

### The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:  
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels,"  
THOMAS COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,  
Messrs. LUK, KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agents measurement.  
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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, March 25, 1892.

### THE OBLIGATION OF SUPPORTING PASTORS.

A recent occurrence in Victoria, B. C., the details of which are given in the Toronto Mail of the 11th inst., is well calculated to remind Catholics of their duties towards their pastors, though it concerns the relations not of a priest, but those of a Presbyterian minister, with his congregation, and for this reason we here refer to the matter.

The circumstances, briefly told are the following.

The Rev. P. McF. McLeod, formerly of Toronto, is now pastor of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church of Victoria; but at the last meeting of the synod of British Columbia a complaint was made by one of the former church managers that owing to financial difficulties, chiefly, the clergyman's usefulness in his pastorate had been impaired, and practically his removal was asked on this ground.

Rev. Mr. McLeod's salary had been \$3,750 per annum, or \$312.50 per month, which had been paid regularly in advance every month from the beginning of his pastorate, though at first the congregation consisted of only forty-seven members. But after the lapse of some years, and when the congregation had greatly increased in numbers, the old managers seemed to take a dislike to their minister, and on the plea of financial difficulties of the church they offered him to pay part of his salary at the beginning of each month, and part at the end, and Mr. McLeod claims that they desired thus to make a beginning with a view to end his pastorate. At all events he refused their offer, and as the majority of the congregation were favorable to him, a new board was elected to sustain him. The old managers then made an attempt to reduce his salary to \$2000, but in this they were opposed by the new board of managers.

The Rev. Mr. McLeod stated to the synod that "it had been said he had a strong will and was unworkable." He acknowledged that "he had a strong will, and he would not give a straw for a man who had not a strong will;" yet "he could not plead guilty to being unworkable." He added that "the whole difficulty could be traced to a bit of Church gossip, and not true at that. He had been in a state of mental torture for the last three months . . . which might soon lead him to Westminster or Ross Bay."

The difficulty, if not settled satisfactorily, will be brought before the General Assembly, which will meet in June.

From all this it will be seen by our readers that some of them are under the wrong impression that Catholic priests are paid very large salaries in comparison with Protestant ministers, and that Catholics are heavily taxed for their support. This impression is also fostered by such articles as are to be read in the Mail and some other journals from day to day, representing, for example, that the taxation of the people for Church purposes is an intolerable burden, especially in the Province of Quebec. We know that there is not a Catholic congregation in the Dominion so heavily taxed as that of the Rev. Mr. McLeod has been; yet we see how resolutely he insisted on the prompt payment of his salary. We know, indeed, that many priests, probably the majority, receive less than \$500 or \$600 per annum for their support. Yet they are, almost without exception, zealous, talented and hard-working laborers in the Lord's vineyard, having in view no object other than the progress of religion and the spiritual and temporal welfare of their people.

It is a natural obligation on our Catholic people to contribute generously, according to their means, for the respectable support of their pastors; and it is, as the catechism and Holy Scripture state, a divine precept also "that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel."

The offerings required from each

Catholic family for the support of pastors is but small, and the total amount which the latter receive is barely sufficient for them, if paid promptly. It is, however, sad to say that there are some in every parish who pay their quota grudgingly; and many who delay payment, leaving their pastors to go into debt, and often to pay interest on borrowed money because of the dilatoriness of their parishioners in paying their just proportion towards their pastors' support. Such neglect shows great want of appreciation of the zeal of their pastors, and of the hard work they perform in fulfilling their duty. A sentiment of loyalty to religion should make Catholics pay the salaries of their priests cheerfully, generously and promptly.

### THE BABEL OF OUR AGE.

Some curious details are noticeable in the official return of the Registrar-General regarding the different places of religious worship registered in England and Wales for the year 1892. The persons registered as having places of meeting are recorded under two hundred and sixty-seven different names whereby the denominations to which they belong are described. In some instances the same religious body is described under several different names. Thus Jews, who have three or four different divisions among them, are registered under eight names, Moslems under three, and there are twenty-five associations which appear to be rather societies established for special purposes than denominations.

Six associations appear to be for the propagation of Infidelity more or less pronounced, and there are three sects of Mormons or Latter Day Saints.

