

BEARING THE PALM.

[Reprinted from the Western Home Journal, Detroit, April 6, 1873.]
Fast the days are now approaching—days of mingled grief and joy—

Days the import of whose coming Unbelief can never destroy;
For the Church of God, whose Founder suffered then His utmost pain,
Yearly brings them to remembrance: Holy Week comes once again!

For the Church is ever living, and as seasons onward roll,
Runs her calendar of past events all present to the soul!
And from glad Annunciation on to glorious Easter morn,
The Christian year shows forth His life who for our sakes was born!

And to-morrow is His triumph and with Him we may rejoice,
Bearing palms to lay before Him,—praising Him with every voice.
Shout "Hosanna in the highest! Praises now to David's son!"
Blessed thrice is He who cometh,—ours the victory He has won!"

For our Lord's triumphal entry to the Holy City then
Only shadowed forth his conquest in the battle "for us men;"
And as Christ has gained the victory over Death and Hell, so we,
If we deem ourselves his children, closest followers must be.

'Twas it was in every nation where the name of Christ was heard:
Multitudes sought out His passion—strongest precept was His word.
And as ages pass before us, nations rise and fall away,
Passes too the white-robed army, bearing palms through endless day!

Not alone the strong-limbed warrior, armed and mailed for earthly fight,
Who can laugh and scoff at torture, and in suffering delight;
Weakest women join the army,—Nature chooses not this state;
Christ alone gives grace to suffer, and the Master imitate.

after he entered the Hospital, McEntyre stated, as he had been in the habit of doing in health, that he would become a Catholic; and that he would send for the priest; then, at a later period, when he thought he was in danger, that he, of his own accord, sent for the priest—thus carrying out the intention he so long entertained, and had so often expressed; that, when the priest came to his bedside he fully satisfied the priest of the sincerity of his intention and wish to join the Catholic Church—

"he declared to me that he wished to become a Catholic and that he always had that inclination." (See Testimony of Father Leclaire). That he accepted freely and with attention the instructions given him; that he obeyed ministerial direction of the priest to prepare for confession by a careful examination of conscience; that on the first occasion the Protestant minister was brought to him he said, as the minister was leaving the ward, "I don't want him." (See Testimony of Mary McGuire). That, on the fourth day after the priest was prevented from seeing him, (during which four days he was visited by the minister) he complained that the priest did not come to see him according to promise, that he was watching for him two days; that, when the dying man was told that Father Leclaire was not allowed to see him, he said: "Father Leclaire knows my mind—he is the first man I will lay hands on when I leave the Hospital;" that, seeing himself deprived of the consolations of religion he longed for, and feeling that the Hospital people, who suspected his intentions, were watching him, he drew a long breath, and then expressed the bitter anguish of his soul in these words: "I am surrounded by a crowd of serpents." (See Testimony of Mary McGuire and of Thomas Sheehan.)

This, gentlemen, is a fair summary of the evidence which makes known the wish and intention of the deceased McEntyre to become a Catholic, before his sickness, and during the time he was in Hospital, up to three days before his death. Four days of the attendance of the Protestant minister, and of the exclusion of the priest from the bedside of the sick man are included in this period. We shall now state briefly the facts of the evidence relative to the exclusion of the priest from visiting McEntyre:—
On the 26th December McEntyre expressed his wish to see the priest, this wish was conveyed to Father Leclaire next morning, when he, without delay, visited the patient. The ministry of Father Leclaire was freely accepted, his instructions attended to and his direction obeyed by McEntyre. Whilst thus engaged in rendering the services of his ministry to the sick man, on the demand of that sick man, the priest was interrupted, first by a nurse of the Hospital, and then obliged to desist altogether by Doctor Cameron. In this interruption of the priest in the discharge of his solemn duties towards a dying man the doctor was not obeying any rule of the Institution, according to his own acknowledgment; on the occasion of the priest's interruption he simply made up his own mind that it should be so; the following day when he repeated his refusal, he alleged he had orders. The doctor did not venture to allege as a reason for interrupting the ministry of the priest, that the patient did not wish to see him, or had not demanded his attendance; the silence of the doctor on these two points is a sufficient admission that he, the doctor, knew that the patient McEntyre had demanded the priest and desired his attendance, and this presumption is raised to evidence by the refusal of the doctor to accompany Father Leclaire, Father Singer, the regular Catholic chaplain, and two witnesses of his own choice, to the bed of the sick man, to ask him the simple question, whether he desired the priest or not. If we suppose that the doctor was ignorant of the real dispositions of McEntyre, his conduct in refusing this just and most reasonable proposal of Father Leclaire cannot be explained on any principle of common-sense or propriety. The tardy excuse given by the doctor for refusing an interview of a word with McEntyre, that the patient was too weak to bear excitement, cannot be admitted for a moment. We have evidence, which from a motive of delicacy we withhold for the present, that a Protestant lady was the same evening permitted to make a prolonged visit to the patient, and that she tried hard to engage him in a rather exciting form of prayer, which, however, he declined to do.

