

The Catholic Record.
Published Weekly at 484 and 485 Richmond
street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LUCE KING, JOHN SIGH, P. J.
NEVEN and WM. A. NEVIN, are fully author-
ized to receive subscriptions and transact all
other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
insertion, advance payment.

Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and
Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as
well as that having reference to business, should
be directed to the proprietor, and must reach
London not later than Tuesday morning.
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper
can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Dec. 1, 1884.

CANON FARRAR ON ANCIENT CHRISTIAN ART.

Canon Farrar, of Westminster Abbey, has just issued a book in which he professes to trace the history of Christ as illustrated by the Christian artists from generation to generation, from the earliest times down to the present day.

The book is professedly written solely from the artist's point of view, and not from any sectarian bias; yet it cannot be doubted by any reader acquainted with the Canon's antecedents that in several points he has been influenced by the ideas which led him ere now to put himself before the world as the special champion of Low Churchism, within his own denomination, and the virulent assailant of Catholic practices and doctrines which have been handed down from apostolic times. But looking through Low-Church spectacles, the Canon cannot perceive in these practices anything but modern innovations of dreaded Popery.

The use of the crucifix in Christian worship he declares to be "unscriptural, unprimitive, and irreverent, tending to a false apprehension of the aspect in which we should regard our Lord, which is rather as a risen, glorified, and ascended Saviour."

He thinks that "Christendom has contemplated too exclusively Christ's brief temporal sufferings, and has to too great an extent substituted in its regard what He once did, for all that He was and is."

It should be scarcely necessary to say to the Christian that the Canon's view of the matter is just what he represents the belief of Christendom for over eighteen centuries to be, unscriptural, unprimitive, irreverent.

It is true that Holy Scripture lays much stress upon the resurrection, ascension, and heavenly glory of Christ, as it lays stress upon all His acts, which all tended to the great object He had in view in coming into the world, this object being, as described in the creed of Nicea, "for us and for our salvation;" but there is no truth more clearly laid down in Scripture than that our redemption was effected mainly through His sufferings and death upon the cross. The prophet Isaiah placed Christ before our eyes as the "Man of Sorrows," the "despised and most abject of men," the "acquainted with infirmity," who was "wounded for our iniquities . . . bruised for our sins, and by whose bruises we are healed." (Is. liii.)

In the New Testament, equally, the history of Christ's sufferings is held to be of such importance that, beside the constant allusions to them by all the writers of the New Testament, the four Evangelists each give a more detailed account of them than of any other event in His life, and St. Paul declares that His obedience whereby "He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death: even to the death of the cross," is the cause for which "God also hath exalted Him, and hath given Him a name which is above all names: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father." (Philip ii.) The absurdity of the Canon's styling the use of the crucifix "irreverent" and "un-Scriptural," as compared with emblem or symbols of the Resurrection and ascension is hence apparent, and it is as much more so by St. Paul, who speaks of Christ crucified and His cross as the symbol of all Christianity, when saying:

"But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ: by Whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world." (Gal. vi., 14.)

The purpose of the cross and that of the crucifix are identical—to remind us of Christ crucified—and one is as lawful as the other.

That the use of the crucifix in Christian art did not begin till after Christianity was four centuries old, as

Canon Farrar asserts, is evident from the single fact attested by Eusebius, that crosses and crucifixes were a special object of devotion in his day, and were made and placed in prominent positions by order of Constantine the Great. We have besides the testimony of Tertullian that in his day, A. D. 200, the sign of the cross was in constant use among the faithful:

"At every going forth and every journey, at coming in and going out, when putting on our shoes, at our bathtings, at table, in striking a light, at lying or sitting down, whatever may be our occupation, we form on our foreheads the sign of the cross."

We might cite many other testimonies which would show that the use of the cross was frequent in the primitive period of Christianity, but what we have cited is as sufficient as it is irrefragable on this subject, and it proves that from the earliest times the cross and crucifix alike were regarded as the symbol of Christianity. They conveyed at the same time the lesson given by Christ, that we must bear the cross of suffering for His sake if we would be His disciples, and that He offered on the cross a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of mankind.

Canon Farrar admits that there were symbols of Christ in early use in the Church, though he would have us believe they were not symbols of the crucifixion. He admits, too, that the cross was one of the symbols occasionally used. But whether it be the cross or any other symbol of religion that is used, the principle is the same: religion is inculcated by pictures or symbols which remind us of the truth of doctrines, or of the sanctity of Christ and His Saints, whose example and precepts we are thereby moved to imitate or to obey as the case may be.

