

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
AT THE
OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING AGENTS:
Messrs. Patrick Mungovan, C. N. Murphy,
C. J. Kernahan and L. O'Byrne.

THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1894.

Calendar for the Week.

July 26—St. Anne, Mother of the Blessed Virgin.
27—St. Veronica Juliana.
28—St. Nazarius and Celinus and Companions Martyrs.
29—Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost.
30—St. Martha, Virgin.
31—St. Ignatius Loyola, Confessor.
Aug. 1—St. Peter in Chains.

Baptist Belief.

Rev. Dr. McArthur, one of the foremost Baptists present at their Convention in Toronto, gives to a reporter a summary of belief. We were surprised to hear a few points of opinion which he advanced, but as he speaks in the plural, he has probably stated the general belief of Baptists correctly.

He objects strenuously to creeds, including the Apostle's, the Nicene, and the Athanasian. He denies Apostolicity of either origin or doctrine to the Apostle's creed, and objects to the words "descended into hell" and "I believe in the communion of saints;" the Nicene creed is called a compromise, and the Athanasian little short of blasphemous in its conclusion.

We had thought that the Apostle's Creed, at least, was free from the fulminations of the nineteenth century Lutherans. It is the most venerable confession of faith which the Christian Church possesses, and has been for centuries a standard of orthodoxy even to heretics. But its time was sure to come. Every new generation of Protestants has to exercise its right of protesting against some fresh point of Christian belief, and now they attack landmarks, of faith which stand, like imperishable obelisks, pointing the way to heaven. The proofs for an apostolic origin of the first Creed are much stronger than Dr. MacArthur's in rebuttal. As Luther threw away an epistle with the lucid explanation "It is an epistle of straw," so the Reverend Doctor flings aside the proofs, saying they are merely "statements of a romancer named Rufinus." It is safe to say that a man lies, when he is no longer alive to combat your opinion, but this method of shifting the argument is neither scholarly nor convincing. All Christian antiquity agrees in the belief concerning the apostolic origin of the Creed; and though, it is not a point of faith, we prefer to accept the statements of the old Fathers in the faith to believing the almost glib assertion of Dr. MacArthur.

The phrase "descended into hell" does not mean "was dead and buried," else why repeat the same idea? St. Peter tells us that Christ "preached to those who were in prison," or, as every Catholic child knows, the souls who were waiting until His death should procure them entrance into heaven. But this sounds too much

like Purgatory, so it must be explained away. The doctrine of the Communion of Saints rests on the same authority as the rest of the Creed. It has been said that Protestants form their creed first and then go text-hunting in the Scriptures for proofs, but here we see them rejecting portions of the Apostolic formula because they do not harmonize with their professed beliefs. As for the other creeds, Dr. MacArthur may consider the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Confession as blasphemous—it suffices for us if God does not. We were surprised, however, to hear that the Nicene Creed was a compromise. It gives us less faith in the Doctor's knowledge of history. The whole fight between Arians and Catholics raged about the word "homoousios," or "consubstantial," or the "same in substance as the Father," and all the former creeds which were proposed as compromises were rejected by the assembled fathers.

As they thus reject creeds it may be justly inferred that they are content to substitute opinion for faith, as faith is the acceptance of truth on the authority of a superior. In fact, this is virtually acknowledged. He says: "We Baptists stand in this attitude. We have unquestioning faith in Truth. We do not ask whether it be new or old, but 'Is it true?' . . . We are open, in an unusual degree, to all new thought. We do not accept it because it is new; but we strive to accept it because it is true, and if it is Truth we accept it, wherever it may come from." If he refers to religious truth, it is a confession of having no faith. He has already reached the goal whither Dr. Brownson said Protestantism is rapidly going—that of unbelief in religious formula. We scarcely perceive how a man can call himself Christian, and look for his religious belief to the discoveries or inventions of the present. Catholics have been accused of making additions to the deposit of faith; and yet we maintain that the faith of Christ was revealed by Him once and forever, and no additions or mutations can be made by man. This is the true principle of Faith.

Dr. MacArthur says of his own co-religionists: "If it is truth we accept it"—that is, if they think it is truth. But this is not Faith; it is simply opinion. Faith is an act of real worship; it is a submission of the intellect to truth, because God says it is true. It thus becomes, as St. Paul says, "the evidence of things not seen." This real Faith is not a stultification of intellect, as some have said. The Catholic first assures himself that God has spoken, and on the authority of the All-wise has more grounds of conviction than almost any other basis of certainty. Our Protestant friends may look at the matter in any light they please—they will find that real, living Faith is found only in the Catholic Church, and that outside that faith are found only diverse opinions, most of which, since truth is one, must of necessity be false and misleading.

The division on the second reading of the Evicted Tenants' bill showed a vote of 259 for the bill and 227 against it. The announcement of the result was greeted with prolonged cheers from the Government benches.