These remarks fully sustained by the evidence we produce bring home to Dr. Cameron the serious charge of having interrupted a priest engaged in the functions of his ministry in favor of a dying man, who had demanded his spiritual care. The evidence goes yet further, when on the morning of the 28th December, the doctor would not allow Father Leclaire to return to McEntyre, already under his care; the doctor said, McEntyre must see his minister first, and he, the doctor, took twenty-four hours for the purpose, dismissing Father Leclaire during that time. In this conduct of Dr. Cameron we find two grievous offences; the one is that of proselytism, the other is a direct violation of liberty of conscience. Let us take proselytism. McEntyre asked for the priest, accepted his ministry, desired to enter the Catholic Church in order to have the spiritual benefits of her sacraments, and had already made his preparation for this great change. Doctor Cameron appears, and says no, I will not permit you McEntyre, you must wait my good pleasure; fixes twenty-four hours, which time, he, the doctor, employs to operate, either mediately or immediately, on the mind and on the wishes of the dying man, in order to change his resolution, and to settle him back in a church which for years he had determined to abandon. A minister McEntyre did not ask for, did not wish to see, ("I don't want him") is brought to his bed, and the priest he did ask for, under whose care he placed himself with confidence, is excluded; the poor dying man strain his longing eyes during two days in vain, he will not be permitted by this official to see the priest of his choice, he will not be permitted to taste the consolations of that religion in which for years he had resolved to die. Is this not proselytism?

Now let us see the other offence, a direct violation of the rights of conscience. Take the evidence in hand. McEntyre is prepared to make his confession, and the priest comes to receive that confession; this is Tuesday morning, the 28th December. Doctor Cameron steps in and forbids the priest to return to the sick penitent, and thereby forcibly prevents the sick man from performing a religious act he desired to perform, and which according to his actual belief was of the most vital importance for his spiritual welfare. The doctor's interdiction must be obeyed for twenty-four hours. At the bidding of this official a dying man must interrupt and suspend all his acts of preparation to appear before God, and during twenty-four hours he must surrender his wishes, his liberty, and his conscience to the fanaticism of Doctor Cameron. What right had the doctor to invade the dearest and holiest possession of a dying man's soul, even for twenty-four hours? Could the doctor guarantee his life for that period of time? What right had he to trammel the liberty of a conscience on the very eve of rendering its account to the Supreme Judge? Doctor Cameron took away from poor McEntyre all liberty of conscience for twenty-four hours, and McEntyre died without having that liberty again restored to him.

We have clear and positive evidence that the deceased did not change his mind; but that, finding himself in his weakness watched and suspected by the people of the Hospital, he made up his mind to yield to necessity, and, encouraged by the hopes of recovery held out to him by the doctor, he resolved to await his restoration to health and liberty to realize the cherished wish of years by becoming a Catholic. Can we on any other than hypothesis,

understand these distressing expressions, "I don't want him" (the minister). They (the people of the Hospital) seeing his helpless condition, and suspecting his intentions, were watching him, "I am surrounded by a crowd of serpents." "Father Leclaire knows my mind, when I get around he is the first man I will lay hands on me." Are these the expressions and the sentiments of a man that was free, of a mind at peace, of a conscience that was satisfied?

We hesitate not to affirm that two offences are here brought home to Doctor Cameron, and to all who participated in his act; proselytism and a violation of liberty of conscience, both under a most cruel form, because the victim was a dying man. Even could it be shown that McEntyre did change his mind subsequently, those offences remained proved; nor can any interchange of sentiments on the part of McEntyre, excuse in the least the violence that prevented the priest of his choice from administering to him the consolations of religion which he demanded.