THE BUTCHERY OF ARMENIAN CHRISTIANS.

Mr. Hazopian, the chairman of the Armenian Patriotic Association, has written a letter to the Earl of Kimberley, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, describing a massacre of Christians which has just taken place in Armenia on a scale which makes this last outrage equal the Bulgarian atrocities which some years ago horrified the whole civilized world, and precipitated the Russo-Turkish war, which delivered the Balkan Provinces once for all from the horrors of Turkish rule.

Mr. Hazopian received his information from an Armenian whose name he does not disclose, as to do so would endanger his life: but the story told, he has no doubt, is true in all its "most sickening details of fiendish lust and atrocious cruelty on unarmed Christians and defenceless, innocent children, deliberately planned and ruthlessly executed under orders received from headquarters at Constantinople."

Last year an insurrection was reported to have arisen among the Armenians; but we are assured that this was a mere fiction got up for the purpose of putting forward some excuse for the atrocities then perpetrated, and for which the Chief Magnate who suppressed the pretended rebellion was promoted by his master. This Chief Magnate is described in the letter as a second Nero.

The present outrage arose directly out of an incursion made by the Mahometan Kurds upon the Armenians to steal cattle, and they succeeded in carrying off a number of oxen. The Armenian appeal for a restoration of the cattle was refused, and a fight ensued in which two Kurds were killed and three wounded. The Kurds then represented to the Governor that the Armenians had over-run the Kurd country, plundering the people. Thereupon a Pasha was sent to punish the Armenians. He was furnished with an order from Constantinople to cut up the Armenians, root and branch, and he appealed to his soldiers to carry out the instructions faithfully as they loved their King and Government. The troops were massed through the Armenian country, and in some districts to each soldier one hundred persons were allotted for destruction. No compassion was shown to age or sex, and, as far as known at present, from six thousand to ten thousand persons, men, women and children, were butchered without mercy. The women were violated before being killed, and babes were impaled on the bayonets of the soldiers, or they were seized by the hair to have their heads lopped off by the sword.

Twenty-five villages have been thus wholly destroyed, and the houses burned with kerosene, while those persons who were not killed with the sword or bayonet perished in the flames.

As usual on similar occasions, the

Turks have issued an explanation of their own concerning the matter, wherein they declare that there was nothing done except to repress a violent rebellious outbreak of the Armenians, and they very comely assert that the regular troops succeeded in "restoring order and tranquility." They add that the villages destroyed were destroyed by Armenian brigands and not by Turkish soldiers.

There is in this account of the matter such intrinsic evidence of falsehood that every one can see it is just like the fictions which the Turks know so well how to concoct in order to screen themselves from the sharp eyes of European observation; but their wily tales are too well known to be accepted as truth without further enquiry into the matter.

It is a fact well known that the nomad Kurds are and have long been permitted by the Turkish officials to make raids upon their Armenian neighbors whenever they will, and that no redress is obtainable, simply because the Armenians are Christians, and are supposed to be restless under Turkish rule. Thus these poor people are kept in an impoverished condition, which makes it impossible for them to pay the enormous taxes which are levied upon them through the greed of the Porte and subordinate officials, who are allowed to do pretty much as they please in gathering tribute.

Under these circumstances it is to be expected that from time to time the Armenians should resist the tax-collectors, and this has sometimes happened; but we cannot but sympathize with a people who are thus ground down under the most grievous of tyrannies.

It is high time that such atrocities should be stopped, and there appears to be no way of stopping them except by putting an end to Moslem rule over all the Christian populations. Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro, have already been delivered in part from this tyranny, but these Provinces are still obliged to pay a tribute to their former masters. This tribute should be abolished, for it serves no purpose other than to enable the Sultan to hold a tighter grip upon the Christian people who are still subject to his tyranny.

We shall not assume without further proof that the Porte has intentionally organized a persecution against the Christians of Armenia; and it is possible that there is some exaggeration in the account of this part of the matter as published by Mr. Hazopian, who is at the head of an association the avowed object of which is to rid his country of the Turkish yoke; but there is no doubt that the atrocities are quite as bad as they have been represented; for they are confirmed by unquestionable accounts coming from other sources than his letter. It would be enough that Turkish rule affords no protection against the commission of such horrors to make it intolerable; but it certainly appears that the orders for the destruction of the villages really emanated from Constantinople, and on the Constantinople authorities the adequate punishment of the crime should be visited.

