Valete!

TO THE CLASS OF 1903.

Of vessels twain that fast at anchor lay
For many a day in goodly company,
One sails, at length, to cross the trackless sea,
And leaves its erstwhile comrade lone. But they,
Who stay, with wishes fair upon the way
Their parting friends pursue. The sail spreads free
To fav'ring winds. From danger guarded be
Their voyage, till, on some far-distant day,

In harbor safe they rest.

O comrades true,
To-day from out this pleasant port you sail
To travel seas unknown. Fair unto you
Be all the days of life; no adverse gale
Your course beset, until, the voyage past,
You reach the eternal haven, safe at last.

"JUNIOR."
Universal education is proposed as the panacea of all evil, is considered America's guiding star in her unparalleled material progress, and is welcomed by the people as the power capable of leading our country to the solution of any problem, which may confront her. To enforce a proper use of universal education, as sought by and for the American people, presents to the universities a mighty task and indicates to them their chief duty. To guide the American people to a clear, just and moral solution of any problem confronting them, to raise the standard of education among them, to elevate their ideas of justice and morality, and to preserve unrestricted that liberty of which we are the beneficiary, require efficient leaders, men with master minds and with characters noble, staunch and unblemished. To produce men of this type is an ideal function for the universities, it constitutes the chief purpose for their existence.

If our republic is to endure, if its social, economic and political problems are to be correctly solved, if Christian liberty is to be preserved for the people, and if man is to receive his complete, harmonious development, the modern university must be the cradle, the nurturing mother and the producing power of leaders, who by the combined force of their intellectual ability and of their staunch, upright and moral characters will guide the people through the sea of troubles and problems, which beset a nation. Such is the duty of the modern universities.

Are they accomplishing this duty—their chief and primary function? The characteristics, the scope and the work performed by the American Universities, which must furnish the answer to this question, vary according to the ideal sought in the numerous institutions. So-called universities, unworthy of the title, must be eliminated from discussion. The injudicious liberality of the legislatures in granting the privilege of conferring university degrees has led to the establishment of many institutions, which do not merit consideration. Instead of being an impetus to higher education, they retard it, they lessen and impair the value of a university degree, they are not in fact universities.

American institutions, consisting of a group of professional schools, do not belong to the same category, within which are classed universities pursuing essential work of higher education. Their functions are contracted to the professional studies there taught, they have not the culture and influence which the co-existence of a broad and Catholic-spirited university department would bestow upon them, they seldom pro-
duce by their own efforts and teaching leaders in any profession or in any station of life.

The American institutions of higher education may be classed as graduate and undergraduate universities. The latter devoting the best of their energy to collegiate education, have confined their efforts chiefly to the work of producing for the welfare of the country broad-minded and Catholic-spirited citizens.

Some educational authorities declare that the modern university consists in the graduate institution, an evolution of the last twenty-five years. The prevailing opinion, however, is that the modern university is a place, where knowledge is conserved, advanced and disseminated by the promotion and the encouragement of the study and investigation of all the branches of learning. It is the cherished hope of the Presidents of the leading universities to make their institutions conform to this idea, and by the fulfillment of it to accomplish the duty of our universities—the production of leaders.

To achieve this aim, the American universities are engaged in building great laboratories, in erecting large museums and in stocking massive libraries. Their eminent scholars and distinguished professors are by means of lectures and essays disseminating their knowledge throughout the institutions of learning. The modern universities are wonderful storehouses of scientific data, and they are the domiciles of men celebrated in every branch of the natural sciences. Everything in or about the universities is for the use of the student, and yet—is the educational system of these richly endowed institutions conducive to the production of men, whose names will go down forever in the pages of history as belonging to the world’s great lights?

The mediaeval universities, which produced such men as Roger Bacon and Thomas Aquinas, Dante and Petrarch, made it their primary function to teach their students to think. The modern universities generally let the student solve for himself the problem and method of thinking logically. They train his observing eye and his other external senses by experimental work, but they often leave his intellect swamped in his infantile and untrained method of thought and reason.

The graduate universities, presuming that their students, when admitted, already possess a broad and liberal culture, encourage them to devote all their faculties to some one branch of knowledge, and instil within them the spirit of performing investigation and original research in some particular study. The reward of such labor is the production of specialists. The natural sciences absorb almost the entire attention of the modern universities, which are producing skilled investigators—men who are leading the world to a greater knowledge of the natural sciences and who are benefiting mankind by the practical application of such knowledge.

The problem, which is to be solved in America by university education, is not the creation of a civilization, but the development and perfection of that which we now enjoy. As in the Middle Ages the institutions of learning were the instruments used to prepare and
create the civilization, to which we have fallen heir, so in turn the American universities should be the means of preserving this civilization, of enriching it by aiding in the development of all our physical and natural resources, of enlarging it by increasing, promulgating and perpetuating man's knowledge in all the sciences, of ennobling it by fostering and cultivating the good, the true and the beautiful, and of perfecting it by increasing the love and practice of the Christian religion.

To fulfill this duty the universities must rear great, intellectual and conscientious leaders of progress. They are increasing man's knowledge of the natural sciences, but are they, as they should be, places of universal science, are they endeavoring to cultivate all the faculties of their students, to make them perfect men and leaders?

Perfect education, that needed to mold true leaders, means the development of the whole man, body, intellect and will. Though the modern universities investigate the truths embodied in religion and morals as a theoretical study, they are not eager nor are they inclined to influence their students in the practice of religion and morality. They labor to find the scientific relations between all known facts and they fail to look to the moral obligations flowing from such relations; they rear intellectual giants with atheistical and untrained consciences.

Institutions of learning, which do not attempt to make their students morally efficient fail to reach their goal and do not undertake the performance of their full duty and obligation. For what is education without righteousness, or a leader without conscience? What civilization and liberty will be preserved for our posterity under the guidance of leaders, who possess not a love of God and a fear of eternal justice? A man worth educating deserves a harmonious development of his entire nature. No greater deformity exists than the combination of a brilliant mind, a warped conscience and an atheistical and untrained will.

The educational system of the mediæval universities was essentially moral and their results show that they accomplished their duty and purpose. The present tendency in our universities is to make education non-sectarian, non-theological and non-religious. Will the modern universities, seeking to develop man's intellect but ignoring the religious and moral features of man's nature, accomplish their full, ideal and patriotic duty?

Some of the universities proceed to instil into the future intellectual giants of our country a natural morality without respect to any religion, but education and morality without religion and religion without Christianity can never constitute the ideal. Universities pursuing such a course will seldom, if ever, be the incentive or cause usually requisite for the training and production of leaders, in whose hands may be entrusted with safety the destiny of a free and liberty-loving people.

The modern universities desire that their students pursuing graduate courses should specialize and should aim to become the world's leaders in their branch
of learning. The majority of them also desire that their students, who are about to specialize, should possess a liberal education which enables them to see beyond their own specialty and horizon. The universities as a rule do not encourage the production of narrow-minded investigators, men of one idea and one interest. May not only a few, but all of the university educators, recognize the importance of the study of theology, morality and religion. May they add to the modern university's courses in the languages, the literature, the history of man, the arts and natural sciences, substantial and practical courses in natural law, theology and ethics, which by the beauty and the sublimity of the subject of study light up the student's intellect with knowledge supreme and with truths sublime, fill his soul with sentiments most holy and with ideas most exalted and by which man is indeed lifted up to the image and likeness of God.

GEORGE MOORE BRADY, PH.L.

---

**Elegy.**

Like to a minstrel's harp in olden hall
That hums responsive to the ocean's note,
His soul was tuned, by golden-lilting thrall,
To echoing kindred with an angel throat.

One mighty note, of which all heav'nly song,
From shapeless Chaos unto Galilee,
Was but the overtone, he murmured long—
The vibrant, sea-voiced theme of Charity.

What though the harp, while still its music rings,
In the blue-bosomed wave has sunk to rest,
Richer by far such fate, than that its strings,
In Time's gray waste should dwindle out unblest.

JOHN A. FOOTE, '05.
"Tu ne quaesieris."

BOOK I—ODE XI.

Seek not, Leuconoe, to know
How long your life may onward go,
Nor strive through wise Chaldean seers
To learn the ending of your years.
'Tis better far to bear each woe
With patience, though more winter's snow
Our Jove decrees, or this, whose blow
Breaks Tuscan sea on rocky piers.
Seek not to know.

Be wise; let Massie, filtered, flow;
And hold your aspirations low,
Lest life's end all too quickly nears,
For whilst we talk time disappears.
On this one day your trust bestow;
Seek not to know.

"Non usitata."

BOOK II—ODE XX.

To Maecenas.

I, both a song-swan and a poet rare,
Will be conveyed through the all-crystalled air
On no accustomed nor on humble wing;
I will not loiter on the earth, nor cling,
Bound down by envy, to the city-side,
But, born of lowly parents, will abide
Forever; nor shall Stygian waves hem in
Whom you call friend. This instant a rough skin
Upon my ankles settles, and my breast
Into a milk-white bird, with plumage drest,
Is now transformed, a feathered down makes bands
Around my human shoulders and my hands.
And now, a bird of wondrous melody,
I will traverse the Bosphorean sea
More expedite than Icarus; the land
Hyperborean will I see, and sand.
The Calchian and Dacia's frightened man,
Who hides his fear of the Marsian clan,
Gelona too of me shall straightway know
And learned Spaniard shall on me bestow
Much study, as shall he who drinks of Rhone.
Let no unmanly weeping then be shown.
Nor wailing lamentations e'er be heard,
Nor dirges when, in vain, I am interred,
Suppress your weeping and forbear the show,
Superfluous, when I am laid below.

"Persicos odi."

BOOK I—ODE XXXVIII.

My boy, the Persian pomp I hate
And chaplets rich with linden twined,
Search not the dell where ling'ring late
The last sweet rose remains behind.

Let but the myrtle us entwine,
It best becomes both you and me,
As now I quaff the ruby wine
In shadow of this mantling tree.

Gerald Egan, '06.
THE MEDIAEVAL UNIVERSITY—MASTER'S ORATION.

Were a college man to tell of the progress and achievements of education in America, Georgetown's record of a century of useful existence, and her present proud position among the universities, would furnish an inspiration for his theme and awaken a responsive chord in your hearts.

But ours is a different part. We are to speak of the great universities that flourished centuries before the future discoverer of this western world of ours had enrolled himself a student of the University of Padua. Ours is a story of Paris and Oxford, of Bologna and Salerno, a story of brave and determined efforts in behalf of truth and enlightenment, a story of the greatest educational renaissance and development the world has known. Sympathy with the cause of education must turn our thoughts in admiration and love to the teachers and scholars of the mediaeval universities who out of darkness brought the light which made possible the intellectual life of their age and ours.

"Education," says Bishop Spalding, "is born in the yearning of the human soul for knowledge." The supreme function then of education is to unfold and develop this life within us, is to aid in the betterment of mankind. The universities of the Middle Ages did their share in this work. Aye, they did more. Unto the peoples of Europe they brought a new life. They lifted the rude and uncouth into a new sphere of culture and refinement, and attuned men's minds to new ideas and new aspirations. This was the work of the mediaeval universities. Guiding and directing and restraining an untrained and passionate intellect, by the power of the ideas and principles of Christianity they evolved a new order of society, which has come down to the peoples of Europe in the civilization they enjoy to-day, and of which our people are happily deemed the highest exponent and illustration.

The most famous of these great schools was the University of Paris, and for a proper appreciation of its work, a knowledge of the conditions prior to its inception is necessary.

The beginning of the twelfth century was the dawn of the most glorious epoch in the history of Christian education. Through all the ages since the fall of Rome, had there been strife and battle, struggle and turmoil. Now comparative peace reigned, and now was come the time when religious, social and political influences, long working through the centuries, were to declare themselves. Too long had disorder and anarchy shut out the light, and now up from all the lands came the great wail of humanity, crying for knowledge and truth. In unison with the cry, men's hearts thrilled with the higher and nobler impulses. The Crusader with the blood of the conquerors of Rome in his veins, rode forth
to plant the banner of the Cross of Christ on the walls of Acre and Damascus and Jerusalem.

Into the schools which Charlemagne had established centuries before, beside the cathedrals of Paris, Pavia and Bologna, entered the spirit of the awakened enthusiasm for learning and it vivified them with a new life. These cathedral and monastic schools were the oases of knowledge on the great desert of ignorance, and to them there now came swarming the uncultured of all the nations, to satisfy their thirst for learning at these fountains of knowledge; knowledge which during the night of barbarism holy men of God had collected and preserved with infinite care and tenderness, and which otherwise must have been lost forever. Such were the modest beginnings of our universities.

Now a Lanfranc and now the sainted Anselm were teaching and now for the first time did the eager and vigorous young intellect of Europe read the golden thoughts of the sage of antiquity. In the light of the philosophy of Aristotle existing studies possessed an added charm. Into the capital city of France came greater numbers than ever before to sit at the feet of Lombard and Champeaux and Abelard in the new schools of St. Victor's and St. Genevieve's.

Now the time was at hand, and the struggle of centuries had not been in vain. "Go forth, teach all nations!" Through a thousand years of persecution and upheaval, of chaos and reorganization, God's missionaries of knowledge had carried their standard of truth and enlightenment to victory. Aye, to glorious victory, for in the shadow of Notre Dame they had built a temple of universal learning and they called it the University of Paris.

It was the morning of a brighter day in the history of man, the day of the Christian university. Great were the schools of Greece and Rome, and cultured was the civilization of Paganism, but all had gone down to destruction. The Christian university was the pledge of a more enduring work. On the rock of Christian education, Paris and Bologna, and Padua and Salerno were to lay the foundations of a more perfect social and political order, and build a higher and grander civilization than the Greek or the Roman had ever produced.