After this statement of the facts connected with the McEntyre case, and which are based upon solemn and legal evidence, a few remarks will suffice to correct some errors which appear in the resolutions of the Committee of Management of the 10th of January. "The Committee cannot recognize any other mode of procuring the services of a minister of religion than through the officials at the Hospital." This rule is not found in the Constitutions or By-laws of the General Hospital; it was never known to exist before the 10th of last January. We are clearly justified in calling it a new rule, made post factum, to cover the McEntyre case. Hitherto the rule on this point has been a uniform usage, according to which our priests attended a patient in the Hospital—or by a relative or friend at the request of a patient. Our pastor, Father Dowd, who has an experience of the Hospital during the last twenty-eight years, assures us that more than half his calls to that institution came through relatives and friends of the patients. Can this rule of usage, hitherto followed without complaint, and to the great consolation of the sick, be now repealed as means of escaping out of an awkward difficulty? Does your Board see no inconvenience in calling the visits of a priest "irregular and unwarranted" when these visits have been requested by a father for his sick child, a husband for his sick wife, a friend for a sick friend?

A Catholic patient, though in no danger of death may have many reasons for desiring the visit of his pastor, these reasons are freely communicated to the ear of relative or a friend, but would not be entrusted to an official of the Hospital. We cannot believe that the Committee of Management took these inconveniences into consideration, before promulgating their new rule.

The third resolution, using the new rule just mentioned as a basis, goes on to say: "that the visits of the Rev. Mr. Leclaire to the bedside of McEntyre for the purpose of religious ministrations and of baptizing him into the Roman Catholic Church without the knowledge of the Hospital authorities, were irregular and unwarranted." We regret to find the Committee of Management in the position in which this resolution places them. In virtue of the post factum rule promulgated on the 10th of January, the Committee attempt to make appear "irregular and unwarranted" the visits of Father Leclaire to McEntyre in the preceding month of December. The rule of usage, the only one known to exist as we have already shown, made the visits of Father Leclaire to the bedside of McEntyre both regular and warranted; and we presume that it will appear to your Board, as it does to us, that no good reason demands the cancelling of that rule, and that both necessity and reason demand its maintenance. We have to add that this ancient usage has never embarrassed the administration of the Hospital, except when, as in the case of McEntyre, the officials of the Hospital improperly interfered with the ministry of the priest, and the religious liberty of the patient. The visits of Father Leclaire were not hidden from the authorities of the Hospital; on the contrary, when the proper time came, and before the formal admission of McEntyre into the Church, Father Leclaire requested the Doctor to change his card, as he, McEntyre, now professed to be a Catholic. The evidence before your Board tells the result of this polite request, and must convince the Board that Catholics cannot and ought not to allow their religious liberty to be trammelled or interfered with by the caprices or prejudices of any official.

The fourth and fifth resolutions are amply replied to in the evidence before your Board. In the sixth resolution, allusion is made to "an impertinence having been addressed to the patient to induce him to change his religion,"—on this we have to give a word of explanation. This "impertinence" took place only on the day after McEntyre had demanded the attendance of Father Leclaire, and consequently could have no influence whatever on the religious change of the patient. The girl from whom the impertinence complained of came was the sister of the intended wife of McEntyre, who, seeing him in danger of death, wished to induce him not to delay longer to give effect to the resolution he had so often expressed to her whilst in health, of becoming a Catholic.

The approbation given in the seventh resolution to the Lady Superintendent for interrupting Father Leclaire in the functions of his ministry, and to Dr. Cameron, for refusing to allow that clergyman to proceed with his duties, is quite natural. Some of the gentlemen of the Committee having already compromised themselves by giving certain "orders," the resolution was simply an act of self-defence.

The resolution states, reasonably enough, that the Doctor required to know the real sentiments of the patient, but surely twenty-four hours were not required for that purpose; a few moments would have been sufficient for a visit to the bed of McEntyre to ascertain his wish, as was requested by Father Leclaire, but twenty-four hours were required to bring to the sick bed of McEntyre a Protestant minister for whom he did not ask.

The eighth resolution is fully met by the evidence before your Board. We appeal to the good taste and sense of justice of your Board to cancel the ninth resolution. The insult it offers to Father Leclaire affects us all, and can do no good. His accusation against Doctor Cameron is proved to be well-founded by sworn testimony; and, besides, the Rev. gentleman has rights, protected by the laws of the country which he will not forego when called to exercise his ministry, in the General Hospital or out of it.

