

whereas he might have charged a large sum elsewhere, to show us that, while he is successful, he still remembers his poorer brethren." Father Vaughan then shook my hand heartily, as I was still in my boxing costume, and I thanked him and the spectators as best I could in a short speech for the very generous reception they accorded me.

It is thus clear that there was no Cardinal Vaughan upon the scene, no 'brutal contest,' and no 'blessing.' Burns concludes his letter by 'deploring the fact that such bigotry exists in a civilised community.' We take no stock in prize-fighting, although we should like to see every youth trained in 'the noble art' of self-defence. But the Burns-Batley 'knock-out' should teach even such inapt pupils as Grands, Semi-Grands, and Double-Grands this 'wisdom' of Sancho Panza: 'Let every man take care what he talks, or how he writes, of other men, and not set down at random, hab-nab, higgledy-piggledy, whatever comes into his noddle.'

The Eucharistic Congress

A short time ago the *London Daily Telegraph* wrote as follows on the 'hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great English Cardinal' (Manning): 'The change which has taken place (in England) in the last quarter of a century is symbolic of much more than the passing away of a particular controversy. The principle of religious toleration, theoretically established long ago, has only within recent years become so much part and parcel of our accustomed mental attitude as to be accepted without complaint or demur.'

We recognise the rights of conscience. We admit the claims of the Roman Catholic body to be guided by priests of their own persuasion. Above all, we discover that the power of the Jesuit in our land is not so mysterious or so all-pervasive as to threaten the stability of the English Church. In this better mood we are able to judge with greater kindness the characters of the Churchmen whose secession to Rome so greatly alarmed the public. This is, no doubt, true. But progress is a motion compounded of many. And in the grand march of religious toleration in England, the rearguard is still far behind, and groups of nondescript camp-followers are still glued to the spot where they sat and clamored against Catholic Emancipation in 1828. They live in another day. The world has moved away from them. But their inflammability is still a 'keeping' quality, and a little spark of circumstance may send them off in whirling Catherine-wheels of sputtering passion, as it did during the strenuous No-Popery times of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act of 1851.

During the past week this combustible element was fired by the notable measure of public attention which was attracted by the sittings, the splendid ceremonial, and the importance of the leading personnel, of the International Eucharistic Congress in London. The particular spark of circumstances which set them alight was the proposal to have a Eucharistic procession in the streets adjoining the new Westminster Cathedral. Two arguments—each in fiery speech—were advanced against this familiar act of religious worship of old-time Catholic England. One was this: that it is 'superstitious and idolatrous.' The other was, practically, the argument of the horse-pond: the protesters predicted a riot—which was an indirect way of suggesting one. But, as Bacon says, there are some people so constituted that they are ready to 'set a house on fire and it were to roast their eggs.'

The appeal to the King—on the plea that the great central act of worship of the Christ's Eucharistic Presence is 'superstitious and idolatrous' brings forcibly before the public mind a 'relic of barbarism' that still disgraces the English statute-book. We refer to the foul insult which the British Sovereign is 'by law required to fling, on his accession, at his Catholic subjects—and at them alone, of all the varied creeds within the vast domain over which he rules. He is called upon

to single out their worship and to fix upon it the foul stigma of 'superstitious and idolatrous.' This radical departure from the form and substance of the old English accession oath was introduced after the Revolution of 1688, when William of Orange and Mary came to the throne. For the first time in history, the word 'Protestant' was then inserted in the oath. The Sovereigns promised to 'maintain the Protestant religion established by law.' By the Bill of Rights (enacted in October, 1689) it was provided, says Macaulay, that every English Sovereign should in full Parliament and at the coronation repeat and subscribe the Declaration against Transubstantiation. This was drawn up by the Puritans in 1643; it was passed by Parliament in the days of Charles II., in 1673, in order to exclude Catholics from every office, both civil and military, under the Crown; it was imposed, in an extended form, upon members of Parliament, for the same purpose, in 1678; and by the Bill of Rights it was forced upon the wearer of the Crown. The interest in this evil relic of the penal days is revived by the paper read at the Eucharistic Congress by Viscount Llandaff. The oath runs as follows:—

'I, A. B., by the grace of God, King (or Queen) of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God; profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.'

This studiously insulting and atrocious oath was the product of a period that, of all others in English history, was splashed with geysers and water-spouts of sectarian passion. It was, too, a period in which but little regard was paid to the sanctity of an oath; a period in which even a solemn treaty (that of Limerick) was violated 'ere the ink wherewith 'twas writ could dry'; a period in which articles of capitulation were again and again violated by the Puritan Parliament; a period whose laxity in regard to sworn promise or assertion was 'pinked' by Samuel Butler in the following lines of *Hudibras*:—

'Oaths are but words, and words but wind,
Too feeble implements to bind,
And hold with deeds proportion so,
As shadows to a substance do.'

Hence the word—even the oath—of the King was to be doubted, and he was obliged (says Bridgett in his *English Coronation Oath*) to 'multiply phrases that he was not equivocating, nor guilty of evasion, nor dispensed to lie, and the rest.' Queen Anne was the first to take this barbarous oath. It has been imposed upon every British Sovereign since her day.

It was taken by King Edward VII. on his accession only. The strong feeling manifested against this 'relic of barbarism' by Catholics and fair-minded Protestants, and by great public bodies, throughout the Empire led to its revision by a Select Committee in 1901. The following amended form was enacted by

'Cock o' the North' Pure Ceylon Tea is as full of delightful satisfaction as an egg is of meat!

The tea that gained a Gold Medal at the Paris Exhibition is 'Maharajah XXXX,' 2s. 'Hondai Lanka.'