Looking at the mediaeval universities in the light of the day in which they existed, judging them not by their ability to meet the demands of the twentieth century, but by what they accomplished in the consecration of learning to the uplifting of humanity, it is not easy to exaggerate the importance of their work, which manifested itself not only in the spread of religion and morality but also in the rise and development of social and political institutions. Ours is the day when the circle of knowledge is constantly widening, when science and investigation are daily laying at our feet new facts and new truths, but the mediaeval professor had at his command little knowledge besides what was contained in the philosophy of Aristotle and the tenets of Revealed Truth, and he was forced to do his work without the aid of a Lick telescope or a Roentgen ray.

We have seen in one year twenty mil-
lion dollars donated to further the cause of education, to erect and endow new buildings and new laboratories, but the University of Paris was so poor it did not own the miserable halls it occupied.

It is our proudest boast that the poorest need not now lack the means of procuring the highest education, but gaze across the lapse of seven centuries to the picture of that poor, starving student of Paris, spending his few pennies on a single manuscript, and driven by the pangs of hunger to beg his bread in the streets of the city.

Yet despite all this, despite the fact that mediaeval university life was surrounded by conditions of hardship and suffering as compared with the comforts and advantages of modern education. Paris in the noon-day of her glory, attracted no less than forty thousand students.*

Judged by our possessions, the sum of knowledge at the beginning of the twelfth century seems small indeed, yet from it and with it the schoolmen of the mediaeval universities evolved the beginning of modern medicine, modern science and modern mathematics; they formed and developed the precepts of Canon Law, and placed the study of Civil Law on a new and lasting basis. But this is not all.

It was theirs to solve the problem that baffled and defeated the subtlest and keenest intellect of the ancient world. The pagan philosopher had climbed high on the mountain of truth, but darkness hung close round about him and he saw not the splendor of the distant light. The Greek had fashioned the most perfect instrument of human thought that has ever been made, yet he failed to lift the veil that shrouded the mystery of his own existence. The Stagyrite had failed, but in the interim of thirteen hundred years no human intellect had discovered the flaw in his reasoning or shown itself his master in philosophy. The unsolved problems of life from the schools of Athens had floated down the stream of time to the University of Paris. What Plato and Aristotle had sought but had never seen, the mediaeval doctors made manifest in the light of the glorious illumination that streamed forth from the beacon of Eternal Truth. They reanimated the dead bones of the philosophy of Greece with the life of Divine Revelation and evolved the most perfect, elaborate and extensive system of philosophic and theologic truth the world has known. “Know thyself,” cried the sage of Greece, a thousand years before, but now for the first time had man arrived at a full knowledge of himself in a knowledge of his Creator, his God.

This was the Christian philosophy, this was the intellectual triumph of centuries, this was the work of the men who taught and were taught in the mediaeval universities—Anselm and Peter Lombard; the subtle Scotus and Bonaventura, the Seraphical doctor, Thomas Aquinas, master of the age in which he lived, unsurpassed in power of intellect and breadth of genius by any of the sons of men. There is no brighter, more glorious page in the history of human

*Drane, "Christian Schools and Scholars."
thought. "Had these men not lived and labored as they did the whole current of modern thought would have run a different course."*

In the light of these facts, the day of the mediaeval university is no longer synonymous with darkness nor is it a term of abuse. Rather it denotes a period characterized by an intellectual enthusiasm almost too enormous for the modern mind to fully comprehend; a period in which the desire for learning and knowledge arose to heights that no succeeding age has ever surpassed.

The mediaeval universities had their defects, yet where have we seen a more powerful work of education than theirs in the uplifting of men to a higher, nobler, purer, sweeter life and in making this world a better place in which to dwell.

They gathered the peasants from the fields of France and the woods of Germany and the shores of far-off Britain, and guided and moulded and instructed them, and sent them forth educated men, some to sit on the throne of Peter in the City of the Seven Hills, to guide the Church of God, and some to stand as ministers beside the thrones of kings, to direct the administration of human affairs and shape the government of the world.

You may learn the work of the mediaeval universities in the lives of those noble sons of Dominic and Francis, who won their master's gown in the halls of Paris, only to lay it aside for the humble garb of the missionary priest, that they might carry the light of truth unto those who sat in darkness.

You may read it in the sublime thoughts of a Thomas Aquinas, extracting the truth from a thousand years' research, and welding together in the symphony of a perfect whole the word of the human intellect, with the truth of the Eternal Wisdom of God.

You may hear it in the divine song of a Dante, as it sounds sweetly down the ages, sending forth in the music of harmonious strains the loftiest and sublime truths ever sung by man.

These were the products of the mediaeval university, these were the works of higher Christian education.

Joseph Arthur Lennon, A. B.
Morning.

Movement No. 1, of Grieg’s Orchestra Suite—Peer Gynt.

The orchestra sat ready, all was still,

The leader waved his wand, and—wondrous art!—

We seemed to hear the pulse of Nature’s heart.

A little bird, beside a purling rill,

Full-throated, sang a song, and every part

Of fen and mountain, meadow-land and hill

Drank in the melody that floated down—

As petals of the mandrake flower in May

Float where the river shimmers clear and brown—

And violets that in the copsewood lay,

And stately maples with a verdant crown

Of new-born leaflets blushing rosy red

From joy of quivering life, and all that Morn,

Rising in beauty from her Eastern bed,

Could give to Earth from out her plenteous horn,

In richest tones before our fancy spread:

At last one note triumphant, clarion, spoke,

And every stream, and every mossy glade,

And every bird in sunny down and shade

Acclaimed the regal sun, and while they sang

The last pale wraith of misty dawn was laid.

JOHN A. FOOTE, ’05.
OUR UNIVERSITY.—VALEDICTORY

Rev. Members of the Faculty, Fellow-Students, Ladies and Gentlemen:

You have heard of the great universities of the past, and of the great universities of the present. One speaker told you how the hordes of barbarians flowed like an irresistible stream from the barren fields of the North down upon the fertile plains of Southern Europe, and settling like a swarm of locusts brought with them a night of darkness, ignorance and violence; a night unbroken save by the gleam from the lamp of learning, which, sheltered from the seething storm without, burned brightly within the hallowed precincts of monastic walls. He told you also how this feeble light, after the lapse of centuries, burst forth into the glories of an university of Paris, a Padua, a Bologne, a Montague, an Oxford, and a host of other seats of learning which were heralds of the morning that was breaking after the long dark night.

The other speaker dwelt on a theme more closely connected with our own interests and consequently dearer to our own hearts. He cast his eye over the great horizon of American education, he described the panorama presented before his eager, questioning gaze. Some things he praised other things he found fault with and deprecated. He depicted the growing needs of our highly advanced civilization and the absolute necessity of thorough, adequate educational methods to fit our men for the brilliant and responsible futures which are our birthrights.

To me a most agreeable task has been assigned. Mine is a two-fold mission to fulfill, and great as have been the universities of the past, and great as are the universities of the present, I rise to speak of the university here on the banks of the Potomac, which must forever hold a dearer, higher, more sacred and nobler place in our affections than any university of ancient or of modern times.

Nearly a hundred and twenty-five years have rolled by since the patriot, priest and bishop, John Carroll, of Maryland, chose this site for our college, and laid the corner-stone of the then unpretentious structure; but even at that remote period the great Bishop's keen judgment discerned the hidden secrets of the times to come; he foresaw the future greatness of the Seat of Government, and as our institution was to be not for a day but for all time, and was to grow as the nation grew, always ready and able to meet the demands of the age, the prudent Bishop called the sons of Ignatius and to their care entrusted the future of the infant college. Nor was this decision made without careful consideration and well-weighed motives. He knew far better than most men what the followers of Ignatius had done to keep alive the lamp of knowledge of which I spoke a moment ago; he knew that for three hundred years they had educated the youth of Europe, he knew that within their walls, the rich and the poor, those that were to attain the highest pinnacles of human ambition, be it on a throne, a battle-field, or in the halls of Government, and also those that were to fill but the humbler stations in life had all alike followed their system
of education as set forth in that incomparable masterpiece, "the Ratio Studiorum."

And here at Georgetown, as the great Archbishop desired, the "Ratio Studiorum" has been followed and will be followed as long as the gray in these walls remains gray and the motto of Ignatius is unchanged.

I need not dwell at length on the famous "Ratio Studiorum." Any one who claims to know anything of the great educational methods of the world, knows by heart the principles upon which this efficient system is constructed. It is sufficient to say that the one great underlying principle which penetrates the entire superstructure is the principle of "common sense." "Common sense" is the key-note of every phrase, "Develop the whole man" is its eternal admonition. And from this one command we may use a priori argumentation and deduce all of the other conclusions. "Develop the whole man." Man is man, not merely by reason of his intellect, but also on account of his will, therefore according to the "Ratio Studiorum," develop the intellect, develop it to its utmost capacity, but do not stop there, go a step further, develop the will, the nobler, more important faculty of the two. Strengthen it, guide it, enable it to work out its ultimate destiny, which is man's greatest happiness—the possession of the infinite good. This is the watchword of Ignatius, and this is the touchstone of his followers' success.

I have now come to the difficult portion of my mission; for to say farewell is always a painful duty, and especially so when it needs must be a long farewell. In former years when I attended these exercises, and looked forward to the reopening of schools in September, I did not realize the meaning of that word "farewell"; but to-day I feel as you must surely feel its full significance; and as a youth who before his departure upon a long journey, wishing to pour forth his heart in thanks to his mother finds when the hour comes that words fail him; the tear starts in his eye, a lump rises in his throat, his voice grows husky, he presses the loving hand to his lips and is gone. So it is with us to-day. We cannot express all that we feel, we can but kiss the hand and say farewell. Were we not oppressed with sadness it would be unnatural. Our college is inseparably connected with four of the most important years of our lives. Here we have seen our careless boyish faces become serious with manhood's responsibilities; here we have learned the deep and subtle meanings of that word friendship; and it was here within these halls that we drank the draught of knowledge and listened to the words of our instructors as they pointed out the intricate paths leading to perfection. Is it to be wondered at, then, that our hearts should grow heavy as the time approaches to bid all fond memories good-bye; the thoughts, the dreams, the works, the joys of four youthful, pleasant years.

And our Professors! Can we leave them without a pang of regret? Those men who have labored with us during all our years; who bore with us when their patience was overtaxed, who
counselled us when we were in need of advice, and who helped us in our endeavors to solve the difficult problems of life. Many times have they stepped down from the professor's rostrum and the lecturer's chair to become our friends. To these, our professors and our friends, we owe a debt of gratitude that can never be paid. The example of their lives alone has been more potent in forming our characters than any amount of instruction could have been. The way to show our appreciation of their labors, and our gratitude to our Alma Mater necessarily leads me to speak of the future.

The future is ours, and for the most part we may do with it as we please; it stretches out before us like an immense, unexplored territory, and we may make the journey as befits a son of Georgetown or we may struggle along as one but lowly born. We must choose the former course and go forth as sons worthy of our mothers. We must place high ideals before us and live up to them. As professional men let us take for our motto "Excellence" and let us never once falter or turn away from the attainment of that goal. Let us love our professions for their own sakes and not merely because of the living they give us. As men we must cultivate our hearts and ever stand ready to give a struggling brother a helping hand. Let us cast aside all petty jealousies that will prevent us from seeing the merits of our competitors. Let us enter the race free from prejudices. If we are outstripped, our opponents shall have won a greater victory; if we win, greater glory shall be ours.

We must bear in mind that an educated man is always a factor in whatsoever community he may be placed, and we must be a factor for the good, the noble and the true.

Let us not fall into the paramount evil of this commercial age—the evil of making money the standard by which all things are measured. Wealth and power are good to have and pleasant to possess, but without a good will and noble affections they are but barren dross and can never satisfy the cravings of the human heart.

For some of us the future seems bright and wears a cheerful aspect; a parent stands ready and able to give help in the struggle for honors and wealth; while for others the fight must be fought single-handed, the outcome of the battle depending on our own personal prowess and our individual strength; but to all of us, whether we be of the former or the latter class, times will come in our lives which will sorely try the stoutest of hearts; times that will call for heroic action. And when those times do come there will be no martial music to spur us on, there will be no hope of resounding glory to echo our names down through the annals of the brave; but alone, forsaken even by those we hold dearest on earth; alone in the privacy of our professional sanctums, we will have to wage war against our passions; we will have to humble our pride, check our anger, and curb our ambition; we will have to choose the difficult path of virtue, truth, and hon-
esty, though everything human within us urges, clamors and rebels against it. These are the times we must prepare for, and if we wish to conquer, we must be ready when the hour of battle comes; and we will prepare and be ready and issue forth from the struggle unscathed if we but recall and be faithful to the precepts learned here at Georgetown.

And now the time is at hand, fellow classmates, to say the parting word—farewell. My heart grows heavy with the thought. We are leaving it all; the trees, the grounds, the college, the boys, the professors, and the romping, happy days of the past. The farewell must be spoken—not _au revoir_—never again shall these happy days return—never again shall this life be lived—it is the saddest word in every tongue—farewell.

To you fellow-students,
To you class mates,
To you Rev. Professors.
To you Rev. Rector of the University
Farewell let it be, since Providence so decrees, but we hope that we leave a fair name behind us, and that in the days to come we may reflect some little glory on our Alma Mater.

W. H. Byrnes, Jr., '03.
THE EXILE OF THE ACADIANS.

MORRIS HISTORICAL MEDAL—PRIZE ESSAY.

The history of Acadia or Nova Scotia from its cession to England in seventeen hundred and ten to the expulsion of its inhabitants nearly a half century later, is in the main the history of the intrigues, base subterfuges and trickery of its governors, who, with but two exceptions, were willing to sacrifice a whole people for the furtherance of their own selfish interests and endeavored with a certain measure of success to cover up their tracks. They had every reason to conceal the real state of things and their own motives and had all facility in doing so. Hence it is that the documents most accessible are those which the perpetrators permitted to exist. But the evil character of a man seems to glare forth from every word he utters and every word he writes, no matter how guarded he may be, and so, even from those documents, collected for the express purpose of concealment, we may glean their secrets, and the efforts to blot out the memory of the events only tend to make it more lasting. Combined with this deficiency in documentary evidence are not only the carelessness of historians but their wilful attempts to falsify, so that the truth is indeed hard to find. However, the recent unearthing of documents, hitherto lost or hidden, and the researches of certain conscientious and painstaking authors have contributed much towards the truth. Among the latter are especially to be mentioned Haliburton and Richard, both of whom had excellent opportunities of knowing the true state of the case.

