

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XVII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1896.

NO. 918.

"WORSHIP" OF IMAGES.

A discussion has been going on for some time in the Toronto *Mail* and *Empire* having reference to the use of images by Catholics and to the honor they pay the Blessed Virgin. Rev. Dr. Langtry, an Episcopalian clergyman, has been most offensive as well as unjust in his contentions. We have much pleasure in reproducing from the *Mail* and *Empire* of Saturday last the following very able letter of Rev. Dr. Treacy of that city, in reply to Rev. Mr. Langtry:

Sir,—I have watched with more than ordinary interest the religious controversy carried on in the columns of your paper between "Catholic Layman" and Rev. Dr. Langtry. From a careful and impartial perusal of the arguments adduced by the latter in support of his groundless contention against the orthodox teaching of Catholic theology, I have come to the conclusion that Rev. Dr. Langtry is not a honest controversialist. I feel sorry that a clergyman of a great religious body that has so much in common both with the history and doctrinal belief of the Catholic Church, should adopt the methods of those who strive for notoriety at the expense of truth, and who endeavor, by means of base insinuations, covert sly insinuations, or even direct falsehood, to malign the Church of God, to garble and misrepresent her dogmatic teaching, and to pandering to the lowest instincts of the uneducated by wilfully and maliciously falsifying Catholic doctrines and practices adopted by Rev. Dr. Langtry. I have gained for him a certain unenviable notoriety. In his attacks upon religious denominations other than his own, he is known to have adopted methods worthy of a man who has no great difficulty in overcoming that punctilious regard for truth which should be characteristic of every Christian, and more especially of every Christian minister. He might remember, however, that the truth is best in the end, and whether he is attacking Catholics or Methodists his charges against their respective beliefs should be supported, not by wanton invectives or garbled quotations, but by the plain manifest statements of doctrine, which every honest man will recognize as being exclusively Catholic or distinctly Methodist. It is really unbecoming in one of my years to lecture such an ancient controversialist as Rev. Dr. Langtry; but when he can take upon himself to dictate to the Venerable Pontiff of the Vatican, I assuredly may be pardoned this breach of ecclesiastical etiquette towards the pastor of St. Luke's. We have no quarrel with the clergy of England; members of the Church of that country we admire the Anglican community as a time-honored institution of great national importance; we respect its members; we admire its clergy; and for those among them with whom we have had the pleasure of personal acquaintance, we entertain feelings of sincere friendship despite our differences in religious belief; and although the position occupied by the Anglican Church as a sacerdotal institution possessing an episcopate without ordination, a priesthood without a sacrifice, and an altar without a victim—a standpoint is strangely paradoxical and open to attack, which need not be strong to prove effective—yet we Catholics do not feel justified in charging our Anglican brethren wantonly in the public press. Why, then, should we receive from an Anglican minister the opprobrious epithet of idolaters? Yet Rev. Mr. Langtry says we are idolaters—and sure he is an honorable man.

If Mr. Langtry wishes to understand the doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding the veneration of images, he has but to apply to any priest in the city for a copy of the "Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent;" and there he shall learn what he doubtless knows before:—" (Sess. 25) The images of Christ, of His virgin mother, and of other saints, are to be had and retained especially in churches, and a due honor and veneration is to be given to them, not that any divinity or virtue is believed in them for which they are to be honored, or that any prayer is to be made to them, or that any confidence is to be placed in them, as was formerly done by the heathens, who placed their hopes in idols; but, because the honor which is given them is referred to the originals, which they represent." Here is the manifest doctrine of the Catholic Church which every Catholic, be he Bishop, theologian, or simple layman, is obliged in conscience to believe, on the veneration of images.

