

copalians in England and Presbyterians in Scotland. On Holy Thursday of last year (1901) her Majesty the present Queen—as reported in the papers at the time—received communion according to the Lutheran rite with the Danish Royal Family at Christianborg.

### Changed Conditions.

The notable ceremonies that took place a few days ago in Westminster Abbey led us to make a passing reference in a recent issue to the enormous change which has been wrought in the relations of royalty to the people by the general abandonment of the principle of personal rule. It is a long stride, not in time, but in progress, back to the days when Louis XIV., as a boy, wrote, line after line, in a large, straggling hand the following lesson set him by his tutor: 'Homage is due to kings; they do what they like'; and when, in later years, he appeared before his Parliament and said: 'I am the State'; and when he detailed the following direction for the guidance of his grandson, the Duke of Burgundy: 'The nation is not corporate in France: it lives entirely in the person of the king.' On another occasion, a number of Louis's courtiers were detailing in his presence some examples of the absolute power which the Sultans of Turkey exercised over their subjects. 'That,' exclaimed the autocratic monarch, 'is as it should be; that is really reigning.'

\*

It was such absolute rule that Elizabeth Stuart (daughter of James I. of England) had in her mind's eye when she successfully urged her wavering husband, the Elector Palatine Frederick V. to accept the Crown of Bohemia. She loved the royal style and title; but she loved still more dearly the power which was associated with it in those days. 'You would not,' said she to Frederick, 'have married a king's daughter if you had not the courage to become yourself a king.' 'To reign is glorious,' said she to him again, 'were it only for a moment.' But Frederick gauged the situation more accurately, and was not so greatly attracted by the glint of barren titles. 'If I accept,' said he 'I shall be accused of ambition; if I decline, of cowardice. Decide as I may, peace is over for me and my country.' At his wife's urgent pleadings he accepted the empty honor of a shaky throne. It was a fatal step, that involved him in a death-grapple with the Emperor of Germany, and cost him not alone the crown that he had reached out his hand to seize, but his safe hereditary electorate as well. An idea similar to that of the ambitious Elizabeth Stuart seems to have worked its way into the brain-cells of the First Napoleon. When he was playing the part of another Warwick the King-maker and disposing of crowns to his relatives and friends, he urged that of Holland upon his brother Louis. Louis pleaded ill-health as an excuse for declining the honor. Napoleon answered: 'Better die a king than live a prince.'

### In England.

In England the change from an absolute monarchy to limited personal rule and from that to present conditions was effected by slow and painful degrees. It is said that George I.—who 'hated all Boets and Bainters'—was greatly disillusioned when he found, after reaching England, that there were, for the times, pretty rigid limits to the exercise of the royal authority. He is alleged to have phrased his disappointment in the following way. 'This,' said he, 'is a strange country. The first morning after my arrival in St. James's I looked out of my window and saw a park with walks, a canal, etc., which they told me were mine. The next day Lord Chetwynd, the ranger of my park, sent me a fine brace of carp out of my canal, and I was told that I must give five guineas to Lord Chetwynd's servant for bringing my own carp out of my canal in my own park.' The second George held a more liberal view of the position of a king in a constitutional government. 'In this country,' said he, 'Ministers are king.' The statement was a bit overdrawn, but it served its immediate purpose of drawing an 'odorous' comparison between the comparative freedom that existed in England under Parliamentary institutions and the condition to which Germany was reduced under the petty despotism that prevailed there. The Third George was, on occasion, 'as stubborn as an allegory on the banks of the Nile.' His obstinacy resulted in the foolish legislation that led to the War of American Independence. He set his face with the hardness of flint against Catholic emancipation. He said in reference to the subject: 'I can quit my palace and live in a cottage; I can lay my head on a block and lose my life; but I cannot break my oath.' We have already seen how the days of personal rule ended with William IV., and that a new era in the history of British royalty was ushered in with the accession of the late Queen Victoria. And her tactful recognition of the limitations of her office, as well as her personal qualities, did much to consolidate the throne of England at a time when those of other countries were tottering to their fall.