Edouard Richard, an Acadian by birth and an ex-member of the Canadian House of Commons, has written two worthy volumes on the subject, has brought forward many new documents and has forged a connected chain of proofs, which show without a doubt the bad faith of such pretentious historians as Parkman and of a certain Thomas B. Akins, who was ordered to compile all documents concerning the Acadian deportation and proceeded to do so by omitting everything which he thought might favor the Acadians in any way or incriminate English officials. This is the man from whom historians take their data. "When brought face to face," says Richard, "with systematic attempts, unmistakably and continually renewed to falsify history, I thought silence became a fault."

Though the aspect given by most writers would lead the reader to suppose that the Exile of the Acadians and the events leading up to it involved but a few years at most, yet, in truth, we must go back some forty years and trace step by step the progression of
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changes which finally consummated the foulest blot that has ever stained a nation's character. We may divide the matter up into the causes preceding the deportation itself and the subsequent fate of the exiles.

The treaty of peace terminating the war between France and England was signed at Utrecht, on April 13, 1713. Pending later determination, France ceded to England "All of Nova Scotia or Acadia comprised in its ancient limits, as also the city of Port Royal," as if Port Royal lay outside of Nova Scotia, although it had been its birthplace and seat of government. The complications necessarily arising from this were settled by war, fifty years later. Article fifteenth of the treaty gave to the Acadians the free exercise of their Catholic faith and the choice either of remaining in the country and keeping all they possessed, provided they took the required oath of allegiance, or of leaving the country within one year, taking all movable goods, together with the proceeds of the sale of their property. This was generously confirmed by a letter to Nicholson, then governor of Nova Scotia, from Dartmouth "By Her Majesty's command." Despite this order of Queen Anne and the article of the treaty, the Acadians were not permitted to depart. That they desired to leave, documents now at hand prove beyond a doubt. In July, 1713, they sent delegates to the French fort of Louisbourg for an understanding with the French, concerning their emigration.

In the autumn of the same year, the Acadians announced their intention of leaving to Lieutenant Governor Vetch, in the absence of the governor himself, but were prevented by Vetch under the pretext that they must await the return of Nicholson. This lieutenant-governor, whose character was so low that he had been fined two hundred pounds by Massachusetts "for having supplied the French with ammunition and stores of war," then wrote to the Lords of Trade in England: "Unless some speedy orders are sent to prevent the Acadians' removal with their cattle and effects to Cape Breton, as it will wholly strip and ruin Nova Scotia, so it will at once make Cape Breton a popular and well stocked colony." Another reason why Vetch and all succeeding magistrates in Nova Scotia opposed the emigration, was fear of the Indians, as expressed by Lieutenant-Governor Caulfield. "But in case ye Acadians quit us, we shall never be able to maintain or protect our English families, from ye insults of ye Indians, ye worst enemies, which ye Acadians by their slaying will in great measure ward off for their own sakes."

Nicholson did not return until the year within which the Acadians were to depart had expired, and when permission to leave was sought from him, he replied that it was first necessary to lay the matter before the Queen. This, of course, was a mere play for time, as we shall see. The Acadians had the right to depart, both by the treaty and the direct promise of the Queen, but Nicholson, who was of much the same character as his lieutenant, had no intention of permitting it. He had been given a colony to rule and did not relish the
idea of its being depopulated. If he received a reply from the Queen, as he in all probability did, the Acadians never heard of it. Meanwhile they were making preparations for departure, fully confident that justice would be done, but were confronted with every sort of subterfuge to detain them. In the first place they were refused transportation and told that they must secure it themselves. When they proceeded to do this Vetch forbade them to depart in English vessels. They turned for aid to the French and Vetch refused to French vessels entrance into Acadian ports. They then built vessels themselves, but were refused permission to procure rigging from Louisburg, and having applied to Boston for the same supplies, were again forbidden to obtain them there and the vessels which they had made were seized. This is only the beginning of a long train of English injustice, and yet Parkman calls their rule a mild one, not that he did not know the persecutions inflicted, for many of the documents, which incontrovertibly prove all I have said and all I am to say, were to be found side by side with those which he has quoted.

Their readiness to leave their homes, rather than submit to English rule, might at first lead one to suspect that the Acadians were not a contented and home-loving people, but it is far otherwise, and though imagination may have added much to the picture, yet an investigation into circumstances shows the possibility of a state of things clearly proven to exist. Acadia was discovered in 1604, and the French were its first and, up to the middle of the eighteenth century, almost its sole inhabitants. Their numbers at first were small and the later influx of colonists, unmarried men for the most part, resulted in the newcomers marrying the daughters of the older settlers and thus a relationship was established, which removed dissensions and created great harmony. The defects, common to the French, of jealousy, backbiting and idle gossip, existed among them, as elsewhere, though toned down considerably by the peculiar status of the people. They were always an industrious and Godfearing people, true to their families and to their religion. Their wants were few and their tastes simple, and their fertile and well worked farms yielded more than abundance.

The way in which France neglected these early Acadians and left them to their own resources made them independent and self-governing, and the taste for liberty thus engendered caused them, even under English rule, to get rid of as many official regulations and restrictions as possible and to rule themselves. This England allowed them to do to a great extent, with the result that the harmony and mutual understanding were remarkable, so much that, even under the most tyrannical of English governors, there is recorded hardly a case in which the people disagreed upon matters of general interest. Simplicity of life, morality, abundance, harmony and social happiness were theirs. They loved their homes, and certainly would have preferred remaining where they had lived so long and struggled so hard,
were it not that they feared the caprice of their governors and, sooner or later, obstacles to their religion. And were their fears not reasonable, when for three years, in violation of a treaty, they had been prevented from departing, and at a time when England was most intolerant in any period of her history?

Up to the year 1717, the Acadians refused to take any oath that would bind them to the country. After that date, they no longer refused the oath provided a clause was inserted, exempting them from bearing arms against the French or their Indian allies. The authorities would not permit this, but demanded an unconditional oath of allegiance which the Acadians ever persisted in refusing, throughout the forty years prior to their expulsion. And yet Parkman calls them "weak of purpose."

The demands of the Acadians were certainly not unreasonable. Either England ought to have allowed them to depart with their effects or have come to their terms. Without these conditions they could be forced to take up arms against their fellow countrymen, brethren and relatives, residing on the north side of the Bay of Fundy, which, as it was disputed territory, might at any time be adjudged to France by an appointed commission. Nothing could be more just than the exemption claimed, especially since they had been detained against their will. The American colonists, who were established on the lands of these Acadians in 1760, were exempted from bearing arms against their New England brethren, during the War of Independence, and this was thought quite natural. Conflict with the Indians was also shunned by the Acadians for their own safety, and they sent the following communication with regard to it: "Find some means to protect us against the Indians and we ask no exemption with regard to them, in spite of the threats which they use against us every day. In default of these means, we will agree to remain in the country and take the oath of allegiance, provided we be exempt from any obligations to bear arms against the French and the Indians."

There are some historians who, to cover up one villainy, reprehend France for trying to prevail upon the Acadians to emigrate, as though by so doing she were guilty of a fault, when in truth she ought to have pushed the matter further than she did. France used no other means than persuasion. She could not. England should have used no other, but resorted to most foul measures.

In 1720 Governor-general Phillips superseded Nicholson. He was imbued with the same ideas regarding the depopulation of Acadia as his predecessor, and made the mistake of imagining that a stern command coming from one of such high rank would be enough to obtain the oath of allegiance required and so commanded them to take the oath or leave within four months, adding: "It is expressly prohibited to those, who will choose to leave the country, to sell, dispose or bring with them any of their effects."

To this order, the Acadians replied that they could not take the oath required and that the question was "still more difficult with regard to the Indians
than to the French," because the former daily threaten us with revenge if our reservations do not extend to them. Since you cannot grant us this reservation, there only remains to us the other alternative of retiring from the country even on the hard terms you impose, life being dearer to us than all our goods."

Phillips had been deceived and had not gotten the oath he wanted. Humiliated and ashamed of his inconsistent conduct, he threw the blame on others and represented the Acadians as headstrong, ungovernable and directed by "bigoted priests," when, in truth, their only fault was that they were too meek and submissive, as the whole tenor of their after actions show. Now, in preparation for departure they set to work making roads, for they had been shut off from all departure by water, but, incredible as it may seem, Phillips issued an order forbidding the work on the roads to continue, on the pretext that their purpose was to unite with others on the isthmus in preparation for an insurrection and the obedient people ceased their labors, just as they had submitted to the order to depart without their effects, although their numbers and the meagreness of the garrison would have enabled them to do as they pleased. They were a peace-loving people, however; they regarded a treaty as sacred and, in their simplicity, thought that justice would be done sometime. Furthermore, if those districts that had it in their power to depart should take advantage of it, they must leave behind their weaker brethren to the vicissitudes of war and despotism. At this early period was hatched the first thought of deportation, for in a letter, dated December 20, 1720, the Lords of Trade wrote: "We are of the opinion that the Acadians ought to be removed as soon as the forces, which we have proposed to be sent to you, shall arrive in your province."

Nothing came of this for the time. A few Acadians families managed to get away into French territory and Phillips, seeing his mistake, turned his policy to wheedling and using fine words to them, but promising nothing definite. In 1725, he went to England leaving in charge Lieutenant-governor Armstrong, whose character was lower than that of any who had preceded him, a man subject to moods and tempers, and willing to stoop to any level to attain his ends. He broke in upon the colony like a storm, with threats and terror, and the only result he attained was the hatred of his own officers and the departure of the inhabitants. In the course of the following summer they prepared for a general emigration, resolved that, if circumstances permitted, they would take no account of prohibitions. Some families did withdraw that year to Prince Edward Island.

The Governor became alarmed. The exodus must be stopped, else he would incur a reprimand, the French would be strengthened and he would be left with none to govern. He changed his tactics to persuasion, called the people to council, displayed to them the advantages to be derived from taking the oath, and, upon their determined refusal to sign, unless a clause was in-
serted, exempting them from bearing arms, the Governor granted this clause to be written in the margin of the French translation, in order “to get them over by degrees,” as he expressed it. Whereupon they subscribed their names to the oath in its original and its French form. The French version was never seen again. He sent deputies to obtain the oath in the same way from the inhabitants of Grand Pré, Pigigui, Cobequid, Beanbassin and other settlements.

The Lords of Trade, hearing of this buffoonery and compromise of the dignity and honor of the crown, sent Phillips to obtain the oath and restore peace. A short time afterwards, December, 1729, he wrote to the Lords of Trade that the oath had been administered to the whole province and that peace reigned. How he accomplished this was plain. He had verbally agreed to the clause exempting the bearing of arms, and, coming fresh from England as he did, with all his dignity, his words were accepted as solemn. In proof of this may be cited the circular sent by Governor Lawrence to the Governors of New England, at the time of the Acadian expulsion:

“The Acadians ever refused to take the oath of allegiance, without having, at the same time, from the Governor an assurance in writing that they should not be called upon to bear arms in the defence of the province, and with this Gen. Phillips did comply, of which His Majesty disapproved.”

All the other governors after Phillips attest the same thing, and yet, in the face of this testimony, the compiler, Mr. Akins, asserts that Phillips obtained an unqualified oath. There is no document to uphold this, for, if there were, it would surely be produced. A man in another century tries to overthrow an historical fact, upheld by the indisputable testimony of Mascarene, Hopson, Lawrence and Cornwallis, all of whom had a thousand ways of knowing the truth.

The question of the oath now rested for twenty years, until the foundation of Halifax, in 1749. The Acadians, wearied and despairing of ever being permitted to depart, were reconciled to their fate, improved their lands, were molested but little and spent the happiest period of their existence, though now and then, they were exposed to the whims of Armstrong who ruled over them until 1740. During that time he was ever complaining not only of the Acadians, but his inferiors and officers and fussed with every one. He was a brute pure and simple, as appeared from his own letters and much more from those of others. Yet he was at times kind and generous, but his conduct was unbalanced and he ended by committing suicide. The compiler mentions none of these things, nor does he mention that Armstrong’s right hand man and constant companion was a murderer, who had escaped from France. Complaints against priests from such a man as Armstrong, have little weight. What must have been the most important case of trouble with the priests, was the trial of Messieurs de St. Poncy and de Chauvreulx, for this is almost the only one found in the Archives. These missionaries are narrated to have behaved most unseemingly at their trial.
Haughtiness and insolence beget the same.

They had been brought there most unjustly and treated with insolence and hence were justified in acting as they did. The inhabitants of Annapolis in a letter to France, say:

"Contrary to the treaty and to all the promises made to us when we took the oath of fealty to His Majesty George II, Governor Armstrong forbade Messieurs de St. Poncy and de Chauvreulx, our two missionary priests, as worthy ones as we have ever had, forbade them, we repeat, to say Mass, to enter the church, to hear confessions, administer the sacraments to us and discharge any of their ecclesiastical functions, arrested and obliged them to depart, though the governor, or other persons whom he had gained over to his opinion, were unable to show or prove, that our above named missionaries have any other fault, than those of which they pretended to find them guilty namely, not to have been willing to go far from our parish to float a brigantine, which in no way concerns our missionaries or their functions."