The image of Christ excites our sentiments of honor for our crucified Lord. We take off our hats to it; we kiss it, consequently, but that honor, however, is referred to the person of Christ. Just as the image of the Queen arouses our sentiments of loyalty and respect for our gracious sovereign. We take off our hats to her image, and consequently we show marks of honor to the image, but that honor

is referred to the person of the good and noble lady who rules so well and wisely over the boundless dominions of our British Empire. This is the doctrine of the Catholic Church. It is the only doctrine that can be deduced from an impartial perusal of the various councils, theologians, or catechisms, where Catholic teaching is explained for the entire Catholic body. There is no fumbling or shuffling with this doctrine amongst the theologians of the Catholic Church, as oftentimes happens in other hand-made religions where there is one doctrine for Ritualists, another for High Churchmen, a third for Broad Churchmen, and a fourth for Low Churchmen, so that there is no unity of religious belief amongst their doctrines except a unity of distintegration, and no agreement in doctrine except a widely as possible on the most fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

But the simple explanation of Catholic doctrine from the Fathers of Trent does not satisfy Rev. Dr. Langtry. He must go behind the areas of Catholic theology in search of the mysterious superstitions of the Church of Rome. Accordingly, he wanders forth (mayhap among the second-hand book stores of the city), like another Aeneas, into regions hitherto unexplored, where (vide his letter in last Saturday's *Mail* and *Empire*), he encounters a medieval goblin by the name of Good John, sometime a dweller in Lyons. Both manage to finally lose themselves in a labyrinth of medieval theology. When one of the two Johns returns again to the light of day, his eyes still blinded by the opaque doctrines of his shadowy companion, he tells his neighbors in the columns of the daily press of the strange things he has seen; of the heathenish superstitions that are taught, and the idolatrous practices that are sanctioned by the teaching of Catholic theology.

Catholic theology was meant but for educated minds that have been purified in logic and philosophy, and not for those who, like the Rev. Dr. Langtry, are neither familiar with its reasonings, nor conversant with its technicalities. If such people do not understand the arguments of Catholic theologians, the fact must be imputed either to ignorance of the Latin language, or else to an absolute deficiency of intelligence. In either alternative they are under no pressing necessity of exposing their own short-comings to the enlightened readers of the daily press. Rev. Dr. Langtry pretends to have read the theological works of St. Thomas on the question of image worship. As a result of his reading he insinuates that St. Thomas taught that the veneration given to the image was absolutely the same as the veneration given to Christ, and consequently, for that is the logical inference, Catholic theology upheld the practice of idolatry. This is a grave accusation against a saint and a scholar, by one who may have the holiness of the former, but who certainly cannot lay claim to the education of the latter. How does he prove this charge? Does he quote fully from the context of St. Thomas? Not at all. Does he even give the consecutive doctrine of the "Summa Theologica"? Not a word of it. He pretends to cite the very part and question and article of the work of St. Thomas; he even unnecessarily adds the usual form of citation "Summa II., 25, 3;" and then, when he is compelled to substantiate his charge by giving the original context, he produces—mirabile dictu!—not the authentic work of St. Thomas, but by his own showing in his fragmentary description of the book, a summary that seems to have about as much connection with the work of St. Thomas as Rev. Dr. Langtry has with the Pope of Rome. Why did the reverend gentleman pretend to quote from the original work of St. Thomas and the faceted investigation prescribed over by Mr. Justice Drake in 1891 to the members of such commissions; and the remark made by one who was present that:—"The first thing to be done with the room where Mr. Justice Drake was not a bit too strong. If Mr. Moylan be not a member of the Commission most certainly he ought to be present here with his reports and papers to throw light on matters. Messrs. Drake Stewart (Inspector of Penitentiary), Foster, (accountant or tax-accountant of penitentiaries), and Fitzsimmons (Deputy Warden of Manitoba), ought also to be present. Is Judge Drake still a Supreme Court Judge of British Columbia? Of course he is. This is British Columbia, and we are three thousand miles away from Ottawa. Had he acted in the East as he did here he would have been impeached at once. Anlay Morrison, M. P., was Deputy Warden Fitzsimmons' council during his prosecution, or rather persecution by Judge Drake. Now that he is in the House of Commons, will he take the matter up, thoroughly expose it, and demand justice for his client? I fear not. It would not pay a lawyer in British Columbia to meddle with one of the judges, no matter how crooked he might be.