If we deduct these from the total, the Catholics, three Oriental Churches, and allow 10 for other repetitions, we shall have about 221 different Protestant sects in England and Wales alone, which is probably very near the correct number of denominations claiming to constitute the one fold and one Church which Christ established, and into which He proposed to bring together His whole flock. They are one only in this sense, that they alike deny that there is any lawful authority existing in the Church for the preservation of unity of faith.

Among those who are set down as Methodists we find Wesleyans, New Connexion, Primitive, Bible Christians, the United Free Methodist Church, the United Free Gospel, formerly called Independent Methodists, Wesleyan Reformers, Benevolent, Modern Methodists, the Methodist Army, New Methodists, Reformed Free Wesleyans, and Calvinistic Methodists. This is not a bad showing of disintegrating power in the short period of one hundred and two years that Methodism has existed. To these must be added the Episcopal Methodist of America.

The Baptists are similarly divided into Baptists (proper), Baptized Brethren, Bunyan, Calvinistic, Congregational, General, Particular, General New Connexion, Old, Open, Strict, Union, Seventh Day, and Unitarian Baptists.

Presbyterians, and even Episcopalians, are also greatly divided, though not to the same extent as those we have indicated. The Salvation Army is by no means alone as a military religious organization. There are the Armies of the Lord, and of the King's Own, the Blue Ribbon Gospel Army, the Christian, the Free Salvation, the Glassbrook, the Holiness, the Hosanna, the King Jesus, the Methodist, the Redeemed, the Royal Gospel, the United Christian, and the White Ribbon Gospel Armies.

Among the most fancifully named sects we find the Christian Eliasites, Christian Israelites, the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion, Eclectics, Glassites, Inghamites, Loving Brethren, Peculiar People, Recreative Religionists, and even Saints, to lead us to believe that all people else are sinners.

We find also Sandemanians, Separatists, and strictly Undenominationalists, besides Unsectarians, so-called probably because they add one to the number of sectarian organizations.

It would be difficult to conceive, if we had not the official report thereof, that three and a half centuries of a professedly pure religion should have produced such a babel of Religious belief, when we know that the thirteen centuries preceding the Reformation were marked by unity of faith, the only thing which marred the picture being the occasional rise of a temporary heresy which wore itself out after a few years of noisy propagandism.

We must add that it appears that the followers of Johanna Southcote,

who passed herself off as the mother of Christ coming again to earth, still exist. This woman also issued 144,000 tickets to Paradise, which were greatly cherished by her devotees.

### THE GRAND ORANGE LODGE OF WESTERN ONTARIO.

The Grand Orange Lodge of Ontario West held last week its annual meeting at Orangeville, Ontario, at which utterance was given to somewhat more than the usual amount of nonsensical bluster concerning the dreaded influence of Romanism on the politics of Canada, and efforts were made to pass a resolution embodying the views of the greatest firebrands of the order on this subject.

The resolution as moved by "Brother Morrison" of Sarnia was that "the Grand Lodge views with alarm the increased power of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada."

It was generally understood that the concealed meaning of the resolution was a condemnation of the Dominion Government for the reason that a Catholic occupies the position of Premier, a condemnation especially of the Hon. N. Clarke Wallace for accepting a position in the Cabinet under a Catholic Premier.

Of course, Mr. Wallace could not permit such a resolution to pass unchallenged, and we should have expected that he would have shown the absurdity of the proposed resolution. He was aware, however, that the Lodge must make some exhibition of bigotry, so he moved in amendment that the word "Ontario" be inserted instead of Canada in the resolution. He then made a speech in which he attacked the Ontario Government, and charged it with the well-worn accusation of "travelling to Rome."

In reference to the appointment of Mr. Wallace to the position of Controller of Customs, one speaker in favor of the original resolution said it was a "sop to the Orangemen." In reply it was maintained that "it was a tribute to his great ability."

One delegate asserted that judging from the discussion which had taken place, one would imagine that "the members present were not Orangemen, but that the Pope had some of his emissaries there to manipulate the wires," and another stated that "Sir John Thompson is a Jesuit and has taken an oath to suppress heretics."