Insinuations of a general character, accusing priests of influencing the people, are not wanting. They were said to have dissuaded the Acadians from taking the oath and to have persuaded emigration. Perhaps some of them did. In the first place these priests were not English but French subjects and hence were guilty of no disloyalty. In the second place, the rulers of Acadia were always haunted with the idea that the priests were plotting. In those prejudiced times, the least interposition of the clergy was enough to raise a storm of indignation against them. However, it was their right and duty to protect their flocks and show them their prerogatives and rights. If the clergy had such influence as is generally attributed to them, it is but just that they should be given some credit for the peace, virtue and submission of their people. During the period between 1713 and 1740 there is not recorded a single insurrection, threat to disturb the peace, resistance to authority or a single assault or murder, though the garrison at Annapolis, for a time long the only one in Acadia, was extremely small and the population comparatively numerous. The real culprits were the officials and, as is natural, in order to direct attention away from themselves, they shifted the blame on the priests and France. This is merely a fallacious, misleading deceit. The actions of France may have made the deportation possible, but this does not offer a sufficient cause for the expulsion of an entirely innocent people.

The administration of Paul Mascarene, Armstrong’s successor, demonstrated most forcibly what a few years of justice and kindness were able to accomplish, with a well-disposed people. In the short period of two years this high and noble character had produced tranquility and peace throughout the province. One of the new governor’s first acts was to ask for new grants of land for the people, because, since 1713, though their numbers were four times as large, they had received no additional grants. It was a shame, after forcing them to stay, thus to hedge them in such narrow bounds, and cause disobedience and quarrelsomeness, for which to reprehend them. On March 15, 1744, war broke out between England and France, and both parties thought the Acadians would take advantage of the occasion to shake off the English yoke. But no, Mascarene’s policy had taken effect. Notwithstanding that Acadia was invaded at least four times during the war and that the French used every means in their power to get the Acadians to their side, their efforts were, for the most part in vain. Not only did the Acadians remain loyal under such try-
ing circumstances, but willingly lent their aid in rebuilding and repairing the English fortifications, which were very weak and the strongest of which was the crumbling fort at Annapolis. Beyond the stand of neutrality which they had taken, they favored the English cause in many ways; they supplied them with provisions, an office which very few performed for the French; they gave valuable information concerning the French movements, and though some charge them with the opposite course, the facts stand for themselves and the French had great trouble, blocking the roads in order to prevent their communication with the English. The Acadians had been more than loyal to their oath and had even caused the arrest of twelve of their own number, for having assisted France. “Without the neutrality of the Acadians,” says Mascarene, “the province would have been lost.”

Either the priests had very little influence with the Acadians or had influenced for the good. The memorable battle of Grand Pré was fought in February, 1747. “They, the people of Mines, had assured the English that the French would come and attack them, but the English were incredulous, relying on the severity of the winter.” Nevertheless the French came and drove off the English and became masters of Port Royal. Thereupon de Ramesay, the French commander, issued two proclamations, in which he pointed out that the Acadians were no longer English but French subjects, that their oath to England was not binding now, and that the Bishop of Quebec had so declared, yet the Acadians “weak of purpose” stood by England. At the end of the war, the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle left the land distributed as before and did not settle the boundary so vaguely defined at Utrecht.

Meanwhile affairs had been progress-
If hitherto, the Acadians had, comparatively speaking, been governed with any gentleness, they met with far different treatment after the foundation of Halifax in 1749. Previously the government could not be harsh beyond a certain measure, since the only garrison, that at Annapolis, contained but one hundred and fifty soldiers, which only tends to show how peaceful and law-abiding the people were. The foundation of Halifax, however, made it possible for future governors to act in a most criminal style. Upon the coming of the new governor, Cornwallis, the Acadians sent a delegation to pay him homage and to inquire if affairs would continue as hitherto, especially as regards religion. Cornwallis responded by ordering the Acadians to take an unrestricted oath and told the delegates to return in fifteen days, with an answer. They returned with other deputies on July 29, and agreed that the Acadians should take the oath with the exemption from arms. His excellency then said that the unconditional oath must be taken before October 26, and that all who failed to do so, would lose their lands. The deputies inquired if they might be allowed to sell their lands and effects, and were told that the treaty of Utrecht had granted one year in which this could have been done, but that now they could not sell or carry off anything. On asking leave to return and consult their respective departments, the delegates were allowed to go but were refused permission to consult with the French government, and were warned that anyone who left the province without taking the oath should lose all rights. In a few weeks the deputies returned with the reply of their people that they would take the qualified oath, otherwise, they wrote, "we are resolved every one of us to leave the country." When asked whether His Majesty had annulled the oath given by Gen. Phillips, Cornwallis replied that Phillips had done wrong in administering such an oath, and that those Acadians who chose to remain after the treaty of Utrecht had become British subjects. Other deputies and memorials followed to no avail. Murdoch, the historian of Nova Scotia, says: "The memorials which these Acadians sent to the council were all stamped with a respectful moderation, and also with a profound conviction. They all rested on this fundamental point: an oath of allegiance, taken with all due restriction, from which they had never consented to swerve since the conquest." Cornwallis, as his predecessors, had been deceived in believing that the Acadians were too much attached to their homes to leave them. Let us see how he managed to prevent their departure. One would think that by this time the store of subterfuges had been exhausted, but the minds of English governors are fertile. Cornwallis had hoped that the Acadians would not leave during that winter and that the next summer would supply further pretexts. All this time the French were using every available means to attract the Acadians to their territory, but the people wished to await the governor's permission and went, in May, to beg leave to depart. The governor told them that they must first sow their fields, so that they might be left in the condition in which they ought to be at that season, and that when they had done this duty he would give a more precise reply to their requests. In the autumn they had been prevented from departing in French or English vessels, now they must and did sow for the benefit of others, as they supposed, and on May 25 came to Cornwallis again. He saw that he must change his mode of acting, and says to the people: "We are well aware of your industry, of your temperance, and that you are not addicted to any vice or debauchery. This province is your country; you or
your fathers have cultivated it, naturally you ought yourselves to enjoy the fruits of your labor.” He further told them that, of course, they had a right to leave, but that as a general and simultaneous emigration was not feasible they must come to him for individual passports, which he promised to give the moment that peace and tranquility were re-established in the province. The Acadians understood that passports would never be given, for the country was tranquil now and would never be more so. They ceased to press their claims and remained quietly in their lands until deportation. Those who had chosen to depart to French soil, had done so the previous autumn. They had been given the alternative to take the oath or go, but they had no choice but to remain or leave without permission. The proclamation of Cornwallis gave the Acadians right to depart, and it was criminal to detain them. Governments as well as individuals are bound by the conditions they accept, and hence the oath of Phillips was the necessary condition for the Acadians remaining in the country and was binding on England as well as on her colony, and the government ought at least have restored the Acadians to their condition before the oath, that of withdrawing with their effects or the proceeds of their sale.

Many historians, as they endeavor to justify every act of the English government in her dealings with Nova Scotia, so they are wont to heap contumely in its every shape upon France and every one of her officials. If the Acadians had a right to depart, France had a right to persuade them to do so. Furthermore, it was her duty to see that justice was done them and that the treaty was kept. For France to coerce the Acadians with violence was blameworthy, but France used violence and that of a mild nature, in the upholding of right, England used most harsh measures against right. Especially bitter are the infamous charges leveled against Abbé Le Loutre, in part commander of the French garrison in Nova Scotia, and though the temptations to justify him are strong, it is hardly in the scope of this essay to do so. He was a priest of high character, imbued with zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, and though, perhaps, his anxiety for the spiritual and higher good of the Acadians led him to many blamable courses, yet it must be admitted that his conduct, if not in every instance worthy of credit, was at least justifiable. Many regard him and the other priests as being a cause of the deportation. But, in view of the facts, the assertion is groundless. If they had influenced the people, it had been towards virtue and peace, if they had endeavored to lure them to French soil, it had been in the cause of right and justice.

The success or failure of so small a colony depends principally on the character of its rulers, and hence to acquire a true conception of Acadia’s history it is necessary to study those who governed it. Their power was almost absolute and the colony’s progress was as a mass of wax in their hands. Yet history has passed from one to another of these governors with an even tenor and as though there had been no change. But oh! what a revelation! Nicholson to Lawrence, who effected the exile! What a difference between such men as these and the gentle Mascarene, under whom the province fared so well! What a change from Armstrong and Cornwallis to the latter’s successor—Hopson, another Mascarene, who remained in the colony but fifteen months and left a happy people! Would that all the governors had been such as he! But as it was what have we seen? Little but injustice and villainy. Have we seen anything so far that would justify the exile, or ought not the in-
justices heaped upon the Acadians rather exempt them from such a punishment, no matter what they might do in the future?

Without delaying longer on these remote causes leading up to the deportation, let us turn our attention to the more immediate events, and see if we may be more successful in our search for a justifiable motive, although the exile itself could never have been justified, let the causes be what they might. When Gov. Hopson left the colony, Lawrence took up the affair in expectation of the governor's return. Lawrence's character is best portrayed by his own fellow Englishmen, the citizens of Halifax. In a letter to England, they say:

(He has) "a great deal of low cunning, is a most consummate flatterer, has words full of the warmest expressions of an upright intention, though never intended, and with much art most solicitously courts all strangers whom he thinks can be of any service to him. By these and such arts has he risen to what he is, and, elated with success, is outrageously bent upon the destruction of every one that does not concur in his measures.

"Another of the governor's acts is to abuse all below him. He has publicly called his Council a pack of scoundrels, the merchants a pack of villains and bankrupts, and has represented at home the whole as a people discontented and rebellious."

Such, according to his own people, was the man who deported the Acadians. If he maltreated the citizens of Halifax, who had it in their power to retaliate, certainly he would be most cruel to the Acadians who had no voice beyond the sea and were of so submissive a character. Lawrence knew this well and acted accordingly. He knew their worth, too, and hence invited into the province those Acadians who were in French territory and who had asked to return in Hopson's time. They refused to come now unless they were exempt from bearing arms. He replied that it was not his intention at present to oblige them to bear arms, and tried to persuade them to come. Why? if they were a troublesome people, as he afterwards represents.

The deportation is now but a year off. In a few weeks he makes up his mind for its execution, and now that Hopson is not to return and his position of lieutenant-governor is assured, he begins to lay his plans. But what was his motive? It seems almost incredible that a man, even of Lawrence's stamp, would inflict so horrible an outrage on an innocent people without some sort of a cause. There had been no cause or even a pretext for exile before Lawrence took charge of affairs. Was there any during the year immediately prior to the exile? or during the whole of Lawrence's rule? Less cause, indeed, than ever before. In fine, the deportation of the Acadians had no cause whatsoever other than the venality and base corruption of Lawrence and his coadjutors. They sprang from their hidden den upon the offenceless people, even as a tiger, thirsty for blood, springs upon his helpless victim. For gold and gain they heaped upon those intrusted to their care a punishment never before or since inflicted upon one people by the hand of man; an outrage which has placed upon Great Britain's character a stain which can never be wholly effaced. How historians can try to justify it, I cannot understand. If the Acadians had been a most rebellious people, ungovernable and wicked, even then such measures would have been beyond all bounds of justice. What appellation, then, can we apply to it with regard to the Acadians as we know them to be, than whom it is hard to find in all history a race at once so obedient submissive, patient and virtuous? Yet,
on all sides, we find historians who place such men as Lawrence on a pedestal, conceal everything which might incriminate them, represent the Acadians as a troublesome, turbulent, dangerous people, ripe for revolt, and by directing attention from the real culprits among the English to lesser lights among the French, and by garbling and repressing documents succeed in entirely misleading those who without question receive them as authorities.

Since in the whole official correspondence of the past four years there has not appeared even a hint of disorder, Lawrence must needs trump up some charges against the Acadians and proceeds to do so in a most masterly style. A few weeks after his invitation to the Acadians on the French side, he wrote a letter to the Lords of Trade in which he condemns the Acadians in most bitter terms, and speaks of the lenity of English rule, and further says that while the Acadians "have incendiary French priests among them there are no hopes of their amendment * * * yet I cannot help being of the opinion that it would be much better if, they refused the oath, that they were away." Why this change after so short a time? He accuses them of intercourse with the French and having assisted the latter by selling them their produce. This was true in Mascarene's time when the Acadians were not protected along the frontier, and they cannot be blamed for taking advantage of a business enterprise, in which the most loyal might indulge. It is certain Mascarene found no fault with it in time of peace, for these relations fostered farming and brought French money into the province. But when war broke out the Acadians themselves formed an association to prevent the intercourse and did police duty against the guilty among them. In the administration of Lawrence, however, though there is frequent mention in the records of traffic between the French and English, there is none mentioned between the French and the Acadians. The charge, therefore, is a general one, and even were it true, the matter is of very slight importance. The next of the long list of accusations was: "They have not for a long time brought anything to our markets." This charge was made in August; last year's harvest has since been disposed of; this year's were still standing. But Lawrence was too cute to let even this slip by. Not a stone must be left unturned; the Lords of Trade must be by degrees prepared for the final stroke. He complains that three hundred Acadians had, against his consent, gone to help their emigrant countrymen in dyke building. They had a right to go, by agreement of Cornwallis. Furthermore, they were assisting relatives and brothers to protect their homes and were preparing a refuge for themselves in event of the threatened eviction. This is the only act of disobedience that can be found. Certainly there was none other or Lawrence would not have overlooked it. By these charges and complaints, and many others of less importance, and by persecutions and oppressions of every sort which he thinks will provoke the Acadians to some rebellious deed, he hopes to lay a foundation which might uphold his intended action.