We have a senator named Mr. Tunes who delights in making a show of himself in the Senate by assailing men who are not there to defend

merely from an abstract of no repute. *Tout perdu mème l'honneur!*

If the motives which impelled Rev. Mr. Langtry were honest he has not made their honesty apparent by his controversial dodge, and he certainly has not impressed the reading public with a very exalted opinion even of his powers of simulation. When he is thus detected at the nefarious game of quibbling with Catholic theology, he has the effrontery to pretend that he could not procure an authentic copy of the works of St. Thomas. Then he should not have pretended to quote what he had never seen; but, if I am right, "Catholic Layman" placed the Roman edition of St. Thomas in the office of the *Mail* and *Empire*. He could have got it there. But he says he cannot utilize the Roman edition, on the supposition that it has been necessarily corrupted by the editors. "And the ministers of grace defend us!" was ever orthodox delicacy carried to a finer degree of ethical nicety? The Rev. Mr. Langtry saw but the one word "Roman," and immediately his vivid imagination conjured up the dark phantom of the scarlet woman of Babylon, sitting on the ruins of religion, with the corrupted texts of Christianity in her hands. It is a well known fact, quite he, that all the writings of the Fathers were amended, so as to bring them into conformity with Roman doctrine; and, of course, the works of St. Thomas were likewise amended. Is it not a strange fact that during five years of residence at Rome, as a student, I never heard once of the "amended" writings of the Fathers; and yet Rev. Mr. Langtry, who doubtless received all his education in Toronto, knows all about them. Granted that all the writings of the Fathers were corrupted, does it follow that the works of St. Thomas met the same fate? Here is another evidence of wilful dishonesty and very bad logic. St. Thomas was not a "Father" of the Church, and consequently his theological works could not come into the spurious category of amended writings. I must ask Rev. Mr. Langtry to prove his allegation that the writings of the Fathers were corrupted. What Pope corrupted them; in what century were they corrupted; which of their writings were amended; when was the *Summa Theologica* corrupted; by what Pope was it brought into conformity with the Roman canon? If Rev. Mr. Langtry can answer these questions satisfactorily he is worthy to receive the mantle of the sainted Little Dale. But Dr. Langtry only "supposes" that the works of St. Thomas were corrupted. Is the mere suspicion of corruption sufficient reason why a reckless statement should be made? Rev. Mr. Langtry must either answer my question or take the consequences of silence, which I imagine would seriously affect his character. I wish to be fair with him, and will place at his disposal, at the office of the *Mail* and *Empire*, or will send to his own house, three different editions of St. Thomas' work.

Yours, etc.,
James Power Treacy,
The Cathedral, Toronto, Dec. 10th.

THE PENITENTIARY COMMISSION.

Editor CATHOLIC RECORD.—Sir—I have read with considerable interest your remarks in issue of October 24th, re "The Penitentiary Commission." As one who has lived in British Columbia for many years, and who, consequently, knows the country well, I am satisfied that if there be not a Catholic amongst those who are to investigate—thoroughly I hope—the affairs of this penitentiary it will be better to let the matter alone altogether. There was quite enough wickedness perpetrated at the farcical investigation presided over by Mr. Justice Drake in 1891 to do for one hundred such commissions; and the remark made by one who was present that:—"The first thing to be done with the room where Mr. Justice Drake was not a bit too strong. If Mr. Moylan be not a member of the Commission most certainly he ought to be present here with his reports and papers to throw light on matters. Messrs. Drake Stewart (Inspector of Penitentiary), Foster, (accountant or tax-accountant of penitentiaries), and Fitzsimmons (Deputy Warden of Manitoba), ought also to be present. Is Judge Drake still a Supreme Court Judge of British Columbia? Of course he is. This is British Columbia, and we are three thousand miles away from Ottawa. Had he acted in the East as he did here he would have been impeached at once. Anlay Morrison, M. P., was Deputy Warden Fitzsimmons' council during his prosecution, or rather persecution by Judge Drake. Now that he is in the House of Commons, will he take the matter up, thoroughly expose it, and demand justice for his client? I fear not. It would not pay a lawyer in British Columbia to meddle with one of the judges, no matter how crooked he might be.

