

in a society for good works, which now counts over four hundred active members. On April 19, 1874, Brother Joseph was elected Assistant Director of the Institute, and he left his beloved occupation to live in the Mother House. Brother Joseph is devoted heart and soul to the cause of Christian education."

BELGIAN LIBERALISM.

The Ottawa Free Press, in its issue of the 10th inst., stated:

"The clerical reactionaries in Belgium have nearly run to the end of their tether. They obtained power by promising to lessen the taxes on spirits and tobacco which the Liberals had increased, and then used their position to change the educational system which the masses regarded as a fixture. This statement of facts gives another complexion altogether to the movement, which some sectarian journals in this country sought to circulate. The tampering with the educational laws had the effect of coalescing the various wings of the Liberal party and brought about such a popular uprising that at the recent communal election Liberal victories were won in even places which had not known Liberal councillors for twenty years past."

The writer of these lines is either hopelessly governed by prejudice, or entirely ignorant of the real state of affairs in Belgium. The issue before the electorate of Belgium last summer, was freedom of conscience as brute force in the all important matter of education. The so-called Liberal administration, which came into power in 1878, had inaugurated the brute-force system. The sacred rights of conscience were ruthlessly invaded by their school law, the true purpose and intent of which was to dechristianize the rising generation of Belgians. So deep and intense a feeling of indignation did the passage of this law create that it was termed by the masses, for whom the Free Press is so solicitous, La loi de malheur and a firm determination seized upon the Catholic majority of the nation to drive the men from power who had devised and carried out so iniquitous a project. The electoral campaign of 1884 was fought out on this issue. The radicals were beaten. They have taken their defeat with bad grace, nay, even succeeded in frightening the king himself, who has, alas for royalty, proved himself devoid of that fortitude that is the monarch's highest attribute. Of one thing the Free Press may rest assured, radicalism cannot rule Belgium. It may obtain momentary triumphs, but these triumphs inflict more injury on the victors than the vanquished. We quite understand our contemporary's allusion to sectarian journals. If there be any paper in the Dominion which has proven itself sectarian in the worst sense of that term it is the Free Press.

THE QUEBEC CABINET.

Our readers will remember that we lately advocated the appointment of a respected Protestant gentleman to the Lieutenant-Governorship of Quebec. We did so out of regard for the feelings of the minority in that Province. Since Mr. Masson's appointment rumors of impending changes in the Provincial ministry have gained ground. One of these rumors is to the effect that Messrs. Lynch and Robertson, of the present Cabinet, are to retire for Messrs. Beaubien and Wurtele, whereas the Montreal correspondent of the Globe waxes wrath:

"The contemplated change in the Local Cabinet, and the threatened wiping out of the English representation, is creating more stir among the English Protestants of both parties than some people think. Mr. Lynch is to be provided as soon as possible with Mr. Schillier's place as the Clerk of the Crown. The latter does not look like a dying man, so his superannuation is now talked of, as the registrarship of Waterloo, which Mr. Lynch was to have had, has gone to a French Canadian, and Mr. Lynch must have a place for his fidelity to his party. Mr. Robertson does not care how soon he is replaced, as he has got all he wants for his Quebec Central Railway, and there is little honour now in holding the Treasurership of this bankrupt Province. Speaking to a leading politician to day, your correspondent was surprised to hear him—well knowing his broad liberal views—express himself in favour of only giving the English Protestants one seat in the Cabinet, because a few of the English constituencies in the Eastern Townships are being depleted of their English votes through the farmers going West and French Canadians taking their places. The English Liberals, however, will not, it is asserted, submit to this should their party come into power at the next elections. They will insist upon two representatives."

Messrs. Lynch and Robertson may, indeed, as the worthy correspondent seems to think, be retired, but not with the result he speaks of. Mr. Wurtele is a Protestant, and will, in any change that may take place, have a Protestant colleague. According to population the English-speaking Protestants of Quebec are entitled to but one representative in the Cabinet. They have always, however, had two. The Globe correspondent has nothing to say on behalf of the Irish Catholics of the Province, a numerous and respectable body who have had no representation in the Cabinet of Quebec since confederation. The Hon. John Hearn or Mr. Carbery, who both have seats in the Legislature, are fitted for the position. But if neither of these gentlemen is available, there are surely many others in the

Province from which to choose. The Protestant minority of Quebec has always, in regard of the claims of English-speaking Catholics there, pursued a very narrow, selfish, and ungenerous course. There have been honorable exceptions amongst them, but we speak of them as a body, and tell them plainly what we think. Their claims to the Lieutenant-Governorship had, we feel assured, met with more general approval had their course been otherwise.