This assertion brought from the Controller of Customs an indignant denial. He said "he would not allow such a foul slander against Sir John Thompson to go unchallenged. Sir John Thompson had taken the oath of allegiance to the Queen. From what he knew of the society of Jesuits they were all priests, and had to spend a number of years in the service of the Church as such before being admitted to full membership. Being priests they could not marry. Sir John Thompson was not a priest, as he was a married man. The delegate who made the charge did not know what a Jesuit was, or he would not have spoken like that. Sir John Thompson was a man of character and ability."

Hereupon Brother Campbell of Toronto—probably the "Jumbo Campbell" whose idiosyncrasies caused so much amusement and disturbance in the Queen's park, when he persisted in breaking the law by his Sunday speeches or sermons—said that the Jesuits extend from the priests to the crossing sweepers, and that laymen could be Jesuits as well as priests. Bro. Wallace then said he would give \$500 to any charitable institution in Toronto if Brother Campbell could prove his assertion, and also \$100 to the town of Orangeville.

The amusing discussion was brought to a close by the chairman, who stated that "they did not wish any lectures on Jesuitism," and it would appear that a compromise resolution was passed to the effect that "the Orangemen of Ontario be on the alert to resist any undue attempts of the Roman Catholic Church to obtain unequal advantages in this country."

We have only to say that this is about as ridiculous as either of the two resolutions in place of which it was adopted. There can be no better proof of the declining influence of Orangeism than the fact that the Grand Lodge of Western Ontario could spend its time in such a discussion.

In the election of officers, the contest for the Grand Mastership was between J. L. Hughes, the Toronto School Inspector, and Alderman Bell. Mr. Hughes, who was understood to stand as supporting the Dominion Government, was elected by a very decisive majority.

A resolution was also passed con-

demning the Home Rule measure of Mr. Gladstone. This will not interfere, however, with the passage of the Bill, though it may tickle the ears of the Ulster Orangemen, to whom Mr. N. Clarke recently promised material aid in case they desire to assume the character of rebels.

### BISHOP CAMERON.

The persistence with which infamous attacks upon the hierarchy, and especially upon His Lordship the Bishop of Antigonish, have been made in the Montreal Witness and some other journals, accusing them of having plotted against the welfare of Canada in order to bring John Thompson into the Dominion Cabinet, and finally to the Premiership of the Dominion, has become notorious and discreditable. The following mainly letter was sent by Bishop Cameron to the editor of the Witness, and appeared in that paper on the 10th inst.:

SIR,—My attention has been called to two letters that lately appeared in the Witness over the signature of "Nova Scotia." As both of them seriously reflect on myself and my clergy, I beg leave to make the following proposal: Provided that your anonymous correspondent is not a man of straw, and that he will have removed his visor, I hereby undertake to prove his communications to be tissues of untruths and misrepresentations. If he declines to honestly show his face, he will deserve to be stigmatized as an impostor, a coward and a slanderer, and as such to be treated by me with silent contempt. Let him choose his alternative. Meanwhile, I confidently affirm that neither have I, either as a citizen or as an ecclesiastic, said, writ or done anything that I have reason to be ashamed of before God or man, in connection with Sir John Thompson's public or private career. Truth compelled me to prefer him to his political rivals, according to his deserts. To condemn me for having so preferred him is like the impiety of censuring the great Giver of "every excellent grace and of every perfect gift" for having graced him with such a rare combination of abilities and virtues.

JOHN CAMERON,  
Bishop of Antigonish,  
Antigonish, March 8, 1892.

### THE EXODUS AND THE CHURCH IN QUEBEC.

"Harp on that still" was the cunning advice given by Junius Brutus to the discontented citizens of Rome when he wished them to revoke their vote in favor of the appointment of Coriolanus to the consulship; and the Toronto Mail seems to have equal confidence in the virtue of harping on a statement which it has repeated to nausea, that the principal cause of the exodus of French-Canadians to the United States is the oppressiveness of the taxes levied for Church purposes in the Province of Quebec.

In an article which appeared in that journal on the 13th inst. this statement is repeated. This article proceeds to show that there are various causes for the exodus in question, one of the reasons being that "life on the farm is not attractive" because "the rising generation is educated to avoid the isolation and labor which the pioneers undertook, and which are inseparable from agricultural pursuits;" and "the labors are more severe in Quebec than elsewhere, owing to the fact that new methods are not promptly adopted there."

It tells us, further, that in Quebec agriculture is in an unsatisfactory condition and unremunerative, because "it is so far behind the age," and the farmer is obliged to go into debt, borrowing money at from 10 to 12 per cent., whereby "he is speedily disheartened and swamped."