We have a senator named Mr. Tunes who delights in making a show of himself in the Senate by assailing men who are not there to defend

themselves, without taking the trouble to find out what truth there may be in his charges; and Dame Rumor, with her thousand tongues, tells us he is to be our next Lieutenant-Governor. Yet men are blamed for hinting at an annexation. I mention Senator Wm. Tunes because he has made himself exceedingly offensive with regard to this penitentiary ever since he found that he was not to be allowed to run it according to his own sweet will. Then, again, Messrs. Moylan and Fitzsimmons (not to mention Chief Justice Davie) are Catholics, and that alone is sufficient to account for Mr. Tunes' antipathy to them. Yes, British Columbia is a queer country in some respects—this part of it at least. Imagine, if you can, an Ontario Grand Jury laying a presentment before the Chief Justice—this has been done here in Mr. Fitzsimmons' case—meddling with a matter which, as was thoroughly well known, was then before the Courts, even if the foreman of that Grand Jury were not a clerk in the office of the counsel for the opponent of the man attacked, as was the case here.

At the investigation, so called, before Judge Drake in 91 it was proved that secret meetings of Fitzsimmons' enemies amongst the guards were held, but Drake summarily stopped counsel when trying to find out the business transacted at these meetings, as Mr. McColl publicly stated that he was "responsible for those meetings," according to Sir M. Bowell, and unsophisticated people like myself are of the opinion that it might have been better for the present Government to clear up that transaction before appointing Mr. McColl Judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

There is another matter concerning which something should be done. A great deal of the trouble in this Penitentiary arose in connection with the appointment of a new Warden. In 1895 Sir C. H. Tupper, then Minister of Justice, although he knew well D. W. Fitzsimmons was perfectly innocent of wrong-doing, instead of appointing him Warden, as Sir John Thompson had promised Inspector Moylan, to place Mr. Corbould (then M. P. for this district), who, there is every reason to believe, was actuated by personal motives against Mr. Fitzsimmons, transferred that gentleman to Deputy Warden to Manitoba Penitentiary, and appointed Corbould's nominee, Mr. Moresby. This gentleman was, no doubt, excellent as governor of the Provincial Gaol, and detective; but it is an open secret that only a few weeks before his death, which occurred last month, D. W. Bourke had found it necessary to write Inspector Stuart demanding his presence in British Columbia. The Warden of a Penitentiary demands special training, but, unfortunately, owing to D. W. Fitzsimmons' reluctance to injure ex-warden McBride, the impression has got abroad that anybody can run a Penitentiary. All that is required is to keep the rules! "Anybody can be a sceptor, all one has to do is to get a block of marble and with a hammer and chisel knock away all you don't want." The position is worth \$2,000 a year, with a fine house; and as the Warden, judging by the past, has little else to do than show himself for a couple of hours each day and sign his name occasionally—the Deputy Warden doing all the real work—it is no wonder there are crowds of applicants. It is generally conceded that the man who has the best chance is one who worked hard for the election of our present M. P. last June, on the principle of "To the victors belong the spoils." It matters not that the probability that it does about him. Penitentiary Warden will be compelled to do the work or have to suffer as his predecessor did from the last crowd that we sent to Ottawa as our representatives, but who showed us that they considered themselves our masters.

I write to the CATHOLIC RECORD to protest against the continual passing over of Catholic Deputy Wardens simply because they are Catholics. A great deal of the opposition to D. W. Fitzsimmons arose from the fact of his being a Catholic. There is strong evidence to believe that all who were with him, simply from religious intolerance, that curse of our day. We pay our taxes, and we are loyal subjects, as we have proved again and again on the battlefield. It is our boast that there is no distinction of nationality or religion in any country over which the Union Jack floats; then why not prove it in this connection and appoint Mr. Fitzsimmons? Corbould and his friends frightened Sir C. H. Tupper last year into committing a gross act of injustice in that man's regard, and we showed our appreciation on June 23rd last at the polls. Is Sir Oliver Mowat a Grit or has he as little of that commodity as Sir C. H. Tupper? Surely Mr. Morrison, M. P. (than whom nobody knows better the nature of the conspiracy against his former client) will do all he can for Mr. Fitzsimmons! Some claim that there would be dissatisfaction amongst the officers were he appointed Warden. This is no doubt true; a few of them—having succeeded in getting Judge Drake to help them, having secured the assistance of the six M. P's. of the Province and the

at least tacit consent of two Ministers of Justice to their scheming—will find it hard to be defeated just when they thought all was serene; but before anything further is done, let that Penitentiary Commission be held—the sooner the better. If justice be done, there will be none of the kickers left to kick.

