Even the priests who say the Indult or Motu Proprio Mass are being ordered not to give communion on the tongue, “for sanitary reasons”. Some priests that do not want to compromise with communion in the hand decided that communion will not be distributed to the faithful, while other priests, who say the Old Mass, are caving to the diocesan guidelines, and are giving communion in the hand at the Latin Mass.

So, what is the attitude of the priests of the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX), facing with the ban on communion on the tongue? The answer is very simple: we will never give communion in the hand but will always stick to the traditional rule of communion on the tongue! Let me explain why the SSPX priests stick to a rule, considered by the medical authorities consulted by the Archdiocese of Toronto as having a high risk of transmitting the virus.

First, there is no unanimity among medical authorities regarding of the risk to transmit a disease by the close contact of the hand of the priest with the tongue of the communicant. This is the opinion of the bishops of the USA, who do not ban communion on the tongue during the Covid-19 crisis: *“We have carefully considered the question of Communion on the tongue vs. Communion in the hand. Given the Church’s existing guidance on this point (see Redemptionis Sacramentum , no.92), and recognizing the differing judgments and sensibilities that are involved, we believe that, with the precautions listed here, it is possible to distribute on the tongue without unreasonable risk. Opinions on this point are varied within the medical and scientific community: some*

believe Communion on the tongue involves an elevated and, in the light of all the circumstances, an unreasonable risk; others disagree.”¹

Moreover, Bishop Athanasius Schneider claims that “*Communion in the hand is no more hygienic than Communion in the mouth. Indeed, it can be dangerous for contagion. From a hygienic point of view, the hand carries a huge amount of bacteria. Many pathogens are transmitted through the hands. (...) Many people who come to church and then receive Holy Communion in their hands have first touched door handles or handrails and grab bars in public transport or other buildings. Thus, viruses are imprinted on the palm and fingers of their hands. (...) Communion in the mouth is certainly less dangerous and more hygienic compared to Communion in the hand. In fact, the palm and the fingers of the hand, without intense washing, undeniably contain an accumulation of viruses.*”²

Second, we have serious objections against communion in the hand, mostly for doctrinal reasons.

As it is commonly practiced today, Communion in the hand does not respect Our Lord Jesus-Christ truly present in the host and it seriously thwarts faith in the Real Presence. We see the results, nearly fifty years after the introduction of the New Mass and the communion in the hand. Besides occasioning sacrileges, Communion in the hand is at least partly responsible for the loss of faith of many Catholics in Christ’s Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament. One who seriously believes he receives the Man-God in Holy Communion cannot approach this Sacrament without showing his respect. Communion in the hand thus leads first to lukewarmness and indifference, and then to loss of faith. **This is the main reason why Communion in the hand must be rejected, no matter what say the bishops.**

The traditional Catholic attitude and, I would say the only true Catholic attitude is that of the infinite respect which is due to the sacrament of the altar, something that is lacking with communion in the hand the way it is commonly distributed modern parishes. The difference in attitude is revealed in the very great attention formerly given to particles of the hosts. St. Cyril of Jerusalem exhorted the faithful to take care lest the least particle fall on the ground. “*Take care that nothing falls on the ground. What you would let fall would be as the loss of one of your members. Tell me: if someone gave you gold powder, wouldn’t you gather it so carefully that none of it would be lost to your disadvantage? Should you not then be much more attentive that not a crumb be lost, which is much more precious than gold or diamonds?*”³

¹ **Guidelines on Sacraments and Pastoral Care.** Working Group on Infectious Disease Protocols for Sacraments & Pastoral Care v. 1.1. Conference of the US bishops, April 2020.

² From an article from Peter Kwasniewski, posted on OnePeterFive, May 6, 2020

³ St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Fifth Mystagogical Catechesis, 21, PG XXXIII, 1126.