It is very true, and this fact the Mail keeps in the background, that the land in Quebec is not nearly so good and productive as in Ontario, and is consequently not so profitable, notwithstanding all of which the Quebec farmers, being very economical in their habits, are generally contented and comfortable; and by the census returns of the Dominion their farms are not nearly so heavily mortgaged as are the farms of Ontario.

It is a fact which we deplore that the Dominion has lost a large proportion of its population, so that notwithstanding emigration, we have not retained what we might have reasonably expected even from the natural increase by births alone. But the exodus to the United States is not confined to French Canadians from Quebec, but extends almost equally to British or English speaking Canadians throughout the Dominion. Thus the increase of population in Quebec during the last decade was 10.3 per cent., while the increase in Ontario was 11.9 per cent. But the increase of the Catholic population of Quebec was over 11 per cent., which is not very much

under the increase of Ontario, showing that the discrepancy is not so very great as to justify the closing words of the Mail's article which makes the onerous tithes of Quebec the chief cause of the exodus in that Province. Thus the article concludes:

"Equally probable is it that if the people enjoyed the social liberty, the freedom from ecclesiastical restraints, and the exemption from unnecessarily heavy Church burdens that they secure when they are out of Quebec, they would not be in such a hurry to go. Men, religious though they may be, do not care to labor all their lives to erect cathedrals in the neighboring villages and to build palaces for the priests."

The Mail is evidently determined to "harp on that still;" but we might with equal justice say that the Protestants of Ontario are fleeing to the States to get rid of the burden of paying for their churches and for palaces for their clergy. They are more heavily burdened in this respect than are the Catholics of Quebec, and their ministers are more costly, even in proportion to the wealth of their congregations, than are the priests and the Catholic Church in any of our Provinces. The very issue of the Mail which preceded that containing the editorial on which we have here commented gives us an evidence of this. We are told in the Mail of the 11th inst. of a Presbyterian clergyman, formerly of Toronto, now living in Victoria, B. C., who received from a congregation consisting of forty-seven members, a yearly salary of \$3,500; and afterwards when on account of some dissatisfaction the monthly payments were not paid strictly in advance, he threatened severe measures to enforce payment, while, on the other hand, the trustees endeavored to force his resignation, though the congregation had very considerably increased.

It is needless to say that such a state of things does not exist among Catholics, but as we have some remarks on this subject in another column we forbear from entering into further details here. Suffice it to say that the whole tithe on farmers in Quebec amounts to only one twenty-sixth of the produce of the land. They pay this willingly, and harshness is never employed to collect it, and in cases of poverty it is not demanded at all.

The Mail acknowledges that there are causes for the exodus besides the tithesystem. Those other causes are surely enough to account for an exodus which has continued for a long period, under government of both political parties, and under every policy of successive administrations, whether reciprocity or partial protection.

The Church must be supported in some way, and if the French-Canadians prefer to maintain it by the tithe system, they have a right to their liberty on this point, and they are not likely to adopt some other plan merely because it is the Mail's wish they should do so.

### NEW LIES TO SUSTAIN OLD ONES.

On the recurrence of the day known as "Guy Fawkes Day," (November 5th), of last year, the Rev. Dr. Campbell of Ottawa, made in a church of that city an harangue of character similar to those which are usually delivered for the delectation of Orangemen whenever the memory of the Gunpowder Plot is to be commemorated. The harangue was, of course, filled with the usual trash against Popery, and was reported in the newspapers.

The Catholic Truth Society at the time called attention to the fact that in quoting from Cardinal Manning a certain passage, Dr. Campbell said, "Cardinal Manning says so and so," to the effect that Catholics could not be subjects, and he drew the inference that they cannot be good citizens.

The Catholic Truth Society showed that the words attributed to Cardinal Manning were merely imaginary words which the latter put in the mouth of the Pope as supposed to be addressed to the King of Italy, and were quite suitable as words addressed by one sovereign to another.

Now Dr. Campbell has denied in a new lecture that he was correctly reported, thus acknowledging that his former statement was a falsehood which he dare not defend.