In 1755 France lost her last hold on the Acadian peninsula. Though England and France were nominally at peace, frequent collisions were occurring all the time, both in Nova Scotia and elsewhere. In the Autumn of 1754 a letter supposed to be from Duquesne, governor of Canada, though its authenticity is doubted, reads in part: "I invite you and M. de Vergor to seek a plausible pretext for a vigorous attack on the English." This was addressed to
Le Loutre, at the French Fort of Beausejour, situated on the isthmus joining the Acadian peninsula to the mainland, and two miles distant from the English Fort Lawrence. Acting on this letter, which fell into English hands, it was determined to reduce Fort Beausejour, and eighteen hundred men were raised for the purpose in New England under Lieut.-Col. Scott and John Winslow. Shirley was still governor of Massachusetts and was, together with Lawrence, the chief factor in the project. Beausejour was taken, after very little resistance, in June. A short time after, the French evacuated the Fort of River of St. John, and left the domination north of the Bay of Fundy practically all English. England ought to have thanked the Acadians for this victory, but used it against them. It was owing to the Acadians that Beausejours fell. When the fort was laid siege to, out of the fifteen hundred Acadians under the French rule, only three hundred could be forced by terrible threats to bear arms, some of these deserted, and the rest refused to fight at the critical moment, and that fort which France had boasted could never be taken, was surrendered without the least appearance of a struggle.

The time was now come when Lawrence had it in his power to execute the expulsion, and had but to go through a few preliminary forms to give an aspect of justice, and if possible provoke the people to some fault, but they were more submissive than ever before. On about the sixth of June a hundred men were sent from Forts Edward and Lawrence and took their station in the houses of some of the Acadians. At night they seized all the arms they could find, which amounted to four hundred pieces, one fifth of the weapons in the Acadians' possession. In a few days an order was issued to the Acadians to surrender the remainder of their arms under the penalty of being treated as rebels. Had the Acadians done anything to justify this? Nothing. It was a part of Lawrence's well set plan, first to provoke the Acadians, and, second, to offset, perhaps, any opposition at the moment of their removal. He did not fear that the Acadians would revolt, especially now that the power of France had passed. If he did fear it, the seizure of so small a portion of their arms would have been the surest way of provoking a revolt. Strange to say, however, the arms were surrendered on the appointed day. Meanwhile a petition had been entered to the contrary, but was not considered until July 3, after the arms had been received. This petition is couched in most respectful and humble terms, begs the governor to consider their past services, and shows how guiltless they are, and say that they need their arms to protect their cattle, their families and themselves from wild beasts. Lawrence is not to be outwitted, and declares the petition arrogant. Then the Acadians write a still humbler letter, begging to be allowed to correct any arrangement occurring. This was ignored. The following resolution is then taken by Lawrence's Council.

"The Council having taken the contents of the memorials into consideration were unanimously of the opinion that the Memorial of the 10th of June is highly arrogant and insidious, and deserves the highest resentment." The clauses questioned are as follows:

"That they were affected with the proceedings of the governor towards them." In answer they were told the lenity of England towards them and their base return.

"They desire their past conduct might be considered." Their evil doings are then recounted.

"It seems that Your Excellency is doubtful of the sincerity of those who have promised fidelity. That they
have been so far from breaking their oath, that they had kept it in spite of terrifying menaces from another power." They were told that this showed a guilty conscience.

"Besides, the arms we carry are a feeble surety for our fidelity. It is not a gun that an inhabitant possesses which will lead him to revolt, nor the depriving him of that gun that will make him more faithful, but his conscience alone ought to engage him to maintain his oath." This was called the "indignity and contempt" of expounding the nature of fidelity to their rulers. The Acadian delegates were then told that this was a good time for showing their fidelity by taking the oath. They refused to take it unless with the usual qualification. They are told to consider the matter, and within an hour return with the same reply. They are then given until ten o'clock the next morning to decide whether they will take the oath, as personal to themselves. They refuse, and are thrown into confinement. They then offer to take the required oath and are refused.

Let us now examine briefly the charges which Lawrence invents against the Acadians. He charges them with secretly assisting the Indians in the face of the fact that for five years past not one group had been in that vicinity. His next charge is that they had not given "timely intelligence" of the French movements. This charge can only refer to the period between 1744 and 1748, when, as neutrals, they had a perfect right not to give information, and yet on the only important occasion, the attack on Grand Pré, did give it. To find pretexts Lawrence had to go back eight or nine years and condemn them at a time when Mascarene spoke nothing but praise. He then says, "That many of them had even appeared in arms against His Majesty." This can only relate to the three hundred at Beausejour, who had been pardoned because they had taken up arms under penalty of death.

"That they had been indolent and idle on their lands, had neglected husbandry and the cultivation of the soil, and have been of no use to the province either in husbandry, trade or fishery, but had been an obstruction to the King's intentions in the settlement."

All these grievances are childish and false. If the Acadians had been unthrifty the blame lies on the government, who for forty years had refused them any new grants, and thus hemmed in their ambition and energy. In spite of this Cornwallis said to them, "Your lands produce grain and nourish cattle sufficient for the whole colony."

"I found it," said Winslow, when about to deport the Acadians, "a fine country, and full of inhabitants, a beautiful church, abundance of the goods of this world and provisions of all kinds in great plenty."

But all these facts did not affect Lawrence in the least. What did he care for the facts so long as he might attain his end. It was the old story of the wolf and the lamb. In vain did the poor little lamb reply that he could not possibly make the water muddy, as he was drinking down stream; that he could not have been guilty of the slander the wolf charged him with, as he was not then born; he was devoured. Lawrence's grievances were not more valid than the wolf's. Not two years before Hopson had said of the Acadians: "Mr. Cornwallis can inform your Lordships how useful and necessary these people are to us, how impossible it is to do without them, or to replace them, even if we had other settlers to put into their place."

No change had occurred since then except that an upright, honest man had been succeeded by a brutal tyrant. Lawrence has been acting without the knowledge or consent of the home
authorities, and continues to do so until the deportation is accomplished. He dares not let the Lords of Trade know of his plans, for he knew they would be thwarted. England for several years had heard nothing but good of the Acadians and had the experience of forty-five years to go by. They had heard how faithful in the extreme the Acadians had been, in trying circumstances, how valuable they were, and unless a clear case of rebellion could be produced, it would be impossible to convince the Lords of Trade that the people were to be feared. It is ridiculous to suppose that Lawrence was afraid of a people whom he knew to be so mild, so loyal, especially now when France no longer held her power, when these Acadians were disarmed, and when everything was in peace and prosperity. No! It would never do to consult those at home. He will deceive them. He, therefore, in a letter dated July 18, tells very briefly that Acadian delegates had presented an insolent petition and had, on being asked, refused the oath, that he therefore considered them French subjects, and would deport them to France. Not a word does he say about the contents of the petition, not a word about the seizure of arms; he does not tell that he had also seized their boats; that he had imprisoned their priests, and that he had carried off their archives to cover up the villainy of the executors. He does not make mention of all this, and the only indication of the exile given was an ambiguous clause in a former letter, to the effect that the deserted Acadians would be driven out of the province. And now having said so much or rather so little, he must make haste to get his work accomplished as far as possible before the Lords could reply. On August 13, the Secretary of State himself wrote a long letter to Lawrence, asking what his ambiguous letter really purposed, warning against any harsh measures, and recommending extreme gentleness with all. This letter was dated six weeks after Lawrence’s. He did not answer it, or intimate that it had been received, until the 30th of November, after the expulsion had been completed, though it must, under ordinary circumstances, have reached him by the 15th or 20th of September, forty days prior to the exodus. Surely he must have received it by October 18, when he informed the lords that the exile was partly accomplished, which was false.

The deportation is on. Regardless of the wishes of England Lawrence, on July 31st, sends his orders to Col. Monckton, Commandant at Beausejour, to prepare transports for a wholesale expulsion, gives most minute directions about everything, and is especially solicitous about the Acadian cattle, lest some be gotten away with; he wants it all. His letter is replete with cruelty, no regard at all is had for the poor victims, so little that his orders required the tearing apart not only those in the same parish, but those of the same family, husband from wife, sons and daughters from their parents. He has no wish to ease their sufferings in the least. The rudest peasant would have been more humane to cattle than this brute was to these wretched subjects. He revelled in their misery. "—get the men, both young and old, especially the heads of families, into your power, and detain them, till the transports shall arrive, so as they may be ready to be shipped off, for when this is done, it is not much to be feared that the women and children will attempt to go away and carry off the cattle." He orders that their homes and grain be burnt and that they be allowed to take with them only their money and
such furniture as the vessels could conveniently receive, "and use every other method to distress as much as can be." Similar instructions are sent to Winslow, at Grand Pré, Murray, at Pigigui, and to Handfield, at Annapolis. To Murray he writes:

"If these people behave amiss they should be punished at your discretion; and if any attempt to molest the troops, you should take an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; and, in short, life for life where the mischief should be performed."

Let us first follow Winslow's success in executing the orders at Grand Pré. After taking up his residence in the presbytery, the church being used as an arsenal, he issues an order to the people of Grand Pré, Mines, River Canard and places adjacent that all males over ten years of age must assemble in the church on September 5th to hear the king's orders. Winslow has a kind nature, and the part he has to play is grievous to him, as his journal tells. The day arrives, and at the appointed hour four hundred and fifteen men and boys, unsuspicious of the plot laid for them, assemble in their little chapel, eager to listen to their sovereign's wishes. Winslow entered after them, took his place in the middle aisle and read his infamous document. It was as kind in tone as Winslow could make it. He said that he had the king's instructions in his hand, which was not so. He told them that their property, lands, and live stock were forfeited to the crown, and that they themselves were to be removed from the province. He promised that he would do all in his power to secure to them their money and furniture, and that families be kept together. But such promises were not their accomplishment. They were prisoners. "They were greatly struck," says Winslow, "though I believe they did not imagine that they were actually to be removed." At last it had come.

One by one they had been deprived of their arms, their boats, their archives, their religion; one hundred and fifteen of their fellows and advisers were lying in prison and now liberty itself, which they held so dear, had fled. They remained under guard until the transports should arrive, and Winslow permitted twenty of the prisoners to go each day by turns to visit their families, on condition that the others be responsible for their return. Detachments of soldiers were sent about the country to gather in all delinquents, and in a few days all who had not been killed were captured or had surrendered. The embarkation was begun in the forenoon of September 10th. After some ineffectual resistance the boys and unmarried men were forced to leave their families and embark at the bayonet point. This was the beginning of that shameful dismemberment of families, which was so general and which increased the agony of the exiles many fold and cast such odium on the names of its authors. Another squad of married men were next put aboard, and when they lingered with their wives upon the shore and begged not to be separated, the soldiers answered with their bayonets. The success of the enterprise was not so remarkable at other points as at Grand Pré, where three thousand were deported. In the other places the summons was in many cases disobeyed, the people fled to the woods, and were taken with great difficulty. The cruelty at this time must have been horrible. Though little of the kind is recorded, yet when we consider Lawrence's orders to "distress as much as can be," and when we take into account the bitter hatred towards the Acadians, we may well understand Winslow's severe commands, "that an end may be put to distressing this distressed people."

The transports and convoys were slow in arriving and not until October
29th did the frightfully crowded fleet set sail with about seven thousand souls on board. To give a detailed account of the embarkation is useless, to depict the sorrow of the inhabitants at leaving their homes and all that was dear to them in life, at seeing their farms deserted and their houses in flames, the results of their many years of toil cast to the winds, and themselves alone and bereft of their loved ones, going forth they knew not where, to picture the agony gnawing at their hearts in their loneliness, is beyond stern, cold history's pale. They were leaving their country, few ever to return, and before the last ship that carried them had passed the entrance to the Mines Basin, the poor people casting a farewell glance, beheld a cloud of smoke arising from their lands. In a few minutes the whole coast from Cape Blomedon to Gaspereau was in flames—truly an everlasting farewell.

The climax of the tragedy is past, and we have but to follow the Acadians into their exile. This chapter of their history is even more obscure than the others, and the distant tradition is slowly dying out. What remains for the most part are bare statistics, which mean so little. I shall, hence, confine myself to a brief narrative, a mere outline of their wanderings, with a view rather of completing my task than of throwing more light upon the subject. The journeyings of the wretched people and their sufferings occupied many a weary year. They had been huddled on shipboard and kept for weeks in the fetid atmosphere of the holds. Buffeted about by the waves, scourged by disease and epidemics, their numbers terribly thinned by death, they were at last scattered along the Atlantic coast from Massachusetts to Georgia, throughout the West Indies and along the Gulf. Many were driven back by the authorities of the ports to which they were destined, sent to England and kept prisoners there for eight long years; transported to France, where they wandered hither and thither for some years; went to the West Indies and back to France again, all this time suffering terribly by sickness, destitution, misery and starvation, and after thirty years of this unremitting deluge of despair, aged by care and woe, crushed by their burden of sorrow, worn out by grief, they go at last to end their lives of misery in the deep solitude of Louisiana, where they receive kinder treatment at wild nature's hands than among their fellow creatures of the civilized and heartless world. They had been expelled at the verge of winter and thrown among strangers, who were neither prepared to receive them nor even knew of their coming. They were everywhere looked upon with suspicion and dread, for they had been reported as a dangerous people. Furthermore, they were Catholics, and in Protestant America there was no crime of which Papists were thought incapable. These circumstances chilled much of the charity which might otherwise have been extended to them. As it was they were in many instances refused permission to land and even where they were disembarked their lot was cruel and their sufferings intense. This once industrious people had now no heart to work and no hope to urge them on. Those who did try to take an interest in life were refused employment, for they were feared. In some cases charitable persons took pity upon them and championed their cause, and some cities, as Philadelphia, appropriated funds for assisting them. But the Acadians, once so happy, had now nothing to look forward to. Hope, the last tie that binds men to life, had no place in their hearts. Nor was it the
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loss of their possessions or of fatherland
that stung the deepest, but the disper-
sion of the members of a family, the
rending of such ties as these people
held the dearest in life. What can ever
assuage the grief of a young wife separ-
ated from her husband and cast on a
foreign shore, what can mitigate the
agony of a mother torn from her chil-
dren whom, themselves on some distant
coast, she despairs of ever seeing again,
what else but death? And its kind
hand came to many, and people said
she died of such and such a sickness,
but in reality it was a breaking heart.