In regard to the tenth resolution, we have to remark that, whilst glad to acknowledge the general good management of the Hospital, and the invaluable services it renders to the community, we cannot admit the claim advanced by the Committee "that its management has been characterized by complete freedom from all religious distinctions." It may be unknown to your Board, but truth obliges us to demur to that item of praise, as not deserved. We do not wish to enlarge the present difficulty by adding to it others of the same kind; we are, however, in a position to assure your Board that Catholics have occasion to complain of attempts at proselytism, and of other acts of religious interference by the officials of the Hospital, and by others tolerated by these officials.

The principle involved in the McEntyre case once satisfactorily arranged, these other complaints can be brought under the formal notice of the proper authorities for adjustment.

The eleventh resolution includes all ministers of religion, but no doubt it is intended only for Catholic priests; as the case of Father Leclaire shows. Permit us to remark on this singular resolution,

that no general hospital in the civilized world ever thought of shutting out the visits of relatives and friends interested in the welfare of the sick patients. These visits are permitted everywhere, not by sufferance, but by a law or instinct of humanity. Then as to ministers of religion, besides the law of humanity, there is a law of religion, which not only authorizes them to attend to their flock under all circumstances, but makes that attendance a solemn obligation. The minister of religion must surely have a right to do what the law of God obliges him to do. Again, it will not be said that a patient forfeits his religious liberty by entering the General Hospital, if not he has a right to the presence of his pastor, whenever that presence is necessary for the discharge of his religious duties. Here then we find at least two rights when the Committee of Management says there is none. If visits to the Hospital are "not of right but of sufferance" the Committee have the right to prevent them all. Rights do not usually conflict in this manner, so that we are inclined to think that all the rights are on one side and a mere assumption of arbitrary power on the other.

Gentlemen, we conclude this unavoidably long statement by expressing the hope that we have satisfied your Board that a grievous wrong has been committed in the McEntyre case. The poor young man has passed to his Judge, with the long-cherished wish of his heart unsatisfied, through the conduct of the officials of the General Hospital, of which you represent the highest authority. McEntyre is beyond your reach, you can not repair the injury done him; but his trusted pastor so unworthily treated still survives, you can make some amends to him, and you can protect from any injury, similar to that inflicted on McEntyre, other patients who in their need may seek the advantages of the Hospital, and may think it for their eternal interests to use their religious liberty, as he wished to do.

We are willing to forget the past if your Board will give us what is asked for in the 2nd resolution—"an ample guarantee that perfect freedom shall be given to all patients in the General Hospital to ask for the clergyman of their choice, and to all Catholic priests, when called for, to attend without obstacle or hindrance of any kind from any official of the institution, to the spiritual care of all those who may choose their ministry." We disown altogether every attempt at proselytism, but we claim, in the largest sense, liberty of conscience. Our priests have always carried their respect for this liberty of conscience, in regard to the patients in the Hospital, even to the extreme of delicacy,—they challenge accusation, or even reasonable suspicion on this point. Should some further precaution be judged necessary, the doctor can ascertain for himself the wish of the patient, only however, in the presence of the priest, or at least of some trustworthy Catholic,—any different arrangement cannot inspire confidence. Nor should this demand appear unreasonable to your Board, since neither on the Committee of Management nor amongst officials of the Hospital have Catholics a single representative.

In the love of peace, in the interest of the General Hospital, and in a spirit of justice, we respectfully request your serious and enlightened consideration of our demand. We have the honor to remain, gentlemen, your obedient Servants, (On behalf of the Committee) (Signed,) P. DOWD, Priest, Chairman.

Montreal, February the 7th, 1876.

APPENDIX 1.

At a meeting of the St. Patrick's Congregation held in the society on Sunday the 16th January after Grand Mass, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

1st. Resolved.—That the violence done to liberty of conscience, in the case of William McEntyre, who died on the 3rd inst., in the General Hospital of this city, directly concerns all friends of religious liberty, but more immediately the St. Patrick's Congregation; and that we heartily endorse the action of our priests in this sad and most regrettable outrage against religious liberty in general, and against the free adoption and profession of the Catholic religion in particular.