Third, it may be objected that Holy Communion was distributed in the hand in certain parts of the early Church, but it was done quite differently from the way it is done today. Careful precautions were taken to secure the respect due to the *Sanctissimum* and, in some places, the communicant was requested to have his hand veiled. However, this practice of the early Church was discontinued a long time ago. With the rise of heresies like Protestantism, Church authorities came to realize the danger of losing the faith the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, and communion in the hand was discontinued.

But one must remember that communion in the hand was reintroduced, back in the 1970's, in a revolutionary way. Pope Paul VI published in 1969 the Instruction *Memoriale Domini* which stigmatized communion in the hand done without authorization in isolated locations. But, after expounding why the traditional usage should be maintained, the pope closed by allowing communion in the hand! Try to understand?

Fourth, let me answer one last objection *“You are a Catholic priest. If the bishop gives order not to give communion in the hand, you must obey the bishop’s order. You think that you know better than the bishop?”*

Archbishop Lefebvre, the founder of the SSPX, gave us the answer. Back in 1975, he was found in a similar situation - not with the communion in the hand - but with the order to definitively close the seminary of Ecône, and to put to an end the work of the Society of St. Pius X, a work of restoration of the holiness of catholic priesthood. Archbishop Lefebvre answered in a respectful but strong manner:

*“We hold fast, with all our heart and with all our soul, to Catholic Rome, Guardian of the Catholic Faith and of the traditions necessary to preserve this faith, to Eternal Rome, Mistress of wisdom and truth. (...) No authority, not even the highest in the hierarchy, can force us to abandon or diminish our Catholic Faith, so clearly expressed and professed by the Church’s Magisterium for nineteen centuries.
(...) The only attitude of faithfulness to the Church and Catholic doctrine, in view of our salvation, is a categorical refusal to accept this Reformation.”⁴*

Faithful to their venerated founder, the priests of the SSPX keep all the good traditions of the Church and refuse the communion in the hand and other novelties that are dangerous to the faith!

Father Dominique Boulet

⁴ Declaration of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, November 21, 1974

Websites:

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

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

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

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

- Fr. David Sherry d.sherry@fsspx.email
- Fr. Marcel Stannus m.stannus@fsspx.email
- Fr. William MacGillivray w.macgillivray@fsspx.email
- Parish & Academy Secretary stpeters@sspdx.ca

Activities:

- **Church of the Transfiguration, Toronto:**

- **Special:**

- **Fatima procession, Monday July 13, after Mass.**

Other activities may resume later this Month, as restrictions start to ease. Stay posted.

Eucharistic Crusaders Intention for July:

For the return of churchmen to Tradition

Our departed souls for July:

Francis DeAgrella, Mrs. Cormier, Lois LaFontaine, Lise Desormeaux, Louise McKay, Lawrence Caulfield Sr., Cpl. Anthony Boneca, Patrick Ryan, Fr. Paul Wickens, Marc Antoine Emily, Orlando Sison, John Zoll, Jack Shaw, Saturnina Picio, Rosaria Gillen, Mary Dorothea Anderson, Mrs. Connelly, Stafford McKenna, Evelyn Reimer, Mai Lie Lie (Tan), Giselle Mery, Jerzy Sienkiewicz, Ed Halbach, Frank Ryan, Marie Ann Tremblay, Cypriano Bascao Jr., Raymond Fex, Marianna Wasik, Jozefa Omelanczuk, Kazimierz Szpirowski, Veronica McKerverey, Luke Jesudhason, Mr. Beauchamp SR, Annette Boardman, Renny Budianto, Napoleon Pueda Sr, Mr. Ondruska, Theresa Darde, Anna Budhazy and Anna Andretter.

Also, please pray for those who died recently in the month of June: Manley Horton, Manuel Carreiro.

Requiescant in pace!

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

1. What's Wrong with Communion in the Hand?

Written by Howard Toon

"It is not permitted that the faithful should themselves pick up the consecrated bread and the sacred chalice, still less that they should hand them from one to another." - Pope John Paul II, Inaestimabile Donum (April, 1980)

The Church teaches that Christ's Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity are present in the Blessed Sacrament. There are many Martyrs who gave their lives rather than deny this teaching. Any self-respecting Catholic knows this. There really ought to be no question about how Holy Communion should be received, and that is: on the tongue whilst kneeling.