CAMPBELL ON GALILEO.

The East Middlesex teachers' Association meeting in this city last week was made the occasion of an unlooked-for display of bigotry on the part of a gentleman from whom we had expected better things. Dr. Campbell, chairman of the City Board of Education, having been invited to read a paper before the Association, selected as his subject "A Great Italian Teacher." Our contemporary, the Advertiser, assures us that this was one of the most interesting, instructive and finished lectures with which the association has ever been favored. If perversion of fact be interesting, bigoted narrative instructive, and ignorance of historical teaching, a proof of finish, we are quite prepared to concur in the Advertiser's appreciation of Dr. Campbell's effort. But, as these are not the generally accepted groundwork of legitimate commendation, we must administer the doctor a little treatment that cannot fail to be of some benefit to him. Believing, as he does, in the adage similia similibus curantur, he may not, of course, admit that darkness is to be dispelled by enlightenment, but he will, no doubt, confess that where a little light has entered, a little more can do no harm. We regret that we have not before us a full report of Dr. Campbell's discourse. The meagre summary given in the daily press fails to give our readers a just idea of this gentleman's ignorance of history or malevolent distortion of the facts it records, and the teaching it conveys. According to the Advertiser report the "great teacher," the central figure of the lecture, was Galileo:

"An interesting picture of Italy at the beginning of the seventeenth century was drawn; the social and intellectual condition of the people in the day of the country's great pride was described, and the aesthetic influences of the time were set forth. He referred to the childhood of Galileo, and next to the condition of medical learning in the Middle Ages, and Galileo's experience as a medical student. As showing the bent of his mind and character, the lecturer mentioned the fact that Galileo studied Euclid two months by listening at a classroom keyhole. It was pointed out that children ought to be taught especially in those departments for which they have the natural ability and taste. He argued that the best teacher was he who could individualize most, and then traced onward the development of Galileo's mind, noting his progress in mathematics, astronomy and the physical sciences. Galileo, as a teacher at Padua, attracted thousands of students, including princes and nobles, and his work was characterized by earnestness and enthusiasm. Allusion was made to the profound sensation created by his astronomical discoveries, to his espousal and advocacy of the Copernican philosophy, which was met by the combined opposition and persecution of the church and the quasi scientists of the day. The Inquisitorial Council declared that the stability of the sun and the diurnal revolution of the earth were false and absurd, and heretical in religion, and compelled Galileo to renounce his heterodoxy. His forced retirement gave him leisure to prepare his famous dialogue between the philosophers, and the elevation of his friend to the Papal chair the opportunity to publish it. The dialogue fell like a bombshell. Old Galileo was led to the dungeon door, and there solemnly abjured the heresy that the world moves. Throughout the lecture was interspersed and pointed with most useful and practical observations for teachers. He pointed out that the great truths of history do not conflict with the truths of revelation, and in conclusion said: For two centuries and a half the story of Galileo's life has told the world of the weakness of falsehood and the strength of truth, of the feebleness of man as well as of his power; of what the human mind can do when seeking right and doing right, and how the human mind can fail when bigotry and ignorance direct its course. Happy we, if we but learn from history to avoid the blunders men have made; to shun their evil ways and gain wisdom from their follies; to emulate their virtues, and read the lessons their lives can teach, and where they have wisely laid foundations deep and strong to build thereon better than they could build."

The doctor's whole contention may be summed up to convey (1) the idea that Italy in the Middle Ages, that is to say when it was most Catholic, was retrogressive and its people debased; (2) the belief that Galileo was persecuted by the Church because of his learning and discoveries, and (3) create the impression that the Church was then the enemy of learning and progress. Now, as the Catholic Church is an unchanging body, if it were in the Middle Ages the enemy of learning and progress, it is likewise so at the present time. This we cheerfully concede. But those who have read history without prejudice know that the Church was then the protector of science and that science has nowhere, as Cardinal Wiseman has it, "flourished more, or

originated more sublime or useful discoveries than where it has been pursued under the influence of the Catholic religion." Cardinal Wiseman, it will even by the East Middlesex teachers be admitted, knew as much of Italy as does Dr. Campbell. He had at least acquired the attainments of that gentleman in so far as historical research and argumentative skill are concerned. He had never held the distinguished post of Chairman of a City Board of Education, nor yet could he point to the honor of having addressed a paper to an East Middlesex teachers' association. But he was for all that an able man, an accomplished scholar, and a finished logician. The Cardinal, once addressing a gathering of Englishmen, employed language which conveys some wholesome truths it were well for Dr. Campbell, and those who think with him, to bear in mind:

"When, then, we see that Italy, where the Catholic religion has the greatest influence, has discovered the laws of motion both in solids and fluids, whether by gravitation or projection; the orbits of the principal planets, their satellites and other appendages; that it has produced lenses, the telescope, the microscope, the barometer, the thermometer, the pendulum, the lock, the theory of canals, the correction of the calendar, the best catalogue of the stars, electricity, and, I may add, clocks, which were first put up in Italian monasteries, and the compass, perfected at last by Flavio Gioja in 1302—when I add likewise that the whole of your banking and commercial system, of which the very name of Lombard street leaves us a monument, is of Italian origin, I think we really may say that Italy has done its full share, has well discharged its duty towards science, and has contributed in fact as much as any country in Europe to great, and important, to both scientific and practical inventions and discoveries. Now, what is the moral that I wish to draw from all this? I think nothing is more dangerous to us, to our real prosperity, to our moral integrity, or to our social interests, than a tone of proud and supercilious superiority which we are too much inclined to assume. I allude not to what individuals feel, but I have observed that those who address the people, the masses, the great body of society, too often do so in a flattering tone, and even directly teach them to exalt themselves above the inhabitants of every other country. Now I think humility is a national and social quite as much as a personal virtue. I own it is painful for me to hear the people always addressed as though their first duty was self-esteem, and self-admiration, as though we were the wonders of creation for the progress we have made in science, and the great discoveries which are supposed to raise us in the scale of existence above all others. The very name of an Italian or Spaniard, as connected with anything scientific, provokes a jeer or a smile. I have observed lately and have observed with pain, in reading addresses to assemblies like this, how boastful and supercilious they are, and how cheers are gladly elicited by contemptuous, though incorrect allusions to other countries. This does us no credit; for I think we may safely say, that always and everywhere true genius is ever modest, real superiority is always generous, and genuine science is at all times just (appreciative); on the contrary, the public acquainted with what others are doing, and with what others have accomplished, will show no ready to give them their true measure of praise; and thus we may also keep ourselves in useful and wholesome rivalry, not assuming superiority, but striving to attain it."

He had, just before administering this telling castigation to narrow pride and prejudicial assumption, disposed of the Galileo slander with a thoroughness so effective that we commend it to Dr. Campbell's attention:

"It is possible, that in the minds of some of my audience, there has been lurking an objection, and that they are prepared to say, 'You have spoken of Galileo, of his discoveries, and of his science; but you have said nothing of his prison and his torture, nor of the Inquisition, and of the manner in which the Church crushed his discoveries, and put shackles on his painfully interesting subject but I will refer you to the fifth volume of the Dublin Review, for July 1833,—where you will find a most able paper on this very subject. It was written by the late lamented Dr. Cooper. You will find the whole question investigated there both of Galileo's treatment and of the ground of his sentence. Let me just add a few observations. Galileo was 70 years old before what is called his persecution really commenced, i. e. before he was formally condemned. Now, during his many preceding years, he had not been called to account for any of these discoveries which he had made; but, on the contrary, when he went to Rome, he showed his discoveries, was highly honored, and Cardinal Barberini wrote poems upon him conceived in the most eulogistic strains. The popular assertion that he was imprisoned and cruelly treated, is justly and honorably given up by Dr. Whewell, who contents himself with denying the right of the Church to interfere in philosophical questions. Our Protestant writers of note have likewise acknowledged the falsehood of popular opinion. And now as to the question between him and the Inquisition. Galileo taught the system which had been openly taught in Rome by Copernicus, and which he would have been allowed to teach on it, in an evil hour, he had not chosen to make it a theological question. When he came forward with that theory which he attempted to prove, but which, it is now agreed, he could not and did