Parkman tells us that “cases of separ-
ation were not numerous,” but truth
cries out, they were. Without touching
upon what Richard has narrated as
hearing by word of mouth in Acadian
homes, where the story of the migra-
tions and the wanderings of their an-
cestors was preserved, without going
to the many other private sources, let
us look at public proofs. In the first
place, of the one hundred and fifteen
deputies imprisoned at Halifax we know
that fifty—and it is most probable
that at least one hundred—were shipped
and landed separate from their fam-
ilies. Averaging five children to a
family, we have here alone about seven
hundred persons suffering from the
family dismemberment. The Acadians
exiled at Philadelphia thus describe
their sufferings in a petition:

“We were transported into English
Colonies, and this was done with so
much haste, and with so little regard
to our necessities and the tenderest ties
of nature, that from the most social en-
joyments and affluent circumstances
many found themselves destitute of
the necessities of life. Parents were
separated from children and husbands
from wives, some of whom have not to
this day met again; and we were so
crowded in the transport vessels that
we had not room even for all our bodies
to lie down at once,” etc. The New
York Mercury of that period reads:
“Their wives and children were not
permitted with them but were shipped
on board other vessels.” Abbé Le
Guerne, a French missionary, says that
among 250 families who were at River
St. John after the dispersion, there was
not less than 60 women whose husbands
had been deported. Among the in-
umerable testimonies the most strik-
ing, perhaps, is a petition addressed to
the French government by a crowd of
exiles landed at St. Milo, who begged to
be transported to Boston in “the hope”,
as they expressed it, “of being reunited
to their children whom the English had
carried thither.” The Rev. Louis
Richard, president of Three Rivers
College, who has made an extended
investigation into this point, writes:

“These researches produced on me
the most painful impression, because I
found at every step proofs of the un-
precedented dismemberment of families.
All those that land on our shores are
but wretched remnants. We constantly
meet with none but widowers, widows
and orphans; there are many more
widowers than widows; it looks as if
the women had been less able to stand
grief and want; you can judge of this
yourself by the accompanying
list.”

And so we have the testimony of
many others; and for twenty years or
more the exiles wandered to and fro
and from shore to shore, with one un-
dying hope that they might again meet
their own.

We see them migrating from France
and Canada, Louisiana and the United
States, going from one settlement to
another, in search of a father, a mother,
a brother or sister, or some other rela-
tive whose whereabouts they had not
yet found. In many cases death had
claimed the lost one, and often again
those supposed to be dead were unex-
pectedly discovered, and thus slowly the scattered members of a family frequently succeeded in all being united again. These reunions and fresh hopes that were from time to time offered them served to revive their crushed spirits. When war was ended men began to see the injustice that had been done. They found these exiles, amid all their sufferings and persecutions, always meek and virtuous; they saw that wherever their lot was cast they were peaceful and industrious, and the world took pity upon them, became interested in their fate, and enabled them to found new homes. But their fortune had been hard, their sufferings lasted for many and many a year, and their ranks were thinned terribly by death. Out of the 18,000 Acadians that were deported from 1755 to 1765, for the exile was not completed by the events of that first exodus, nor even during Lawrence’s administration, but was continued for many years after his death, and with all the cruelty of the first. Out of the 18,000 deported souls 8,000 and more died within these ten years, some from disease and maladies contracted in the dirty ships, others from starvation, many from the climate of the south, which to these northerners was as a death furnace; some died from grief alone, and hundreds were lost at sea, having been sent out on unseaworthy, leaking ships. They were exposed to all the horrors of war which was then in progress between France and England, and which stifled many an act of pity in their behalf. Those who had escaped the earlier deportations met with a fate even more terrible than their unfortunate brethren, for on them Lawrence wreaked his cruelty to its full measure, and tales come to us, horrifying and disgusting. Every Acadian whom he could lay hands on was banished, except those whose scalps were brought in and paid for out of the bounty offered for those of Indians, except the helpless women and children who had been mercilessly killed. Lawrence, like Macbeth, when his first crime was accomplished, succumbed to the powers of hell within him and all conscience fled. This picture is revolting, but it is not overdrawn. Even the evidence remaining removes all doubt. What, if we could know the whole truth!

But the most bitter trials do not always entirely crush a people’s energy. The calm after the tempest, the faintest glimmer of hope sometimes are enough to revive our spirits and to urge us once more to cling to life. And so the meeting of friends and relatives, the compassion of the world and the hopes of new homes, of peace and quiet were often sufficient to enliven hearts and after ten, twenty and even thirty years we see them starting out afresh. We see them harkening with eager desires to Spain’s invitation to settle in Louisiana; we see them flocking from every part of the world to this new haven; we see them establishing a colony there, which to-day has increased from twenty-five hundred to forty thousand souls; we see them settling in Baltimore to the number of five hundred, for there the presence of priests and fellow Catholics rendered their lot more tolerable; we see seven hundred of them in France, and then, eleven years after their exile, we see thousands swarming back to Canada and places adjacent, and some even to their beloved Acadia. One heroic band of eight hundred Acadians set out from Boston to reach this country on foot. They trudged for many weeks over rugged mountains and through dense forests, living on whatsoever they could find in the chase, in fishing, and even on wild roots. Children of all ages were among them, and infants in their mother’s arms.
How many died on this sad journey, overcome by weariness, hunger, and disease; how many were left without friends, without priests, without any consolation, to die amid all the anguish of grief and neglect, no one will ever know. When at last the column of exiles, their ranks now thinned by the journey, arrived at their former homes, which they hoped to find waiting for them, they found new owners upon their lands and everything changed—language, customs, even the names of their cities, and they themselves strangers in their own country. They were led to new forest lands and forced to begin all over again. Clearings were made in the forests, and from the felled trees quickly arose log cabins; they took to fishing and hunting; little by little their numbers were increased, and the colony was started that now spreads over the western portion of the Peninsula. So, many other settlements began in the different maritime provinces and French Canada and the descendants of their inhabitants now number nearly half a million.

But the hearts of the whole people had been saddened, and the memory of their sufferings can never be blotted out. It will endure as long as history lasts, and the wounds which it causes can never be healed. The Acadians are still for the most part an industrious people, but they no longer live in the simplicity, peace and abundance of their ancestors, no longer are they a nation, but are scattered here and there throughout the world, and what is to be regretted more than all else, is that many have lost their religion, which their forefathers were willing to sacrifice all to preserve. O, England! how darest thou hold up thy head in pride? Behold the suffering thou hast caused! Behold the sword of anguish with which thou hast pierced the hearts of thy people!

"Still stands the forest primeval; but under the shade of its branches Dwells another race, with other customs and language. Only along the shore of the mournful and misty Atlantic, Linger a few Acadian peasants, whose fathers from exile Wandered back to their native land to die in its bosom. In the fisherman’s cot the wheel and the loom are still busy: Maidens still wear their Norman caps and their kirtles of homespun, And by the evening fire repeat Evangeline’s story, While from its rocky caverns the deep-voiced neighboring ocean Speaks, and in accents disconsolate answers the wail of the forest."

DON CARLOS ELLIS, ’04.
THE MERRICK DEBATE.*

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

Resolved, "That the State government should interfere in strikes which threaten the welfare of the whole people."

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Father Rector, Honourable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen:

When we observe the general outline of our modern civilization, we must admit that the evolution of society is still incomplete, and that a desirable rate of progress has not been attained in labor matters. The conditions and surroundings of civilized man have been vastly improved in modern times. War with its cruelties is less savage than formerly; the victorious battlefield is no longer defiled with inhuman butchery; the captured city is not now given up to plunder and slaughter, and the cruel punishments formerly inflicted upon criminals are things of the past.

In the intercourse of man with his kind, individual welfare is now more carefully guarded than ever before, and the privileges of even the humblest citizen are more generally recognized and granted. Yet, with all this progress, with all this advancement in civilization, there is still a weak point in the social structure and that is found in the relations between Capital and Labor.

Our opponents tell us that Capital and Labor are being brought closer together, but if we judge from the disturbances that are constantly taking place in the industrial world these assertions must be seriously questioned. The wars they wage on each other will continue so long as the people shall be content to permit its privileges to be violated and ignored, and so long as it shall refrain either from compelling the battling elements to settle their quarrel in the interests of the public peace and general business, or from settling it for them.

In the first place, I wish to emphasize one point, lest the object of my contention be misunderstood. I do not claim that the interference of the State is the best method to pursue in settling labor disputes, nor do I propose this interference as the first remedy. I grant that Voluntary Arbitration and Conciliation are far superior to Legal Arbitration, but when Capital and Labor fail to arbitrate peacefully, when they fail to conciliate, then, and not till then, let the State interfere for the benefit of the public good.

But does not the history of the past and present show, with exceptions, that employer and employee will not make use of these peaceful agencies? Have we not heard the announcement of Capital that "we have nothing to arbitrate?" Have we not heard that declaration of Labor that "we are opposed to the State interfering with our rights?" Even if they did make use of Voluntary Arbitration, it would not be ultimately successful, because a recommendation
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could only be made as to what would be for the best interests of the parties concerned, but there would be no power to enforce the award. There are Voluntary Arbitration Boards in Colorado, California, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, but they have proved unsuccessful. Why, today there is in progress in the city of Lowell, Massachusetts, one of the largest factory strikes in the history of the State. The Board of Arbitration was called in to adjust the difficulty, but accomplished nothing, and the strike still goes on.

Under the conditions which have been mentioned what is the result of these differences? A strike is ordered, and then come those evils which are a blot on the boasted civilization of our country and which tend to undermine the very foundations of society.

As our subject deals only with those strikes which affect the whole people, a better example cannot be had than the recent strike in the coal regions of Pennsylvania. The miners quit work; no coal was mined; there was none to be hauled; coal became scarce, and you all remember the result; industrial plants, unable to obtain supplies, were shut down, thus throwing thousands of workmen out of employment; the financial loss became enormous, and in every State of the Union the distress of families deprived of this valuable necessity of life was beyond description. There was rioting, men were wounded and even killed; from North to South, from East to West, the effect on business could not be estimated. Which party to this dispute may have been the cause of all this loss and misery does not concern us. The important point is, that the public was the sufferer and its rights first of all should have been protected. This fact was recognized by that great apostle of labor, and the greatest strike leader of modern times, John Mitchell, when he said: "It is only in a great emergency like the one of last year that the intervention of outside forces is desirable. The great lesson to be drawn from the coal strike and its settlement is, that neither Capital nor Labor can with impunity disregard the interests of the people. Public considerations are, after all, the highest considerations and this applies to the managers of corporations as well as to the leaders of labor organizations."

We have as a further consequence of a strike the boycott, that deadly weapon, whose real value as an aid to labor is overlooked, and it becomes an instrument of industrial warfare deserving the condemnation of every American citizen, an instrument that knows no laws of justice or morality, an instrument which inflicts untold injury upon the public when unlawfully used. The Summer of 1894 furnished a notable illustration of the unlawful boycott resulting from a strike of railroad men in Chicago. The reason assigned was, that laborers for the Pullman Palace Car corporation had gone on a strike because of a reduction in wages. It began with a boycott against railroad companies which made use of the Pullman Palace cars and which did not discontinue their use. This was followed
by a general strike, whose purpose was, by blocking the wheels of traffic, to coerce the railroad companies into taking such action as would compel the Pullman car company to arbitrate the charges of oppression brought against it. When the car company refused to arbitrate, and it is well to note this fact, a strong union, composed of railroad employees in various departments of the service, declared a boycott and went out on a strike. It was this kind of a strike that was so damaging to themselves and to the public. What a boon it would have been to the country and to the industrial interests involved if this controversy had been immediately settled by the State. Consider what actually occurred here. Thousands of persons, who had paid to be transported across the country and who had a legal right to proceed without detention, were sidetracked at way stations without their consent; the transportation of the United States mails was impeded; tropical fruits and dressed meats by the train load, even live cattle, all belonging to private parties, were destroyed. The suffering of innocent persons, as a necessary result of what had been ordered, was quite beyond estimate. The victims were found in every part of the country and among all classes of people. Can there be any doubt as to whether the State should have interfered in such a strike? It did interfere, and Mr. Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, in summing up this case, said, "The strong arm of the National Government may be put forth to brush away all obstructions to the freedom of interstate commerce or the transportation of the mails. If the emergency arise the army of the nation and all its militia are at the service of the nation to compel obedience to its laws. Now, whenever the wrongs complained of are such as affect the public at large and concerning which the nation owes the duty to all the citizens of securing to them their common rights, then the mere fact that the government has no pecuniary interest in the controversy is not sufficient to exclude it from the courts or prevent it from taking measures to fully discharge those constitutional duties." What greater proof do we desire in behalf of State interference than a decision rendered by a representative of the highest legal tribunal in the land?

Another evil attending a strike is the conspiracy, and in connection with this the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has decided, that the offence of conspiracy is still punishable at common law in that State, and that any combination designed to coerce employees or other workmen by the various expedients known as intimidation, blacklisting, or boycotting, are illegal.

What right has any man to injure another because he does not sympathize in his cause? Must those men who desire to labor to keep their families from misery and starvation be subjected to threats and insults? Must they be compelled to join with the strikers in breaking their contracts with their employers? Must they be forced to disregard the mandates of the law? Unquestionably, No!
Consider the financial loss entailed to the public by such strikes. The computed loss from all causes as a result of the recent coal strike in Pennsylvania was over $140,000,000. Take again the Chicago railroad strike. The losses suffered throughout the country by reason of lack of transportation and consequent stoppage of industry amounted to nearly $80,000,000.

Our opponents, no doubt, will argue for the rights of Capital and Labor. They will claim that the State should not interfere in their private affairs, and that the workingman has the privilege of striking whenever his rights are infringed on. I do not deny the right of the laborer to strike if conditions, present or prospective, do not please him. But the employer has an equal right to hire other men when his employees desert. With equal moral justice it must be contended, that if the individual employee has the privilege of abandoning his employment and seeking elsewhere at his own convenience or against the wishes of the employer, the latter can discharge any individual whenever he may desire and for any legal reason. No privilege, whether moral or industrial, can safely be accorded to one man or set of men and denied to another man or set of men.