There can be no denying that Holy Communion is now almost universally received in the hand and that this has been the case since shortly after the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council. Note, however, that there is no mention whatever of Communion in the hand in the documents of Vatican II. In fact, Cardinal L Suenens first introduced the practice illicitly in Belgium in the mid 1960s from whence it spread quickly to Holland, Germany and France.

When the abuse came to the notice of Pope Paul VI in 1969, he issued *Memoriale Domini* ruling out universal change to the Church's method of administering Holy Communion on the tongue to kneeling communicants. In this document the Pope expressed his sadness that Communion in the hand had been introduced in some places without either his knowledge or the Church's consent.

Subsequently, Pope John Paul II twice indicated the irregularity of this practice as a universal norm. In *Dominicae Cenaе* (Feb. 1980), he stated: "To touch the sacred species and to distribute them with their own hands is a privilege of the ordained."

Then, in *Inaestimabile Donum* (April, 1980), Pope John Paul wrote: "It is not permitted that the faithful should themselves pick up the consecrated bread and the sacred chalice, still less that they should hand them from one to another."

Pope Benedict XVI now shows by his own example how the Apostolic See wishes Holy Communion to be administered. At his Papal Masses the faithful are obliged to kneel and receive on the tongue from HIS hand, not their own.

In fact, no post-conciliar Pope has approved, much less promoted, the novelty of Communion in the hand. Papal toleration is not the same as papal approval! That ought to be sufficient to make priests and the faithful reflect seriously on what they do.

Sadly, though, an attitude has manifested itself since the Second Vatican Council whereby many now see the Church as a democratic rather than a divine autocratic institution, claiming that it is best served by acceding to the wishes of the majority rather than being led by the Pope with the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost in matters pertaining to universal faith and morals.

There are some in positions of authority within the Vatican itself who are also of this mindset, and who have set about their agenda for change by restricting the extent to which the Catholic Faith is taught.

For example, when religious instruction was on the curriculum in Catholic schools, children were taught about the faith – how and why Christ came to earth, His Revelations, His Passion and Death on the Cross, His Ascension into heaven and the provisions He made for the growth of Christianity.

Given the suffering that Our Lord went through in order to redeem our souls, and the greatness of our debt to Him, it is clear that no Catholic should come into His presence without genuflecting, and no Catholic should receive Him in Holy Communion without kneeling down in reverence. It ought to go without saying that no lay Catholic should ever consider touching the Blessed Sacrament with his hands. Such was the teaching throughout history up to 1960.

Religious Instruction was then suddenly changed to Religious Education and a new programme imposed teaching children to explore the different religions as if they were all equally valid means for attaining eternal life.

Did not Our Lady of Fatima speak of 1960 as the latest date by which the Third Secret was to be revealed, because then, as Sister Lucy said, the world would better understand what it meant? The year is significant.

At any rate, an indicator of the success of the new strategy is reflected in a U.S. gallop poll of a few years ago recording just 30% of U.S. Catholics now believing in Our Lord's True Presence. The other 70% had either various shades of Protestant belief or no belief at all. This situation can only have come about through ignorance – through simply obscuring the facts.

How has this been allowed to happen? It wasn't just allowed to happen – it was deliberately brought about. It is down to the drive for ecumenism and the agenda of some to create a global religion under the control of a single leader.

It was indeed Christ's intention, when He instructed the Apostles to "Go and Teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost", for there to be one global religion – the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church – but certain power-brokers behind the scenes at the Vatican have a different model in mind.

Amongst the chief obstacles preventing the success of their plans, however, are the Mass of all Ages, and the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. The only way for them to overcome these obstacles is to debase the ancient Catholic Liturgy, from which man gains the grace to resist temptation and evil, and to destroy belief in the Real Presence.