At the general election last June we got rid of four of the six who were supposed to voice the sentiment of this province, but as it is doubtful whether, all things considered, any one of our M. P.'s would like to ask the following questions in the House. Is there not some one in the East who would put them to Sir O. Mowat, or his representative in the Commons:—

1. In the year 1895 did the Dominion Government own the whole or any part of the proposed new site for the British Columbia Penitentiary, opposite New Westminster?

2. If they did not, is it true that that proposed new site was, and is still, a swamp, or little better, never worth more than \$10 or at most \$20 an acre, even when the boom fever was at its height?

3. Is it a fact that an attempt was made to induce Sir J. Thompson to buy that site at the rate of \$25 an acre, by whom, and in whose interests? There are strange stories told here in this connection, and it is only fair to those whose names are mentioned that, if untrue, they should be officially and authoritatively contradicted.

4. Does anybody know whether Mr. G. L. Foster is Accountant of Penitentiaries or not? Some fifteen months ago Mr. Moresby was appointed Warden of this institution, yet Mr. Foster is still here, drawing as, it is believed, the full pay of Accountant \$1800 a year. Is this also because we are in British Columbia and nobody cares what is done amongst us?

I have already intruded too much on your space, but cannot conclude without vigorously protesting against the continual putting aside of Catholic officers in our Penitentiaries. In justice Deputy Wardens Sullivan, McDunnell and Fitzsimmons should have been appointed as Wardens of Kingston, Stony Mountain and British Columbia Penitentiaries respectively. Had they not been Catholics there is little fear that they would have been passed over.

If Sir O. Mowat be so great a craven as Sir C. H. Tupper, and so fears to appoint Mr. Fitzsimmons to this place, let him at least be manly enough to state his reasons; let him give the names of those whom he fears, and we will undertake to show the reason, or reasons, for their antipathy.

Justice.

A MINISTER'S VIEWS ON CATHOLIC IRELAND.

Extracts from Dr. Zartman's Sermon on "The Land of St. Patrick."

Philadelphia Standard and Times.
Rev. Rufus Calvin Zartman, D. D., pastor of Heidelberg Reformed Church, this city, who has lately arrived home from a tour of Europe, delivered two sermons last Sunday week. In the morning he spoke of "Dr. Pierson's Renunciation of Infant Baptism," criticizing the changed views of the former pastor of Bethany Presbyterian Church, of this city, who, it will be remembered, succeeded the late Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon as minister of the Baptist Metropolitan Temple of London. In the evening his subject was "The Land of St. Patrick."

A representative of the *Catholic Standard and Times* called at Dr. Zartman's residence on Monday, and, failing to see him, left a request for the manuscript of the latter address, stating that such extracts as might prove of interest to our readers would be used. The manuscript and an article on "The Emerald Isle," written while in Edinburgh, were afterwards mailed.

While the religious views expressed in the address are naturally Protestant, yet there is evidence of a desire to be just to both the Irish and the Catholic Church. In speaking of St. Patrick, he says: "It is thought that Pope Celestine ordained St. Patrick to be a Bishop," a point which non-Catholics frequently but vainly attempt to refute, yet Dr. Zartman asserts that, "in his teachings he makes no allusions to purgatory, the *adoration* of the Virgin, transubstantiation or to the *authority of the Pope*," though, he says, "the Church which he founded is monastic, ascetic and sacramental."