2nd. Resolved.—That the vital principle involved in the case of young McEntyre must be defended at any cost; and that therefore we pledge ourselves to support our clergy in the prosecution of the case, till an ample guarantee has been secured that perfect freedom shall be given to all patients in the General Hospital to ask for the clergyman of their choice, and to all Catholic priests, when asked for, to attend, without obstacle or interference of any kind from any official of the institution, to the spiritual care of all those who may choose their ministry.

3rd. Resolved.—That a committee of five gentlemen, with power to add to their number, be now appointed to co-operate with our priests in the employment of all such means as may be deemed expedient to secure the object of the above resolution, and that they be authorized to appeal to the general support of the Catholics of the city, should that step be found necessary for the purpose.

4th. Resolved.—That in regard to the ninth published resolution of the Committee of Management, forbidding Father Leclaire, one of our pastors, to visit the Hospital, though demanded by a penitent or other patient who might require his ministry, we condemn the said resolutions as being in the highest degree arbitrary, offensive and unjust, and we pledge ourselves to Father Leclaire to sustain him in the adoption of legal or other measures to vindicate his own clear and just rights, and the rights of those who may require the benefit of his holy ministry.

(Signed,) P. DOWD, Priest, Chairman.

APPENDIX 2.

Olivier Rousseau, aged sixty-seven years, residing at 465 St. Joseph street, in this city, following the occupation of cook, being duly sworn at his own request, deposed as follows:

I have known the late William McEntyre, who died in the Montreal General Hospital on the third of this month, over two years; saw him regularly twice a week; he declared to me that he would never die a Protestant; that he would become a Catholic; repeated this several times. I went to his last sickness; I said to him, "Do you not think of becoming a Catholic?" He answered, "Yes, I will become a Catholic. I will not die in the Protestant religion; I will send for the priest and I will become a Catholic." And further deponent saith not, and declares he cannot write or sign his name.

Sworn to before me at Montreal this twenty-second day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six.

(Signed,) A. BROGAN, Comr. S. C. Joseph Briere, aged twenty years, butcher, living at 380 St. Joseph street in this city, being duly sworn at his own request, deposed as follows:—I knew the late William McEntyre well. About two weeks before his last sickness McEntyre said to me, "I have seen my girl, and she told me I should be a good Irishman and become a Catholic." I asked McEntyre what he answered to that; he said, "Yes, all right." McEntyre used often to say to me, "I went to mass at St. Patrick's last Sunday." (Signed,) JOSEPH BRIERE.

Sworn to before me at Montreal this twenty-second day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six. (Signed,) A. BROGAN, Comr. S. C.

Michael McShane, aged forty-four years, butcher, living at 384 Dorchester street, in this city, being duly sworn at his own request, deposed as follows:—I knew the late William McEntyre well; he worked for me at his trade of butcher over two years, and resided at my house during that time. I never interfered with him about religion, but he frequently told me that he knew the Catholic prayers and catechism, having been taught them by his grandmother who was a Catholic, and that he intended to become a Catholic himself. When offered meat on Fridays he frequently refused to eat it, though sometimes pressed to do so, on account of his hard work; he often attended St. Patrick's Church with my children. (Signed,) MICHAEL McSHANE.

Sworn to before me at Montreal this twenty-second day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six. (Signed,) A. BROGAN, Comr. S. C.

James McShane, Sr., seventy-five years, proprietor, residing at 141 St. Joseph street, being duly sworn at his own request, deposed as follows:—I knew the late William McEntyre well during about two years, as he used to work in my yard for my son; he often told me that he had been reared as a Catholic by his grandmother, that he never went to a Protestant Church since he came to this country, never went to any but the Catholic church; that he was as much a Catholic in mind as myself. (Signed,) JAMES McSHANE, Sr.

Sworn to before me at Montreal, this twenty-second day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six. (Signed,) A. BROGAN, Comr. S. C.