### A Dignified Rebuke.

Our Melbourne and Sydney cables of a few weeks ago let us know that the 12th of July was not allowed to pass in those centres without the usual Orange eruptions and though the messages contained little detail sufficient was said to indicate that the Orange orators had been more than usually coarse and violent and had literally 'gone the whole hog' in their denunciations of the Church. We now learn that the conduct at these meetings was so outrageous that all religions were more or less brought into disrepute by such an exhibition, and Archbishop Carr accordingly deemed it his duty to draw public attention to the unchristian and anti-social character of the Orange utterances and to administer to the bigots a dignified and effective rebuke. The Archbishop selected as the occasion for his reference to the matter the issue of a Pastoral Letter in connection with the annual collection for Peter's Pence in which, after alluding to the personality and life-work of the Pope and to his masterly refutation—in his recent great Encyclical—of the many calumnies urged against the Church, his Grace proceeds to refer specifically to the recent 'Orange attacks.'

\*

We make one or two brief extracts. 'The same calumnies,' said his Grace, 'which were refuted in the encyclical of the Holy Father they had repeated amongst themselves during the past week. That they should be repeated by men who sought notoriety by abuse of the Catholic Church they need not be surprised. But what Catholics had a right to complain of was that those men should profane the Gospel of peace and of charity by quoting texts to suit their evil purposes. Let them appeal to some Draconian code in justification of their uncharitable and unchristian hatred and calumnies, but let them spare the letter and the spirit of the Holy Bible from the profanation of such association. They had a right to complain, too, that reputable citizens lent the sanction of their name and presence to proceedings which, even if they were not so wanting in truth and charity, were so demoralising as to greatly lower the standard of public decency and propriety.' His Grace acknowledges that there may be some who are sincere in this public opposition to the Church but for the most part they fail to see the true inwardness of the agitation in which they are engaged. 'No doubt,' he says, 'there are some who honestly believe that there is something to be feared from the Catholic Church, and therefore that it is well each year to assemble and demonstrate against her.'

They do not advert that many of the orators are making political capital out of these demonstrations, and that to produce any effect they have to appeal to the lowest passions of their audience, or go back to ancient times and ancient feuds, and try to fasten the odium of these on the Catholic Church. But they can produce nothing certain, nothing tangible, nothing present, beyond their own unfounded suspicions and vague uncharitable charges.'

\*

This last sentence really contains the pith of the whole matter. In all this din and hubbub against the Church which is periodically made by the Orange organisations they produce 'nothing certain, nothing tangible, nothing present,' nothing the truth or falsity of which can be promptly tested here and now. For the rest it need only be said that Dr. Carr's whole letter was, both in its matter and in its spirit, a model of what such an utterance should be, full indeed of loyalty to principle and to conviction, but full also of Christian charity, courtesy, and forbearance.

### The Fortune-Tellers and the Coronation

'Young man,' said Josh Billings, 'never prophesy, for if you are right no one will remember it, and if you are wrong, no one will forget it.' A successful prophecy on the subject of a king's coronation, however, would undoubtedly stand a good chance of being remembered, and it is not surprising, therefore, to find that superstitious people generally and the race of prophets in particular disregarded the humorist's sage advice and were for some considerable time prior to the consummation of the great ceremony of Saturday freely scattering predictions as to the fate in store for King Edward in relation to his Coronation. Whatever interest was felt in such utterances naturally centred in the vaticinations of the professional prophets, and it is rather remarkable that amongst these there appears to have been something like a unanimous verdict that the King would never be crowned, a gypsy, a London palmist, and a Parisian fortune-teller all being credited with having foretold that Edward VII. would die before the day of his Coronation.

\*

Popular feeling in London appears to have been sufficiently interested in the matter to make the Paris correspondent of *The Times* think it worth his while to interview the famous fortune-teller, Mme. de Thèbes, and inquire whether she had been one of those who had given utterance to these doleful premonitions. The lady was good enough to give him the