The Novus Ordo Mass was specifically written to be inoffensive to Protestants by removing all mentions of it being a Sacrifice, and replacing that doctrine with one of it being a mere commemoration banquet or "celebration of the Lord's supper," as it is now widely known. This part of the undermining is now very well entrenched, and few Catholics realise what has befallen them.

As for belief in the Real Presence, that doctrine is no longer taught in Catholic schools, and respect for Our Lord is being undermined by discouraging genuflections and kneeling in His presence, and by encouraging Catholics to handle His body as if it were no more than "blessed bread." The longer this deception is allowed to go on, the more likely it is to become accepted as the truth.

Before long, only a very few Catholics will be left who have any true conception of the Catholic Faith as it was handed down unaltered through the centuries up to 1960.

If this tide of indifferentism is to be reversed, three important things have to happen. These are the restoration of the Mass of all Ages, with its emphasis on Sacrifice, restoring respect for Our Lord by fostering belief in the Real Presence, and the daily recitation of the rosary.

Pope Benedict XVI has already made a start by showing us that Holy Communion should only be received kneeling and on the tongue. When will the Catholic world begin following Peter's lead?

Originally published in Traditional Catholic Answers
Source: The Remnant

2. The Truth about “Social Distancing”

This article, posted on OnePeterFive, was called “The Rebellious Peasants”, but we decided to change it, for a better understanding. SSPX Ontario.

The “distancing” part is obvious enough: stay at home, and if you have to venture out, maintain the six foot buffer zone.

The “social” part is more difficult; we rack our brains for ways of overcoming our isolation, spending hours on the phone, “zooming” familiar faces, or boosting our presence on social media to the next level.

Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote in the 1700’s that men were naturally solitary creatures, happy in their independence from others. They only entered into a “social contract” once they started grasping at personal property; it became clear that some set of rules would have to govern men’s interactions now that they were competing for the goods—the territory, fruits of the land, shelter, and women—that had once freely been used by anyone.

Rousseau probably wouldn’t be surprised to see coronavirus escapees flood the supermarket and stagger out under armfuls of TP. After all, he believed that society was only invented to make it easier for each person to hold onto what’s *his*—to build himself a small kingdom and own it safely alongside other people’s kingdoms.

He’s friendly with the neighbors because their fences set off his own lawn so nicely. He’s charitable to his employees because they keep his business afloat. He donates to food kitchens because nobody wants to be threatened by the hungry homeless. Sure, he feels pity for anyone who’s suffering, and is willing to help as long as it doesn’t jeopardize *him*.

But when it’s a question of who gets the last container of Clorox wipes in Walmart, or whose freezer will be stocked with steak in the months ahead, it’s every man for himself. “The good of society” becomes a lackluster motivator when “the good of *me*” is in the balance. If society was only invented to protect *me*, I can walk out of the contract if it’s not in my best interest.

Recently, social distancing guidelines have been thrown to the wind as rioters take to the streets to protest injustice. But many of the champions of George Floyd do themselves no small discredit by raiding their favorite stores—at others’ grave expense—while they loudly cry for fair treatment. A social justice warrior turning in from a hard day’s protest well stocked with loot from the nearest Nike store cuts

a sad figure; it's easy to say you care a lot about Floyd, especially when you stand to gain your favorite pair of tennis shoes by shattering windows in his honor. Rioters seem to be suffering from a pandemic of tunnel vision; suddenly Floyd is the only one who deserves justice, while the rights of local shopkeepers, police officers and other innocent citizens who can't exactly be *looted* for are conveniently forgotten. Hidden behind the most altruistic slogans, self-interest easily parades as social justice.

This is the root of revolution: the rebelling peasants of the French Revolution, the American hoarding food in the basement, and the rioter making off with loot from local businesses are fueled by the same impetus. Each decided that the status quo was intolerable, and stood up for themselves at the expense of others.