Russia has hitherto assumed the protectorate of Greek Christians in Turkish territory, and many of the Armenians belong to the Greek Church; but the Armenian Catholics are now almost as numerous as the Greeks; and there are even some Protestants among them, though their number is but small. The sufferers, probably, include Christians of all denominations. Russia is almost, if not quite, as intolerant as the Turks themselves, and even if she should desire to settle the trouble after her own fashion, she should not be allowed to do so alone as she sees fit. It is a matter which concerns the whole civilized world, in which we can scarcely yet include Russia, notwithstanding the magnitude of her strength and the vastness of her population.

The partition of Turkey by force in such a way as to prevent the ruling race of Turks, which, after all, forms but a small proportion of the population, from dominating so large a territory, European and Asiatic, as the Ottoman Empire includes, has been seriously contemplated before now; and this seems to be the only practicable way to solve such difficulties as the present, which are continually cropping up, and will continue to do so until some radical change be made by agreement of the European powers.

Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Spain, are all deeply interested in the amelioration of the condition of the Christian people of the Turkish Empire, and we cannot refrain from expressing the hope that the repetition of such outrages as the

present will be rendered impossible for the future by a united intervention of these powers for the establishment of some form of government quite different from that which now prevails to the disgrace of the disunited Christian world.

Turkey has been tolerated so long only because of the international jealousies of Christian nations. It is time that these jealousies should be laid aside, and a solution of the difficulty be made in the interests of common humanity.

PREPARING FOR BATTLE.

The Glasgow speech of Lord Rosebery, in which he indicated the policy to be pursued in order to lessen the legislative powers of the Lords, is meeting with so much favor that it is confidently predicted that if it be made the issue at the next election, the Government will be triumphantly sustained, especially if the powers of the Lords be so reduced as to satisfy the Radical element in the Liberal party.

The Government has undoubtedly some plan of action in view, but the details of the measure to be introduced have not as yet been made public, as they are not sufficiently matured; but as Lord Rosebery is known to desire the introduction of his measure at an early period of the next session of Parliament, it is expected that the details will soon be ready to be announced.

On the other hand, the Conservative papers express considerable dissatisfaction with Lord Salisbury for his not having stated any counter plan of a scheme of reform of the Lords when replying to the Premier's speech. He admitted, indeed, that a reform of some kind is necessary in order to bring that body more into harmony with the House of Commons, but he proposed no definite method whereby this might be brought about.

Some members of the Cabinet are said to be opposed to the early introduction of the Reform Bill which will deal with this subject, their desire being to make it the issue on which Parliament will be dissolved; but it is unlikely that Lord Salisbury will wait the convenience of the Government in this matter and it is stated that he will force the issue by introducing into the House of Lords, at the earliest possible moment, a resolution asserting the possession of executive privileges by that body. This action will necessitate the introduction of Lord Rosebery's plan as a counter measure, and thus the fight will be begun, and an early dissolution of Parliament will be made necessary.

Lord Rosebery's declaration that the supremacy of the House of Commons must be affirmed has made his Government more popular than ever, and it appears certain that when this issue will be brought before the people squarely at the general election, the electorate will sustain him by a most decisive majority.

From Lord Salisbury's reticence on this important subject it is generally believed that it is the intention of the Tories to fight to the end to sustain the Peers in all their privileges; but the Liberal Unionists cannot afford to adopt this policy, as their constituents are decidedly in favor of restricting the powers of the Upper House, and will support the Government in their efforts to bring about a Radical reform. Hence the Liberal Unionist members very freely assert that they will support a scheme of reform, and it is expected that they will use all the influence they can bring to bear on Lord Salisbury to agree to a large reform measure, as otherwise they are likely to be swept out of existence as a party at the coming elections.

The Irish Nationalists, with the exception of the Redmondites or Parnellites, are convinced that a reform in the House of Lords must precede Irish Home Rule, and so they have agreed to support the Government measure which Lord Rosebery has promised to place before the House of Commons at as early a moment as possible.

The Redmondites threaten that unless the question of Home Rule be kept in front of all other questions they will oppose the Government, but Mr. Dillon in his recent speech at Mullinahone declared that the Irish Parliamentary party "would be madmen and traitors to the cause if they refused to give all the assistance in their power to help the Radicals of England break the power of the House of Lords which throughout generations has been the bitterest enemy of the Irish people."