Labor leaders say that if the employers were not restrained by the power of organized labor and a constant threat of a consequent strike they could discharge every union man in their service and hire non-union men. But workingmen forget, that when they find the plan feasible, they compel employers to discharge the non-union men and to employ union men in their stead.

As to the rights of Capital and Labor a distinction must be made between individual or personal rights, such as the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and those other rights which appertain to an individual as one of the units of the body politic.

The rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are secured to every man under the Constitution and laws of this country. Among these inalienable rights is the right of purchase, of sale and of contract, the right to pursue any lawful business or vocation in any manner not inconsistent with the rights of others, the right to work for whoever may offer employment at any price agreed on. These rights, however, like all other rights of the individual, are held subject to the laws of human necessities and the welfare of the people. "No man shall be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law," is one of the maxims formulated and enforced by the courts, founded upon principles recognized long before Magna Charta was granted. But this maxim never has been construed to conflict with those other maxims of the law, "the well being of the people is supreme law" and "The voice of the people is the voice of God."

If we look back on the pages of history, we will find that "private rights" are inferior and have been subjected to that public right which inheres in a community to protect its general welfare. Neither an individual nor a corporation can have any rights exempt
from the supervision and control of that community politic, because the exercise of every function of that individual and of that corporation relates to and affects the rights and privileges of all other members of that community. The corporation is the creation of the State and the recipient of special favors from the State. Therefore it is dependent on and accountable to the power that created it. This condition carries with it the power to prescribe a course of action and to compel its observance.

On the other hand, the laborer, although he is not indebted to the State for any legislative favors, yet is under moral obligations for the provisions which the State makes to protect him from injustice and oppression. Therefore it is within the province of the State to both insist that he recognize these obligations and to exercise such constraint as the public good requires to enforce it. It is a keen, selfish sense of private rights and a total disregard of public obligations that give rise to and aggravate all industrial troubles.

We have in support of our contention the words of one of the greatest, if not the greatest statesman of our age, Leo XIII. He has said, "rulers should anxiously safeguard the community in all its parts; the community, because the conservation of the community is so emphatically the business of the supreme power, that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first, but it is a government's whole reason of existence."

Should the State allow Capital and Labor to make war on each other at the expense of the public weal? Should the State permit them to bring distress and suffering to the whole people, merely to satisfy their private contentions? Should the State suffer them to paralyze the commerce and industries of our country?

But the question arises, how shall the State interfere in such strikes as we are treating of this evening?

The remedy which I propose is legal arbitration, that is, whenever one party has a just grievance against another, which just grievance the second party will not eradicate either by voluntary arbitration or conciliation, then the aggrieved party may apply to a legal board of arbitration for a writ requiring the second party to come before the board and show cause for his action. The board's decision is to be binding, and failure to comply will be held as contempt.

Our opponents may refer to the Arbitration system which is at present operative in New Zealand, and may tell you it has proved unsuccessful. I agree with my opponents that it has failed of success. But why has it been a failure? It has failed because it does not cover non-union men; it has failed because it does not include sympathetic strikers; it has failed because it does not embrace labor unions not registered. But the system which I have proposed is to include all classes of Capital and Labor whether organized or unorganized. Our opponents will deny the power of a Board of Legal Arbitration to enforce its award. They will say, you cannot compel eighty thousand or a hundred thousand men to do or refrain from doing a certain thing. Let us see
whether or not this can be done. The
public, through its courts, issued an in­
junction against the Chicago railroad
strikers of 1894, which not only re­
strained the strikers from interfering
with the freedom of interstate com­
merce and the transportation of the
mails, but it broke up the strike.

To further prove this point, let me
quote you an extract from the testi­
mony of Mr. Debbs, one of the foremost
leaders of that strike. When he ap­
peared before the United States Strike
Commission at that time, he said, "When
the employees found that we were ar­
rested and removed from the field of
action, they became demoralized, and
that ended the strike." It was not the
soldiers that ended the strike; it was
not the labor unions that ended the
strike; it was simply the United States
Courts that ended the strike.

Now, this proposed Legal Board of
Arbitration is to be the same as and to
possess the same powers as a Court of
Equity. Therefore, when our oppo­
nents raised the question that this board
could not enforce its award, they must
deny the power of a court to enforce its
decisions, which, Honorable Judges, you
know is an absurdity.

The settlement of the recent coal
strike may be taken by the affirmative
as a glorious example of voluntary
arbitration, but be not deceived. Did
not the coal barons say, "we have noth­
ing to arbitrate"? Can any true Ameri­
can erase from his memory the defiant
attitude of President Baer towards the
President of the United States, when
the latter tendered his good offices
to settle the strike? But what a
change took place when Congress re­
moved the tariff on coal and when the
public demanded the seizure of the
mines. The operators immediately sub­
mited to President Roosevelt's pro­
position. Was this voluntary arbitra­
tion? No, it was arbitration enforced
by the public.

To sum up, I have shown you the im­
possibility of any satisfactory agree­
ment between Capital and Labor.
Secondly, I have pointed out as a resu­
t of this disagreement, the strike and its
evils. Thirdly, I have pictured their
effect both on the people directly and on
the commerce and industries of our
country. In the fourth place, I have
shown that the State has a right and
should interfere in strikes which affect
the welfare of the whole people, both
from the nature of the State, and from its
duties to its citizens. And finally, I
have proposed a remedy in case volun­
tary arbitration or conciliation fail to
accomplish the desired result.

Let us hope the time will come when
the disastrous wars between Capital and
Labor will cease. Let us hope that the
State will awaken to the realization of
those obligations which it owes to its
citizens and on which depend the vital
interest of society and the very exist­
ence of the Republic.

Let us rise and demand this in­
terference, that the greatest obstacles to
our social and industrial progress may
be removed. Then will we see the
whole people enjoying the blessings of
peace and happiness. Then will we
see the strong arm of Capital uplift the
tottering form of Labor and march onward, not as enemies, but as brothers in the cause of their countrymen, ever remembering

"He's true to God who's true to man;
wherever wrong is done
To the humblest and the weakest
'neath the all-beholding sun,
That wrong is also done to us, and
they are slaves most base
Whose love of right is for themselves
and not for all their race."

FRANK LEO ROGERS, '03.

SECOND NEGATIVE.

Mr. Chairman, Rev. Father Rector, Honorable Judges, Ladies and Gentlemen:

A good law should be necessary; a sound law should have in it no elements of danger; an acceptable law should be in keeping and in conformity with the principles of our nation. A law empowering the Government of a State to interfere in strikes would not be a good law, for it is not necessary; it could not be a sound law, for we shall see there lurk therein the elements of discord and disunion; it would not be an acceptable law, for it strikes a blow at the first fundamental and paramount principle of the American people.

Before I address myself to the task of proving these three points I ask you, Honorable Judges, to recall the words of the question, "Resolved, that the State government should interfere in strikes which affect the welfare of the whole people." We have not come to argue the question of compulsory arbitration; we have not come to deal with compulsory investigation or with any special form of interference. The question of State interference in general is the problem before us. Upon that question alone have our opponents challenged us, and upon that question we are ready to meet them.

 Strikes can affect the welfare of the whole people in two ways. First, by endangering their lives or property, and second, by interrupting their material prosperity. The first case is far from warranting the plan of the affirmative, for throughout the land, in every State, stringent laws with harsh penalties are already awaiting the man who kills, the man who burns, the man who dare promote social disorder. The second case is equally far from commending the necessity of this measure, for not only does justice from time to time demand that men be deprived of some luxury, but no less an authority than Mr. Carroll D. Wright tells us that "strikes and industrial conditions are governed by positive economic laws," and over those laws the State has no more control than over the laws of the physical universe which manifest themselves in the eruption of a volcano.

Our past furnishes no incidents which have given rise to the necessity of this measure. We have experienced wars, political problems, enigmas of a social and industrial nature, but one by one in the common interest they have been solved without this power reposing in the State. To the peoples of the earth we have shown we can settle strikes without this arbitrary method: the American people have shown they can be trusted.

Where, then, lies the necessity for States possessing this power? States already possess the power to guarantee protection to their citizens in their lives and property, to enforce the reign of law and order. Beyond this there is no power, no jurisdiction for any State.

The present conditions in the world of labor offer no ground upon which
the opposition may safely rest their claims for the necessity of such a law. Day by day the laborer is learning that violence can no longer aid his cause. He is learning too that property must not be destroyed, for out of property must come his wages. The laboring man of to-day is a keen student of his own interests, and the more zealously he guards those interests the more clearly does he see that violence can no longer be his weapon. More and more he is disregarding it until riot is the exception and not the rule. Why then shall we confer this power upon the State as a preventive of an evil diminishing in strength with a rapidity which augurs only for its speedy and final death?

With law and order already ensured, with every prospect for meeting future emergencies as we have met those of the past, and with the policy of violence nearing its end, I say there can be shown no necessity for the State government possessing the power of interference.

In assuming to uphold and defend the soundness of this law, my opponents have undertaken a gigantic proceeding. Fair and pleasing as I grant you it is to the ear, sober reflexion and unbiased judgment show it to teem with the possibilities of disaster. No sooner than any State would assume the power of interference there would follow an immediate and desperate clash between the forces of labor and capital for the control of legislation of that State. Is this to be desired? Have we not enough of political scheming to satisfy us? Think you it would benefit any State to be thus torn in the arms of unending political strife?

Let us not blind our reason by the thought that we would be exempt from the fulfilment of this probability. Just as long as States possessed this power, just so long would the battle be waged; just so long would labor and capital face each other with hostile eyes.

This contention would certainly follow, and it would follow to the detriment of the State. It would mean endless corruption in State legislatures and unlimited injury to the great mass of the people.

Let us not forget that in the course of time progress, labor and capital must be reconciled. If you grant this power to States the hope of the coming of labor peace must be forever banished, for never would either side lay down their arms in the struggle for legislative supremacy in order that this same interference when used would be employed in their behalf.

We can afford to recommend no State to enact a law which would give such ample scope for the lobbyist and his deadly work. We can recommend no State to assume a power which would postpone for one day the coming of the settlement between labor and capital.

If my opponents would claim this resolution to be sound as far as justice is concerned, I would tell them that the hope of any such result from it is but a vain and idle fancy. To hope for a legislature controlled by capitalists to exercise the power of interference with injury to their own interests would be in vain. To hope for a legislature governed by the interests of labor to yield one inch to capital in the employment of this power would be but to cherish a foolish and absurd conviction.

A strike is a labor war. It is war between the contestants for what each deems to be justice.

Let us suppose a great strike to be on hand. Let us suppose some demand has been levied by labor and refused by capital. On one side we see the laborer demanding what he thinks is right. We see him girding his loins, taking up the struggle, animated primarily by man's right to life and the means to sustain it. Facing this determined army we behold an array no less determined, no less convinced that they are right.
Can any State justly claim the right to step in and settle such a contest by interference? By what standard shall any legislature determine the proper moment for the exercise of this power? Would not the fact whether or not they should employ it be determined by the interests of the controlling party in that legislature?

Suppose the formidable ranks we have pictured have declared war and advanced to the fray. Suppose the welfare of the whole people is threatened. Of what avail is the power of the State to interfere? If she attempt its exercise, side by side with her labor trouble would come a political war strong enough in its intensity to rend that State. In the legislature, if interference would benefit the employer, the men of his class would contend for its employment. If, on the other hand, interference would jeopardize the interests of labor, her representatives would fight against it tooth and nail! What chances here for corruption! What golden opportunities for bribery!

But, my opponents say, the majority in that legislature would rule and there the matter would end. Let us not be deceived! In settling that strike the State would issue an award favorable to one party or with concessions to both, or she would use means to attain that end.

If the award of the State be not satisfactory to the employer he can exercise his undeniable right of closing his doors, retire from business and throw thousands of people upon the State with no hope of employment. In this case the State would be absolutely powerless. Can she compel a man to continue business when he refuses? Can she drag an employer back to his office, compel him to direct his forces and utilize his brain for the successful production of material? No! The State can only stand aside and looking out upon the vast army of the unemployed and feeling her political structure shaken by the dissensions in her legislature, she could curse the day she assumed the power of interference! She could only curse the day she adopted a policy warranted by no necessity, a policy so unsound, a policy so fraught with disaster!

But what if the award of the State be not satisfactory to labor? If the employer can cease to continue business, cannot the labor cease to work? My opponents say "No!" They say the welfare of the people is threatened and the laborer must be compelled to work! For the State, if the laborer refuse, two avenues of action are open; a commandment of law and the use of armed intervention. She chooses the first and orders strikers to accept her decision. If they again refuse, the second avenue of action is still open and she orders forth her armed troops and bids them uphold the power and majesty of the law.

In mentioning this action I will not dwell upon the fact that nine-tenths of the militia are laboring men and never would they level their guns against their brothers in the struggle for life.

Now the State stands in its last quandary. Either she must order men to be intimidated and shot down or she must admit she cannot enforce her own commands. If she does the first it means war! If she does the second it means that her citizens can no longer respect a State unable to enforce her own commands and with respect for law gone, there can be no stability for any State. Surely this is a terrible alternative to force upon an American State!

Seeing, as we do, the frightful consequences which could follow the adoption of such a policy, we must yield to reason and admit that whatever can be said in its favor, no man can say it is sound.

If State interference in strikes has shown itself to be warranted by no
necessity; if we have seen it to be so unsound, what can we say of its acceptability? Of its being in accord with the principles of the American people? If you admit the right of the State to interfere in strikes you admit the right of the State at some time to interfere with the liberty of the individual; you admit a principle which could lead to the State controlling the every act of the individual. Can this be an acceptable law? No! A thousand times no! No law can be acceptable to the American people contrary to the creed that all men are created with equal right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness.

A law empowering States to interfere in strikes would strike a death blow to individual liberty, and hence to the liberty of the body politic. Against this we raise our voices in loudest protest! Liberty for all is our watchword. Dearly purchased has it been by our fathers and dearly cherished is it still in the hearts of their children. We will commend no measure which is an abrogation of that sacred national principle. We will lend our approval to no law which says that the Stars and Stripes shall not wave over the land of the free.