Mary McGuire, aged twenty-six, servant, residing at Hon. Peter Mitchell's, 190 Mountain street, in this city, being duly sworn at her own request, deposed as follows:—I began to keep company with the late William McEntyre about eighteen months past; I then told him I would not keep his company if he remained a Protestant; he said his inclination had always been since his boyhood to become a Catholic; he often repeated the same thing to me and my sister Catherine; it was a matter well understood that he would become a Catholic before our marriage. He often came to St. Patrick's with me. Two weeks before he fell sick he wanted me to come to Father Dowd to get a pew in St. Patrick's, and to tell Father Dowd that he wished to become a Catholic; I put him off, saying it would be time enough when we were ready to get married. On Sunday evening, the 26th December last, finding himself sinking, he asked me would he be buried in the Catholic cemetery; I said no, as he was still a Protestant; he then said: "Will you send Father Leclaire to see me, he was the priest who was with Catherine (my sister) when she was sick, I wish to have a long discourse with him." I told my sister Catherine to come to Father Leclaire, that William McEntyre wanted him.

On Tuesday, the 28th December last, I went to the Hospital in the evening. William McEntyre had just seen the Protestant minister. I saw the minister going out. I asked Willy who that man was; he said, "he is a minister, but I don't want him."

On Friday, 31st December last, I went to see Willy again; he wanted to know what was in the papers, and said "Father Leclaire promised to come and see me but did not come; I watched for him two days." I said, Willy, Father Leclaire was told you did not want him; he got indignant and asked, "who said that?" "Tell Father Leclaire they are like serpents around me; they are a little quieted down to-day. If I were a little more excited I could not stand it. Father Leclaire knows my mind; tell him if God spares me to leave the Hospital he will be the first man to put his hands on me."

On Sunday, the 2nd inst., I returned to see Willy at the Hospital, and asked him how he was. He said, the doctor says I will be all right in five weeks and will become fat and strong. As the thought of his dying so soon did not strike me I did not mention anything about religion. Except the conversation with Willy, on the 26th and 31st December, as stated above, when he himself mentioned the subject, I did not speak to him about religion, as the doctor had forbidden me to do so.

On Monday afternoon, the third instant, I was sent for by a message from the Hospital. I went to the Hospital without delay, but poor Willy was dead when I arrived. I asked a nurse who appeared to be the head-nurse why I was not sent for before Willy was dead. She told me she did not wish to have any fuss about religion. And further deponent saith not, and declares she cannot by reason of nervousness, write or sign her name.

Sworn to before me, at Montreal, this twenty-second day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six. (Signed,) A. BROGAN, Comr. S. C.

Catherine McGuire, aged thirty-one years, servant residing at Hon. Peter Mitchell's, 190 Mountain street, in this city, being duly sworn at her own request, deposed as follows:—I knew the late William McEntyre during eighteen months before his last sickness; he kept company with my sister Mary during that time and was engaged to marry her. He often said in my presence that he intended to become a Catholic before marrying my sister. Two weeks before his last sickness I heard him say that he wished to take a pew in St. Patrick's Church; to see Father Dowd in order to become a Catholic and to arrange for his marriage. On the 26th December last my sister Mary told me to come for Father Leclaire, that William McEntyre wished to see him in the Hospital; I delivered this message to Father Leclaire next day. I know that William used not to eat meat on Fridays, and that he used to bless himself before and after his meals. (Signed,) CATHERINE McGUIRE.

Sworn to before me at Montreal, this twenty-second day of January, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six. (Signed,) A. BROGAN, Comr. S. C.

Thomas Sheehan, aged thirty-one years, book-keeper, residing at 142 St. Mary street, in this city, being duly sworn at his own request, deposed as follows:—I knew the late William McEntyre, butcher, about two years; my knowledge of him was intimate, owing to our both being in the employment of Mr. Michael McShane, and because I liked his honest character. I never spoke to him on religious questions but, of his own accord he once told me he preferred the Catholic religion,—this was before his last sickness. When McEntyre took his last sickness I drove him to the Montreal General Hospital, and visited him frequently there. On the occasion of these visits I never in any way alluded to religious questions. The last time I visited him before his death was on Friday, 31st December last. Mary McGuire, whom I knew he intended to marry, was present at the same time; there was also present another girl whose name I did not know. Mary McGuire stood at one side of the bed, McEntyre's face turned a little towards her; I stood at the other side, and the girl I did not know at the foot. I heard him tell his intended (Mary McGuire) that when he got better and around again Father Leclaire would be the first man to lay hands on him; he told her, further, that he could not bear to be troubled; he wanted peace and they (the Hospital people) seeing his helpless condition, and suspecting his intentions, were watching him; and, after drawing a long breath, he finished by saying he was surrounded by a crowd of serpents. I heard the words distinctly, as he spoke them in rather a loud and irritable