Seeing men as individuals rather than social creatures nicely explains their urge to hoard when they feel they'll lack something essential. But "social distancing" hasn't just sent people happily into their well-stocked homes to wait out the storm. As carefully as we might stash toilet paper rolls away in the closet, nobody is arguing that they will make us *happy*. Once we've checked all the boxes and filled our pantries, we sit alone and become...lonely.

We want to communicate. It's one of our deepest urges. It's one of the most rewarding ways we can spend our time, and it's really our only option when we're filled to the point of bursting with how much it means to be human. Who can bear suffering, or bear the experience of beauty, without his soul overflowing into his friend's? Life must be shared, and social distancing strains us like hoses on full blast, clogged.

We're faced with two phenomena: hoarding and loneliness. Don't they contradict each other?

Most people explain the phenomenon of loneliness with the obvious observation: people are social animals! Social distancing is an unnatural ripping apart of people who naturally stick together.

But the corresponding phenomena of hoarding goods at others' expense raises the question: Was our society truly united before this began? Or were we nothing but a Rousseau-style homogenization of individuals who *really* only cared about ourselves? If we were nothing but a well-stirred blend of oil and water, it was only natural that we'd eventually drift apart.

At root, do we deserve the great joy of friendship if we respond to a crisis by putting our own needs before our friend's? Do we deserve a flourishing society in peace time if the whole idea of society dissolves in a crisis?

In World War II, hoarding was seen as unpatriotic. It was a whitewashed treachery to be full while one's countrymen starved. But hoarding is also the logical consequence of philosophies which isolate man instead of viewing him as part of a larger whole.

By contrast, St. Thomas Aquinas wrote that "it is natural for man, more than for any other animal, to be a social and political animal, to live in a group." Like Aristotle, who termed man the *zoon politikon* or political animal, Aquinas believed that our urge to be social was deeply ingrained in us; society was a rich fabric woven of individuals who contributed, each in his own way, to the common good of the whole. For Aristotle and Aquinas, we naturally want to be part of something bigger than ourselves.

The Catholic's answer to social distancing isn't to try gluing ourselves to our friends through FaceTime. It's a deeper answer, simple, costly, and wholly satisfying. We belong to a Mystical Body. This means that there is no such thing as "me" versus "everyone else." Truly I am an individual, but as a Catholic, my individuality becomes a way to *identify* with others. In my own soul I see the print of my brothers and sisters in Christ; our needs are one.

To say that men are naturally social is to promise both great happiness, and great sacrifice. Happiness because we can love, and love means fullness. Sacrifice because we must love, and love means the gift of self to the other, often feeling more like a self-annihilation than the self-fulfillment that it truly is.

While it's easy to share when we have enough, it hurts to think of *going without* because we've shared. And yet this readiness to share what we don't have much of—be it TP, time on the phone when our nerves are already frayed, a smile when we feel depressed, or a sacrifice whose fruits we may never see—is the true remedy to social distancing.

We will only cease to feel lonely when we have emptied ourselves for our friends; when we give out of our own nothingness.

Jane Spencer

Source: OnePeterFive Blog

MASS TIMES FOR JULY 2020

Here are the Sunday Mass times, for the time being. As we keep monitoring the situation, adjustments to the Mass times may be needed in the coming week. Thus, we are unable to give a Monthly schedule. Note that registration is presently needed for Sunday Mass in Toronto, Orillia and St. Catharines. Always call or email to get the current information.

	Toronto	Orillia	St. Catharines	New Hamburg
Sunday Mass	8am, 10am, 12pm, 4pm, 6pm	10am, 12pm & 5pm	8am and 10am	8am and 10am

Further information for the Church of Transfiguration, Toronto

- From Monday through Friday, the evening Mass in Toronto will be preceded by the Rosary, at 5:45pm. Some exceptions happen.
- 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. info.toronto@fsspx.ca
- Physical distancing is required while on the church property. We are being watched!
- No social, but everybody will be invited to exit the building after Mass, to allow our volunteers to sanitize.

Thank you for your kind cooperation!