not prove, as the exclusively true theory, and insisted that it should be so received as conformable to Scripture—the manner he began to take theological grounds that tribunal interfered. He was told again and again that he might as a philosopher hold his system as a theory. It was contended that there was no satisfactory demonstration of it; yet that when there was it would be time to interpret the scripture according to it. In fact the proof on which he mainly relied, a theory of the tides, is acknowledged to have been completely futile.—And Lalande observes that no real and satisfactory proof existed of the system till many years later. What was Galileo doing? He was insisting on the Church to adopt a system not demonstrable, and contradictory to the words of Holy Scripture, and he would have the scriptures bend to his theory rather than make his theory bend to the admitted view of the Holy Scriptures. Taking into account the times in which this happened, and the jealousy with which religious innovations were watched (and here it was no Catholic dogma but the truth of scripture that was involved); it is no wonder that a person thus pressing forward a theory which he could not demonstrate, should have been condemned to silence. Galileo then wrote a most sarcastic work, showing that he despised the sentence and then came that condemnation not by the Church, but by a tribunal, all the circumstances of which have been so unfairly exaggerated. Then, Galileo was never disturbed for anything which he really effected, nor for any of his discoveries for science, but simply for endeavoring to thrust an unproved opinion on the Church. This, I know, is a meagre outline of the case, but if you will look into the essay which I have mentioned, you will find it fully and minutely proved. I may add, that to the end of his life, many of his best friends were ecclesiastics, and some of them occupied high positions in the Church."

For any further information that gentleman may need on the subject, and he is painfully in need of much, we can direct him to the researches of an impartial Protestant, M. Mallet Dupan, of Geneva, author of a dissertation on the subject in the *Revue de France*, 17 Juillet, 1784; Bérault-Brocstet, *Histoire de l'Eglise*; and Bergier, *Dictionnaire de théologie*. We cannot conclude without an expression of our profound disapproval of the practice of turning these teachers' associations into anti-Catholic gatherings, which no good citizen should patronize. We respectfully submit that the time has come when the Minister of Education should step in to protect the Catholic minority from the insults of such men as the Chairman of the London School Board of Education.

THE PRIEST IN POLITICS.

On Sunday evening, the 9th inst., the Rev. Father Filatre, D. D., O. M. I., of the College of Ottawa, discoursed in the chapel of the Congregation of Men, in that city, on the subject of the rights of the priest in politics. The well-known reputation for learning and eloquence of the rev. lecturer gathered a large audience representative of every class at the capital. With clearness and precision Father Filatre dealt with his important subject, with the effect of satisfying his audience that the priest even more than any other citizen has the learning, the aptitude, and the necessary qualities to deal with political affairs in a manner profitable to the government of the country.

We need not mention that the question was treated from a lofty standpoint altogether above the narrowness of partisanship so often imported into such discussions. He clearly indicated that the exclusion of the priest from politics, in other words, the separation of Church and State, was one of the doctrines of Freemasonry condemned by the Holy See, and that the true Catholic principle should thus be stated—the priest has not only a right to take part in politics, but at times it is his bounden duty to do so. The reverend father, in support of this thesis, cited the authority of Holy Writ; "The lips of the priest shall guard science and from his mouth they shall learn the law." The Catholic priesthood being the legitimate heir and successor of that of the old law, has the same rights enjoyed by the latter. Besides, did not Jesus Christ himself commission his apostles in these words: Teach all nations—nations, and not alone individual men. The priest being, by his vocation, the defender of dogma and of morality, is often by duty bound to raise his voice in politics. The priest, moreover, possesses the qualities which the study of political questions in general require. He has patriotism, disinterestedness and learning. He has that theological science which more than all others develops the mind. By his very calling the priest is freed from the anxieties of family life. He is also protected against the temptations of fortune. Wont to expose himself at the death bed of the sick and to give himself up for souls, is he not ready, in the interest of good principles and of just government to make the sacrifice of his ease and pre-occupations for the public welfare? Father Filatre concluded his well-wrought discourse by rendering homage to the grand figure of Mgr. Freppel, who, in the French Chambers so courageously raises his voice in defence of Catholic rights and the maintenance of the true glory of the French nation.

PERSONAL.

His Lordship the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Bishop of London, left on Wednesday last for Baltimore, to attend the sessions of the Plenary Council in that city. His Lordship goes by special invitation to assist at this greatest and most significant church assemblage of the age, if we make one exception, that of the Council of the Vatican. He is accompanied by the Rev. Father Coffey, editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD. At Hamilton His Lordship was met by His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, the Most Rev. Dr. Carbery, Bishop of Hamilton, and the Most Rev. Dr. O'Mahoney, Bishop of Eudocia, i. p. i.

THAT FLOGGING.