Is Home Rule a Curse?

The *Toronto Mail* is, seemingly, as deeply interested in the welfare of Ireland as in the honour and good name of the Catholic Church and her Priests and Prelates. Thus, while it unceasingly and without any solicitation points out to Priests and Bishops the course of action or inaction on their part that would redound most to the credit and advantage of Catholicity, it warns all Irishmen against advocating or helping on the cause of Home Rule for Ireland. The *Mail* would change the whole system of Education and Church establishment in the Province of Quebec; and by starving the Priests and Bishops, and stopping all work of improvement in schools and churches, bring back the French Canadians who are earning from two to five dollars a-day in the manufacturing towns and cities of New England.

The *Mail's* unsolicited advice anent Church matters in Canada is just as absurd and insulting as its dogmatizing remarks about Home Rule. The whole country, it maintains, would be exposed to faction fights and domineering of priestly authority, "while capital would be driven out of the kingdom and all industries would come to an end." We can assure the *Mail* and its friends that there would be no more quarrelling for supremacy in Ireland under Home Rule than there is in Canada—probably not quite so much. Here the opposing parties are about equal in strength and numbers, and bitter contests, as in the late election, are unavoidable. In Ireland they are but nine against seventy, and the probability is that the next general election will reduce the minority to a body guard of two.

One thing the *Mail* may rely upon is the utter impossibility of an appeal ever being made in Ireland to the religious passions or prejudices of the electorate. Such may occur in a few counties in Ulster, where Protestantism reigns supreme; but in all the rest of Ireland an appeal to religious passions would be frowned down by all, both Priests and people. What the *Mail-Meredith* Party has undertaken at four different elections in this Province could not be attempted even once in Ireland. The promoters of such a scheme would be universally condemned and ruled for ever out of the political arena.

The argument about capital leaving the country and industries being allowed to perish under Home Rule is most untenable, as it is most absurd. Is the *Mail* blind to the facts that ever since the accursed Union was proclaimed, capital has been leaving the country, and in consequence, with very few exceptions, all industries have already perished? The landlords either lived out of Ireland or they went to Paris, Florence and Monte Carlo to squander Ireland's capital every year, without exception, for a whole century. The Derbys, the Osbornes, the Clanricardes, the Bloomfields, and all the rest to whose forefathers the best land was all donated by Cromwell or King William or Elizabeth—all these estates and earls live riotously and in luxury upon the hard earnings of the Irish farmer, who pays enormous rack rents, and

can scarce keep his family in decency or the house over his head.

But all must change with Home Rule. When the tiller of the soil becomes proprietor of the land upon which he lives the earnings must all stop at home, capital must accumulate and industries will be fostered, and peace and contentment bless the land that makes its own laws and works out its own destinies.

Dr. Barnardo's "Popish Plot."

Most Canadians are familiar with the name of Dr. Barnardo, the gentleman who, for some years past, has been making Canada a dumping-ground for the refuse pauper lads of London. Catholics may have seen his name in connection with the famous case which resulted from his having perverted and deported a Catholic boy, whom he was unable to find when the lad's mother demanded her son. He now appears in a new role, scarcely more honorable than any of the others. In order to raise money for his Home he sent out stirring appeals in the usual Exeter Hall style, stating that a "Popish Plot" had been formed to buy the property adjoining him in order to establish a Catholic Sisterhood as rivals to his work. If £7,000 were not immediately forthcoming the Doctor would have to abandon his work, which is such a gain to London and such a glory to the righteous. An ordinary appeal for charity does not always open the pocket-books of John Bull; but when coupled with a great and original "Popish Plot," the effect was magical, and the money came rolling in.

In the meantime, the *Tablet* began to make inquiries, and found that the Doctor was either deceiver or deceived. He refused to answer the *Tablet's* charges, even when called on to do so by Mr. Hoare, M.P., who is a friend of the institution. Mr. Labouchere, with his usual hatred of shams, took up the case in *Truth* and urged Barnardo either to give the public a satisfactory explanation to the *Tablet's* charges or refund the money which he had received from his Protestant friends. The good man, thus persecuted, preserved a holy silence, merely stating that the charges were "puerile," that his lawyer and his friends advised him not to answer them, and that "no man's honor requires a defence against an attack in *Truth*." Labouchere returned to the attack, mildly but persistently, and asked why, if the charge is "puerile," did Dr. Barnardo hold so many councils concerning it; whether it is a "puerile" affair to get £7,000, even innocently, under false pretences; also whether Dr. Barnardo included the *Tablet*, the *London Times*, and the *Standard* under the class of papers from an attack in which no man's honor requires defence. But still the unworthy man keeps his peace, and incidentally, the £7,000. This sum will go far to console him under the assault of the unrighteous.

No person can accuse Dr. Barnardo directly of having concocted this story himself. It is charity to suppose that he was deceived. But he has erred against the two cardinal virtues of