In this view Mr. Dillon is at agreement with his colleagues of the Irish party, who now see plainly that the power of the Lords must be broken, or at least greatly restricted before Home

Rule can be gained. The Irish members will, however, insist that the plan of reform of the House of Lords shall be sufficiently drastic to make it possible to secure Home Rule afterwards in spite of their determined opposition to any legislation favorable to Ireland.

AN IMPORTANT BY-ELECTION.

The elevation to the bench of Mr. Wm. R. Meredith, leader of the Opposition in the Ontario House, left a vacant seat in London, and much interest was felt as to whether it should return a supporter of Mr. Mowat or a supporter of the Opposition. The election took place on the 20th ultimo, and the Reform candidate, Mr. Hobbs, was elected, having a majority over his opponent, Mr. Essery, of 800. Now that the smoke of battle has passed away, and the heated passions of the partisans likewise, we feel that we should look over the field and take a view of the conditions that entered into the London contest. Were it an ordinary political fight, a contest between Grit and Tory, carried on upon purely political questions, we should have nothing to write concerning it, as the CATHOLIC RECORD never was, is not now, nor will it be at any future time a political newspaper.

We had some hope that with the exit of Mr. Meredith, the Conservative party of Ontario would enter upon a new career—would lend its efforts to the work of forwarding the true interests of the Province and acknowledge manfully its error in introducing sectarian issues into our political life. To our surprise, however, this it not only did not do, but the new leader, Mr. Marter, and his followers, have started out with the determination of carrying on the anti-Catholic crusade to the better end. War on the Separate Schools seems to be the watchword; and we may well conclude that crippling their work would not be the only injustice inflicted upon Catholics, were the reins of power placed in their hands. In their speeches delivered in the Opera House in support of Mr. Essery, Messrs. Marter and Howland exhibited a greater degree of intolerance towards Catholics than had been shown in any previous campaign; the last named gentleman being particularly offensive in his remarks. Much emphasis was placed on the fact that the purpose of the party was to uproot if possible the separate school system, and, failing in this, they would rescind all the amendments made to it in the last twenty years by Mr. Mowat, thus inflicting on Catholics a system of procedure in the conduct of their schools which would impair their efficiency, and, in fact, render their continuance a hardship on the Catholic people.

Our Conservative neighbors are very unsparing in their condemnation of Catholics, because, as they say, they give a solid vote for the candidates of the Government; but it would, indeed, be most extraordinary, under the circumstances, were they to take any other course. There is not to be found any section of the community, from one end of the Dominion to the other, which under like conditions would not act in a similar manner. The purpose of the Opposition has been, as everyone knows, to raise the sectarian cry, prevail upon the Protestants to move to one side and leave the Catholics on the other. This was the scheme by which it was thought the reins of power would fall into their hands and the sweetmeats of office into their laps. It has failed—miserably failed—and yet, strange to say, we find the party still clinging to the hope that some day or other the Protestant people will say good bye to their common sense and place their political destinies in the keeping of that ambitious but mediocre class who hold the leading strings of the P. P. A.

To the Conservatives of London belongs the discredit of bringing into the arena as their champion one who has made himself more offensive to Catholics than perhaps any other man in Ontario. Mayor Essery, the little Lord George Gordon of the P. P. A.—Mayor Essery, the ardent admirer of Mrs. Margaret Shepherd—Mayor Essery, who, while holding the position of chief magistrate, presented that shameless woman with a Bible as a mark of esteem—Mayor Essery, who would, had he the power, drive every Catholic out of the Province—was selected at the convention of the Conservative party as their candidate, and his election, after a slight show of opposition, was made unanimous, and thunderous applause hailed the conquering hero as he donned his coat of mail and entered the arena to do battle against the Pope, Popery, brass money,

wooden shoes and Oliver Mowat. The party and its candidate, however, suffered an ignominious defeat, and they richly deserved it. No doubt the majority given Mr. Hobbs was swelled to some extent by some Conservatives either not voting at all or casting their ballots for him. It is undeniable that a goodly number of Conservatives looked with disfavor on the selection of Mayor Essery as the standard-bearer of the party, but their influence availed not. It was a case where the tail could not wag the dog. Some few prominent Conservatives—men who should know better and who have reason to be ashamed of themselves—backed up the bitter-tongued agitator with platform utterances. They should have left that work to the Macklins and the Coos—birds of a feather with Mr. Essery—who have sought to recommend them to public favor save brass and bigotry.