The Ottawa Evening Journal maintains the accuracy of its report, and in its issue of 25th February thus chastises the doctor for his mendacious quibbling:

"The reporter of the Journal who was present at Dr. Campbell's lecture on November 6, is unshaken in his belief that Dr. Campbell did not mention the Pope in connection with the quotation. In this belief he is to day sustained by others who were present on that occasion, as well as by other reports that then appeared in the press. Dr.

Campbell was endeavoring to show that Roman Catholics, by virtue of the doctrines of their Church, could not be good citizens; he referred to the writings of Cardinal Manning, an eminent authority in that Church, in support of his contention; and he was reported as saying that 'Cardinal Manning says so and so,' without mentioning or explaining the qualifying utterances preceding the quotation (as he did on Thursday evening) showing that Cardinal Manning was merely placing in the mouth of the Pope imaginary terms in which the Pope might fittingly address another earthly potentate. Now, the Journal reporter, like the reporter of another city paper, may possibly have been mistaken on Nov. 6. Anything is possible. But the reporter is confident that he was not mistaken, and the Journal is interested enough in Dr. Campbell's denial at this late date, to make the accuracy, to analyze the matter further.

The reporter's recollection and notes of the matter on Nov. 6 are that Dr. Campbell did not read the quotation from the book direct, but that he said: "I have not the quotation with me, but I can give the effect. Cardinal Manning says, etc." And this was the report that was published in the press. The Catholic Truth Society, in commenting on Dr. Campbell's utterance, admitted that Cardinal Manning used the words quoted, but denied that he used them as his own, showing that the Cardinal was supposing a reply by the Pope to the King of Italy over the latter's claim to the Pope's allegiance to him as an Italian subject. The Catholic Truth Society, in taking up the matter, accepted the press reports and proceeded on the assumption that they were correct. Representatives of that society wrote to Dr. Campbell, first privately and then publicly, calling his statement in question on that basis. Dr. Campbell made no response to them. Should he not at once have notified them that all the published reports of his remarks were so grossly incorrect? Or, if he did not wish to notice the Catholic Truth Society, should he not in simplest justice to the public, so misled, have immediately asked a correction from the press? Dr. Campbell did neither.

After much delay, several weeks indeed, he made a statement. This statement was only to the effect that he would vindicate the assertions he had made on Nov. 6. He did not say that he had never made the assertions credited to him; he simply said that he would vindicate his assertions. If he had never made the assertions, why not say so? If the assertions he made on Nov. 6 were simply those admitted by the Catholic Truth Society, where was the need of the vindication? But Dr. Campbell reserved himself until Thursday night—nearly four months after his original deliverance—and then instead of the proof which the public reasonably expected of a supposed statement that Cardinal Manning said so and so, Dr. Campbell for the first time informs the public that the reporters had been wrong four months before.

Rev. Dr. Campbell is a fair sample of the no-Popery lecturer. All of this class maintain their cause by bare-faced mendacity.

### THE CHURCH IN GERMANY.

There seems to be now no doubt of the speedy return of the Jesuits to Germany, whence they have been excluded by the rigid laws enacted against them under Bismarck's iron regime. Herr Richter and the Freisinnige party have intimated their intention to vote for the repeal of the law, and the Catholic party in the Reichstag will at an early date introduce a bill for the purpose of its repeal.

It is not long since Chancellor Von Caprivi declared that the Government will never consent to the abrogation, but it is known that they have modified their views very much, owing to the greatly increased influence of the Catholics of the Empire, as well as to the liberal views now entertained by the Emperor towards Catholics. To these motives for the change of policy of the Government must be added the fact that it has become evident that the Government have found out that the Army Bill cannot be passed in the Reichstag without the vote of the Catholic party, which is the strongest and most coherent party in that Chamber. As the Government are most anxious that this bill should be passed, they have a strong motive for conciliating the Catholics; and as they were never seriously of opinion that the Jesuits are a noxious order, they are the more ready to depart from the hostile attitude they formerly assumed towards that illustrious body of missionaries and educators.

This persecuting law against the Jesuits, which was originally due to Bismarck's expressed wish to check the progress of the Catholic Church, and thoroughly to Protestantize the German Empire, was kept up for the purpose of satisfying the Lutheran and Calvinistic hatred of the Jesuits even after it became evident that the wonderful increase of Catholic influence was not thereby lessened, and that a continuous anti-Catholic policy is not