As regards the Rev. Doctor's allusion to St. Patrick's belief, it might be said that the omission to mention a doctrine is not necessarily a sign of disbelief in it, but oftentimes an evidence of its general acceptance, just as many of the definitions of the faith given by the Church have been called forth by the denial of what was previously unques-

tioned. That St. Patrick was sent by Pope Celestine is practically admitted by Dr. Zartman. Pope Celestine gave to the apostle of Ireland the name by which we know him, he having previously been known as Succat, and Probus, in his "Trias Thaumaturgus" puts into the mouth of the saint the following prayer, uttered before he started for Rome:

"O Lord, Jesus Christ, lead me, I beseech Thee, to the seat of the Holy Roman Church, that receiving authority there to preach with confidence Thy sacred truths, the Irish nation may, through my ministry, be gathered to the folds of Christ."

During St. Patrick's time the Nestorian heresy flourished, and it certainly does not appear that St. Patrick opposed honoring the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of God. As regards the "adoration of the Virgin," the Catholic Church distinguishes between imploring her intercession and adoring her. Adoration is reserved for God alone, though all generations of the Catholic Church have and shall call His Mother blessed (Luke i., 48). However, the fact that St. Patrick acknowledged the authority of the Pope necessarily carries with it his acceptance of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.

Of Ireland he said: "The soil, for the most part, is fertile and productive; its mountains are not lofty, but very beautiful, and covered with heather from base to summit. Its lakes are among the loveliest to be seen."

"The Irish people, like Jews, are often lightly esteemed; indeed, some people despise the Irish and sneer at them. Perhaps some of you deem it an affront to be called Irish. While in Ireland this summer I was twice said to have Irish blood in me and to have the face of an Irishman. It did not offend me, for I knew it was intended as a compliment—in fact, as the highest tribute which they knew to bestow upon me. I want to tell you that the Irish people are kind, impulsive and warm-hearted. St. Peter was the Irishman among the Apostles of our Lord, for he was quick and impulsive in his mind and manner."

"Many of our good, thrifty, industrious and law-abiding American citizens to-day hail either directly or through their ancestry from the Emerald Isle. Our own eminent, illustrious General Phil Sheridan was an Irishman, though born at Somerset, Ohio."

"There is no place like home," even though Ireland is that home. I was impressed with the truth of this old adage in going across the Atlantic this summer. On board our ship going over the deep were two brothers, one from Philadelphia and the other from Australia. The latter was a room mate of mine on shipboard. He had amassed a fortune in the gold fields. Both of these brothers were born in Ireland. One had not been home for thirty-three years and the other had been absent forty-six years. When they saw the coast of their native Isle they wept for joy. They seemed almost foolish in their demonstrations of delight. But their ecstasy was pardonable because they were seeing and nearing their dear old homestead."

Dr. Zartman made this incident the subject of a short instruction on love of country, which would prove of benefit to some of our so-called patriotic orders who imagine that they possess a monopoly of that virtue. Continuing, he said: "Ireland has some great evils, things that are to it a bane and that retard its progress. One of these evils is landlordism. The land is owned chiefly, almost entirely, by English lords, who extort exorbitant rents from the poor Irish peasantry. About three-fourths of the Irish are tillers of the soil; they are farmers, but they do not own the land; only a very few Irishmen own the land which they till. They are kept so poor by the landlords that they cannot purchase the small farms on which they subsist in the most frugal and impoverished manner. These farms, too, are mere patches of earth, from half an acre to fifteen and twenty acres in size. Nearly all the money earned on Irish soil by the yeomanry is carried across the water to enrich English lords. If these Irish people could own the land they would take pride and pleasure in improving it, and in the hope of transmitting it to their posterity they would be encouraged and stimulated to be far more industrious and energetic. May the day soon come to Ireland when landlordism shall be only a historical memory!"

He devoted considerable attention to the religious status of the people, viewed from a Protestant standpoint, and said that Ireland's greatest, deepest need is "earnest, fervent piety among its people."

It is not to be supposed that in saying this Dr. Zartman meant to imply that the Irish need this essential more than other peoples, as even now preachers are contrasting the fervent piety of the Irish Catholic servant girl that of their non-Catholic mistresses, to the disadvantage of the latter.

Duty is a power which rises with us in the morning, and goes to rest with us at night. It is a shadow which cleaves to us, go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life.