Our contemporary, the *Free Press*, we are sorry to say, was also to be found battling fiercely on behalf of the party of intolerance. From day to day warm appeals were made to the electorate to support Mayor Essery, and long reports of the acrid utterances of himself and his P. P. A. following were given to the public. After the election, however, the editor decided to turn about in his boat and row the other way. On the 21st the *Free Press* said editorially:

"The Conservative party, whatever individuals within its ranks may propose upon their own account, will not enter upon a crusade against the fundamental constitution of the Dominion so far as it affects the vital existence of the Catholic schools."

But when the "individuals within its ranks" are the leaders of the party in this Province, to whom, if not to them, should we look for a declaration of policy. It is a pity our contemporary did not experience a change of heart and make a declaration of this kind before the contest took place. As the case now stands we must fancy the editor assuming a penitential cast of countenance and declaring "he didn't know it was loaded."

A SCHOOL QUESTION IN QUEBEC.

Eight years ago the Protestant School Commissioners of Montreal issued a report in which they complained regarding the education of the Jewish children of the city that

"All public-spirited persons must regard with concern the provisions of a school law which allows such a distribution of the Public school funds, and with aversion the selfish policy of a wealthy minority that can take advantage of such a law."

By the wealthy minority here mentioned are meant the Jewish rate-payers of the city, and this clause is intended to throw odium upon them for the manner in which they have disposed of their regular school tax in accordance with the school laws of Quebec. But not content with blaming the Jewish minority, they likewise suggested that there is some unfairness in the provisions of the school laws of the Province.

The cause of this complaint is not, as it might be supposed, any injustice done by the Quebec school laws, either to Protestants or Jews, but from an arrangement in the law that the Jews shall have the liberty to send their children to whatsoever class of schools they choose themselves, whether the Public schools or the Protestant; and they may declare that their taxes shall go to whichever schools they choose to select.

A fairer provision than this could scarcely be imagined, but it appears that the Protestant board is not at all satisfied with it. They wish the Jews to rank themselves as Protestants willingly.

Before 1886 the Protestant Commissioners had made some kind of arrangement with the Jews whereby Jewish children were admitted as Protestants to the Protestant schools; but it appears that the majority of the Jews afterwards found out that they could not get what they considered to be equitable terms; and of their own accord they asked the Catholic Board to collect their tax and to sustain a set of Hebrew teachers out of the receipts, devoting to this purpose 80 per cent. of the amount collected and retaining 20 per cent. for the trouble of collection, and for the education of such Hebrew children as might attend the Catholic schools. The Catholic Commissioners agreed to this, and the schools have been for some time conducted on this plan.

The source of the Protestant Commissioners' complaint is that the Jewish seceders who turned their taxes into the Catholic school fund represented \$2,116 out of a total of \$2,700 of Jewish taxes; but as only a very small percentage of this sum went into the Catholic school fund, and as this was burdened with

an obligation, therefor complaint that seceders were actually desiring to do for the education of their own children.

When it is considered that the Jews are Catholics, whether the be seen how much Catholic legislation Protestants than the Catholics of Ontario and yet it is the great party in the to cripple the Catholic still more than at

The Quebec Protestants reason for complaining by the law in the the Ontario Catholic stands they appear cause of complaint ever, that the Catholic have made an agnostic Board that will permit the shall be apportioned ing to the number educated by each arrangement the gain a large The Ontario Oppose a little on the between Quebec Catholics their own intoler-

EDITORIAL.

The German Catholics recognize the Church because of its central America. The Evangelist, referring to this state some years ago, the Church authorities incorporated as application was officials saying enough with one from abroad, and could not be during the period kamp was in the Church. No that the Methodist Church has no its members, America, have international Com succeeded in authorities than nized, and it is German Methodist itself an independent may secure the tion also much

AMSTERDAM, appreciation of all books, after the limitation of national competition the city for a Thomas a Kempis sent in before for the movement erected at Zw Agnes, where at the advance years.

It is stated authority that special appeal inviting the in re-establish Mother Church large section belief in near Catholic Church that the invit-

DIOCESE.

Dedication of Woodstock Yesterday was the history of Newark and V but sacred, a memory as a formal opening Norwich Roman The beautiful situated on the church used to presents quite The inside of ing a seating a and is most ceiling is finished The pews are were furnished Walkerville window repre our Lord, to the pioneer of the altar is a Patrick May Mother of Church is a choir is located a furnace from Woodstock, at of Ottaville, erected at a credit on the Newark and skilful workmen of Norwich, the tect, Fred He stand, gave h good work. The service Bishop O'Gon blessing the service which