The more close the examination into the conduct of Mr. Atty.-General Miller, of Manitoba, the more it is galling for that official. Brutal and high-handed conduct, such as he has proved himself guilty of, is fortunately rare among Canadian officials. Hence the indignation aroused in the city of Winnipeg and throughout the Province of Manitoba by Mr. Miller's flagrant disregard of decency and humanity. We last week cited the opinion of the Winnipeg Sittings on the subject. Our readers will, we know, bear with us if we favor them with the laceration which that journal in a later issue very properly administered Her Majesty's Attorney-General for Manitoba. The Sittings thus lays it on:

"Want of space and lack of time prevented us addressing you, Mr. James Miller, last week, as we should have liked to have done. We will endeavor to atone for our lapse of good manners this week and leave you nothing to wish for. And now, Mr. James Miller, Attorney-General of Manitoba, lend us your attention while we talk pleasantly, if at the same time a little familiarly with you. We believe that you are to day the best hated and disliked man in the city of Winnipeg and you have none to blame or thank for it but yourself. In your official capacity as an adviser of the Lieutenant Governor and a member of the Government you have to bear the blame of imposing upon the people of this particular portion of the Dominion an unwarranted indignity. With an absence of humanity difficult to conceive you not only had a miserable wretch flogged for doing what was natural under the circumstances, but you attended the execution of the sentence, and with a few choice friends gloated your eyes with the writhings and torture of the victim. Are there not dog and cock fights enough going on that you must lower your own and the dignity of the government by witnessing a jail flogging? So outrageous was your conduct felt to be, that upwards of five thousand citizens marched in orderly procession the night after the occurrence and denounced you and your conduct as both deserved to be denounced."

The Manitoba Free Press spoke the honest sentiments of the community when it declared:

"That for no greater offence than an effort to recover his liberty, under tempting circumstances, a prisoner in a common goal should be manacled, stripped to the skin in the midst of a snow storm, and layed in the presence of his fellow prisoners, and an appreciative group of semi-official onlookers is not to be tolerated at this stage of the world's history, even if the performance is directed by, and takes place under the distinguished patronage of the Hon. Attorney-General for Manitoba."

"The ears of British subjects have long been unfamiliar with the agonized shrieks of tortured prisoners, and judging from the echoes awakened in the hearts of the hearers by the sounds which on Thursday morning proceeded from the Provincial goal yard they are not likely to take kindly to the revival of such music, in Winnipeg at least. Brutal crimes, we believe, deserve adequate punishment; and no one would regret the restoration of the whipping-post for women beaters and assassins of defenceless childhood, but it is neither brutal, nor degraded, nor unnatural, for a prisoner to make a dash for liberty. It is all of these, however, and more, to abuse such a prisoner, as John McCormick was yesterday abused within the limits of this city."

"It is unnecessary to comment further at present on this heastly business; but we warn those responsible for it that the Bishop had better never occur again in Manitoba."

Mr. James Miller has, it appears, a constituency of one vote. That voter might do his country service, and certainly relieve Mr. Norquay of grave embarrassment by requesting the Attorney-General to resign. We do not believe that any constituency in the North-West will ever again send the Attorney-General to the Legislature. We commend the citizens of Winnipeg for their manly stand on behalf of outraged humanity. It speaks well for this new community that it should have entered such a protest against barbarism as will forever prevent the recurrence of the scenes reproached by the leading papers of the North-West.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

—The result of the Presidential contest is no longer a matter of doubt. A plurality of more than one thousand has been, by the official count, declared for Cleveland in New York. The electoral vote will therefore stand as we first announced, for Cleveland 219, for Blaine 182.

—The Scott Act has been carried in the county of Henfrew by a vote of 1,748 to 1,018. In Norfolk county

the majority for the Act was 1,178. These figures go very far, in our estimation, to show that public opinion in this country is ripening for some radical measure dealing with the liquor traffic.

—In reply to a correspondent of Hespeler, Ont., we beg to state that the Bishops of Ontario have not, in so far as we know, pronounced themselves, either individually or collectively, for or against the Scott Act. There are many priests in this Province who favor prohibition, and all, with whose opinions on the subject we are acquainted, advocate the more rigid enforcement of our license laws and the further restriction, at the earliest moment, of the number of places licensed. In respect of our friend's second enquiry as to the instructions, if any, issued by His Grace the Archbishop to his clergy, during the late Scott Act campaign in Halton, we can only state that His Grace could not have issued any special instructions to the clergy there, as that county is not part of the diocese of Toronto, but belongs to Hamilton.

—In reply to a correspondent, we are enabled to give the list of members elected to the State Assembly of New York from the following counties: New York, Albany, Kings (Brooklyn) and Erie (Buffalo).

- NEW YORK.
David E. Finn, James Oliver, Charles Eissman, Patrick H. Roche, Michael Brennan, Edward F. Reilly, Ed. H. Senteau, Charles Smith, John P. Rockefeller, George F. Rosch, Walter Howe, S. D. Rosenthal, J. P. Windolph, Jacob Kuzneman, J. E. McGoldrick, Edward P. Hagan, John H. O'Hara, John P. Keany, Eugene S. Ives, James Haggerty, Henry A. Barnum, J. L. Garey, Jacob A. Cantor, John E. Shea,
Mass J. Wafar, Frank M. Giese, Peter K. McCann, Patrick Burns, Michael J. Coffey, Thomas F. Farrell, George H. Lindsay, Robert E. Conolly, Lewis A. Myers, James Taylor, Henry H. Ath, Mortimer C. Earl, William F. Sheehan, Frank M. Giese, William M. Hawkins, John Kraus, Amos H. Baker, ALBANY COUNTY, Stephen H. Niles, H. M. L. Hotelling, Patrick Murray, Terence J. Hardin.

Democrats in Italy, Republicans in Roman. It will be seen that in these great centres the Irish element has held its own. The next Assembly will be politically divided into 74 Republicans and 54 Democrats.

CATHOLIC FAMILY ALMANAC.

The numerous orders we daily receive for the Catholic Family Almanac attest its popularity and excellence. We urge on those of our patrons and friends who have not yet sent their orders to do so at once before our supply is exhausted.

THE LATE DEAN O'REILLY.

CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.

him had a name and a record that will be held in lasting and grateful remembrance by all his friends, but especially by his old parishioners of Dunias and his many dear and devoted friends among the clergy, who will often pause before the altar and make a special memento for the Dean. May his soul rest in peace.

The funeral took place on Monday. The coffin, which was placed before the sanctuary, was surrounded by the lights. The stalls for the clergy were within the sanctuary. Amongst the clergy present were Bishop Carbery, of Hamilton; Very Rev. E. I. Heenan, V. G.; Very Rev. T. Dowling, V. G.; Very Rev. J. Kough, Chancellor of the diocese; Rev. E. Slaven, Okville; O'Leary, Freeport; Tierman, London; Barkon, Cayuga; Madigan, Caledonia; P. Lennon, Brantford; Maguire, Galt; M. J. Cleary, J. Lennon, J. Bergman and M. Halin, Hamilton; P. D. Donohoe, Sandwich; M. O'Reilly, Leslieville; F. W. Lillis, Elera; Feenev, Dundas; Dr. Kilroy, Stratford; Moiphy, Ingersoll.

The office and mass commenced at 10.30. His Lordship presiding. The cantors were Rev. Fathers Cleary and Bergman. At high mass the Bishop was celebrating, Fathers P. Lennon, and F. W. Lillis deacon and sub-deacon, Very Rev. E. I. Heenan, V. G., as master of ceremonies, Rev. Fathers M. O'Reilly and F. Donohoe as deacons at the throne, Very Rev. Father Dowling, V. G., as assistant priest. Immediately after mass the Bishop delivered a touching and earnest address on the priestly virtues, the untiring zeal and devotion, and the many amiable and attractive qualities of the deceased, who endeared himself to all creeds by his charity and amity of manners. He was never known to refuse an alms through suspecting imposition in the applicant. The address terminated, the solemn obsequies were commenced by the Bishop and the clergy standing around the coffin, after which cross-bearers and acolytes, the clergy following with lighted tapers and singing the psalms of the Liturgy. The body was borne by his brother priests, who even contended among themselves for the opportunity of showing their love and veneration for Father O'Reilly. As the procession wended its way around the beautiful church the effect was most imposing. Having arrived at the vault, the opening of which is within the church in the north transept, the Bishop took his place at the head, and the last touches being concluded the body was lowered to its final resting place amidst the abundant tears and fervent prayers of the surrounding priests and sorrowing vast congregation, each of whom feels they have lost a father and a friend in the death of Father John O'Reilly. The slab that was laid over the vault had inscribed on it the following pithy and appropriate words:

"Rev. John O'Reilly awaiting the Resurrection, departed November 14th, 1884, aged 66 years. R. I. P."