John H. O'Brien, '04.

May 4, 08
FATHER CHARLES K. JENKINS, S. J.

Father Charles Kennedy Jenkins, S.J., who died at the College on June 18, was born in Baltimore, Md., on May 24, 1834, and had almost reached the scriptural age of three-score years and ten. His father, Mr. James Jenkins, of Baltimore, was a student at this college from 1820 to 1824, and was a staunch Georgetown man, a conspicuous figure at every commencement, venerable and dignified in his serene and honored old age, as he attended the centennial celebration of 1889. It was a rare treat to hear him recall the memories of early days at Georgetown College, and to read his reminiscences communicated to former numbers of the College JOURNAL. Father Jenkins belonged to a family which has long been identified with the highest mercantile life of Baltimore, which has been conspicuous for sterling Catholic faith, and liberal endowments of Catholic worship and charity. The family of his uncle, Mr. Thomas Jenkins, built Corpus Christi Church, Baltimore, and the family of his mother put up St. Anne's Church, in the same city. Father T. Meredith Jenkins contributed the funds which were required to found and equip the Georgetown College Observatory, and the Rev. Oliver Jenkins, of the Congregation of St. Sulpice, was largely instrumental in securing the stability and success of St. Charles’ College, near Ellicott City, Md., over which he presided for many years. It was owing to his kinship with the president of St. Charles that young Charles Jenkins entered that institution for his course of classical studies, instead of Georgetown College, where his father and so many of his relatives before and since have been educated. Among his fellow students at St. Charles was His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons. At the age of twenty Charles Jenkins entered the Novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Frederick, Md., August 12, 1854. After his novitiate and juniorate, a summary of his assignments to duty throughout his long and useful life is as follows. He taught rudiments at Georgetown 1857, the same class at George-College 1858, 1859; was assistant treasurer of Loyola College, Baltimore, 1860. He studied philosophy at Boston College 1861-1863, and theology at Georgetown 1864-1866, being at the same time treasurer during this last year. He was ordained priest at St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore, in 1866, with Archbishop Kain, of St. Louis, and Archbishop Keane, of Dubuque. He was minister at Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., 1867; minister at Georgetown, 1868-1869; treasurer at Gonzaga 1870; treasurer at Georgetown 1871-1872. He made his third year of probation at Frederick, Md., in 1873, was minister at Georgetown 1874-1875, and was appointed rector of Gonzaga College in 1876, retaining this post until 1882. He
was made Superior of the Residence of St. Aloysius, Leonardtown, Md., where he remained for the following twenty years. Last year he underwent a painful surgical operation without the use of anaesthetics, but although this gave him some relief his constitution was shattered. Still he would not ask to be relieved from the post of duty, as he was deeply attached to his congregation and was dearly loved by him. During last February, however, a stroke of paralysis, which it was thought at the time would prove fatal, incapacitated him for all further work, and he came to Georgetown College, where he had been staying in the infirmary, for rest and medical treatment. His residence at Georgetown proved beneficial, and he was able to celebrate Mass once or twice, but as a general thing he was unable to offer the Holy Sacrifice, and so it was his custom to attend the half-past five Mass in the Dahlgren Chapel, and receive Holy Communion, so that when the end came he was prepared and fortified. On the 18th of June he expected to return with his sister to Leonardtown, the field of labor where he had lived so long and accomplished so much good work. But Divine Providence disposed otherwise. He had been present as usual at the early Mass and had received Holy Communion from Father Fargis, the celebrant of the Mass. He seemed just as well as usual, until after Mass, when the prayers were being said, he fell to the floor, striking his head against the kneeling bench and cutting it as he fell. He was carried unconscious into the sacristy and Father Fargis administered the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. He expired shortly afterwards at about eight minutes past six, without recovering consciousness. His death, though sudden, was painless, and well provided.

Father Jenkins was of a cheerful disposition, kindly, and retiring, but earnest and zealous. It may be said of him that he never had an enemy. His principal care and solicitude was for the Christian education of the young. He established the Academy of Notre Dame in the parish of St. Aloysius, while he was rector of Gonzaga College, and the flourishing Academy of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, at Leonardtown, which he watched over with paternal care and which will feel his loss severely. These two academies are the monuments of his zeal and piety. The funeral of Father Jenkins was simple but impressive. The Office of the Dead was chanted in the Dahlgren Chapel at 9 a.m., followed by a Low Mass of Requiem celebrated by Rev. Father Rector. In the sanctuary were the fathers and scholastics of Georgetown, the fathers of Trinity Church, Rev. A. A. Curtis, D. D., Bishop of Echinius and Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Baltimore; Very Rev. J. C. Kent, O. P., Prior of St. Dominic’s; Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Rector of St. Mary’s; Rev. James T. Mackin, Rector of St. Paul’s; Rev. W. S. Caughey, Rector of St. Stephen’s; Rev. J. D. Marr, Rector of the Immaculate Conception parish; Rev. Joseph C. Mallon, of Tenallytown; Rev. M. F. Foley, Rector of St. Paul’s, Baltimore; Rev. E. D. Boone S. J., and Rev. M. J. Byrnes, S. J., of St. Ignatius’, Baltimore; Rev. George
Dougherty, of St. Augustine's; Rev. John Abell Morgan, S. J.; Rev. John J. Fleming, S. J., and Messrs. J. H. O'Reilly, S. J., and F. H. Kreis, S. J., of Gonzaga College; Mother M. Catherine and Sister Seraphina of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Leonardtown; Sister Pauline with others of the Franciscan Sisters of the University Hospital, and some Dominican Sisters were in attendance, also Father Jenkins' brothers, Messrs. Edward and James Jenkins, his sister, Miss Mary J. Jenkins, Mr. Harris Camalier, State Attorney; Hon. Frank King, member of the Legislature, and editor of the *St. Mary's Beacon*; Dr. Greenwell, Mr. Charles Abell, Mr. Oscar Morgan and Superintendent of Schools Joy, all of Leonardtown. The *Journal* is much indebted to Rev. E. I. Devitt, S. J., who amid the stress of work during a mission at St. Thomas', Md., found time to send valuable material for this sketch of Rev. Charles Kennedy Jenkins. *R. I. P.*
The long-looked-for and much-talked of Hodge-Podge of the Class of 1902, has at last appeared, bearing the inspiring motto, "Hic est—Ubi pretium?" We are all glad that the annual has been issued, for indeed it is a very creditable publication. It is useless to rehash the causes which worked against the earlier appearance of the year-book, because there are two sides to the question. Yet, for the benefit and edification of the coming classes, we should take the lesson which this experience teaches to heart, and provide against a recurrence of the conditions which obtained in the publication of the Hodge-Podge of 1902.

Two things have been established: first that Georgetown will support an energetic class publication; second, that the united efforts of the class is the first necessary element to receive success and the desired support of the college. The college was half-hearted in supporting the Annual of 1902, but it was probably a lassitude caught from members of the class that issued the Annual. If we are to have future editions of the Hodge-Podge, and we hope that the class of '04 will prove equal to the task of publishing an Annual, let it be understood that the class men must work as a unit, and support it both with funds and moral encouragement, for in no other way will even ordinary success be possible.

While the persecutions of the religious orders in France during the past year excited great indignation among Roman Catholics the world over, and while time and again it was asserted that the elements at work in that erratic republic had as their ultimate object the destruction of all religious liberty, neither great interest nor indignation was manifested by the world of sectarian Christianity.

But recently there has come an awakening to the fact that it is not men who are opposed to Roman Catholics, or to religious associations alone,
but men who are avowed atheists and are opposed to everything held sacred by religion, that are behind this movement of which the disestablishment of the religious houses was the first coup. So good an authority as the *Journal des Debats*, of Paris, verifies this opinion in a recent issue, and its verdict may well give rise to grave apprehensions.

In the course of an article discussing the subject with great candor the *Journal* says: "What our country most lacks is the sentiment of liberty. The recent circular issued by the Minister of Public Worship ordering the closing of churches not authorized by the State will necessarily touch independent men and provoke protestations from all liberal-minded persons worthy of the name. It no longer concerns itself with the congregations, it no longer confines itself merely to the Catholic religion. Religious liberty itself is arraigned. In order to fulfill its complete mission, a religion should certainly have the power, if it respects the general laws of the country, to exercise itself freely and to spread its teachings for the triumph of its ideas. Oppression exists the moment religion has no longer the faculty of presenting its belief."

Republican France would do well to learn wisdom from the example of the United States in the matter of religious liberty. The government that undertakes to regulate the consciences of men will always be in trouble. While ostentatiously proclaiming in favor of liberty, the great need of France is, as the *Journal des Debats* says, "the sentiment of liberty," which recognizes every man's right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, unmo­usted by governmental regulation or interference.

Among those who, on June 28, were raised to the Holy Order of the Priest­hood, at the Jesuit House of Studies, Woodstock, Md., were four of Georgetown's former professors, Revs. Alphonse J. Donlon, S. J., Joseph J. McLoughlin, S. J., John D. Butler, S. J., and William F. O'Hare, S. J. Father Donlon is also an old student, having graduated in 1888. He was afterwards Professor of Physics, from 1893 to 1900. Fathers McLoughlin, Butler and O'Hare were, at different times, between 1893 and 1895, connected with the College as teachers and prefects. Georgetown, through the *Journal*, wishes them all happiness and every blessing in the performance of the duties of the sacred ministry.

Edward Maurice Shea, A. B., class of 1898, was elevated to the Holy Order of the Priest­hood, at the Seminary of Mt. St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, Maryland, Tuesday, June 16. The Right Reverend Edward P. Allen, D. D., Bishop of Mobile, to whose Diocese Father Shea is affiliated, conferred Holy Orders. Father Shea celebrated his first Mass at St. Aloysius' Church, Washington, D. C., on the Patronal Feast of the Church, June 21, in presence of Monsignor Falconio, Delegate Apostolic. Reverend Father Rector and several of the Fathers of the College were present on the auspicious occasion. Father Shea was, during his residence at the College, very
Mr. James F. Costello was married to Miss Elizabeth Worthingtop, of Georgetown, in the Dahlgren Chapel, on Thursday, June 25th. Rev. Father Rector performed the ceremony, assisted by a number of the Fathers and Scholastics. A brother of the bridegroom assisted as best man, and a sister of the bride as bridesmaid. Mr. George Herbert Wells presided at the organ. "Jim" Costello was in residence here, 1899-1900, later entering the Georgetown Law School, from which he graduated this year.

The Journal extends congratulations to both the newly-married couples, and wishes them all future happiness.

---

GEORGETOWN AND THE ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA.

The Riggs Library has just received the concluding "New Volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica" 1902. Volume IX, forming volume XXXIII of the Complete Work, contains an article on Washington by Henry Gannet, Chief Geographer, U. S. Geological Survey, in the course of which the following occurs: "The colleges are as follows:—Columbian University, a Baptist institution, opened in 1821, which in 1899 had a faculty of 173 professors and was attended by 1041 students including 118 women; Georgetown College, a Jesuit institution, opened in 1891, which had in 1899 a faculty of 113 and was attended by 634 students; Gonzaga College, a Roman Catholic institution, opened in 1821, which had in 1899 a faculty numbering 15 and was attended by 151 students; Gallaudet College, a Government institution for the education of deaf mutes, was opened in 1865; in 1899 its faculty numbered 18 and the attendance was 103, including 39 women; the Catholic University of America, opened in 1889, and intended for graduate students only, had ten years later a faculty numbering 34 and an attendance of 168; the buildings of the American Methodist University are in course of erection" (p. 762). "Opened in 1891" is evidently a misprint for 1791, as the University catalogue for 1899-1900, to which reference must have been made in compiling the article, has on p. 16: "In 1788 the erection of the first building was undertaken, yet
1789 is commonly considered the year of the foundation of the college, as the deed of the original piece of ground was dated January 23d of that year. Students were not received before 1791. Still it seems an unpardonable oversight in proof-reading to allow so misleading a statement to remain in such an authoritative work. It is also inaccurate to speak of "Georgetown College," as the Medical School dates from 1851, the Graduate School from 1856, and the Law School from 1870. The figures given for faculty and students do not accord with the catalogue of the University for 1898-1899, which gives the faculty as numbering 133 and the students as numbering 614. Moreover, there seems to be no reason for calling Georgetown "a Jesuit institution" and Gonzaga "a Roman Catholic institution," since both Georgetown and Gonzaga are "Jesuit institutions" and hence of course "Roman Catholic institutions." It is to be hoped that the other articles in the "New Volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica" are not so misleading as the item on Georgetown University.

SCIENCE NOTES.

In connection with the article on Fr. Alqué's work in the Philippines in the May Journal, the following may be of interest:

The monthly Bulletin, published by the Philippine Weather Bureau, under the direction of the Rev. J. Algué, S.J, contains much valuable information relating to the meteorology and microseismic movements of the Archipelago. The tables include meteorological data deduced from hourly observations made at the Manila Observatory, and rainfall and temperature data at a considerable number of stations. The last Bulletin we have received for November, 1902, gives an account of the track of a typhoon which occurred between November 7 and 12. This typhoon was one of the most rapid that has been experienced, and its speed did not decrease until it reached the Asiatic continent. The map shows that at noon on November 7, it was near the meridian of 135 degrees west, and that twenty-four hours later it had already reached 122 degrees east longitude, and that it entered Luzon during the afternoon of that day. It speaks well for the efficiency of the forecasting department of the observatory that it was able to give timely warning of the approaching storm to the provinces threatened."—Nature, May 7th, 1903. Page 14, vol. 68. No. 1749.
The Ex-man penned his little valedictory last month, but is once again back doing business at the old stand. With us, writing exchanges has become a habit—a bad habit, perhaps, but nevertheless a habit, and one which we fear we will not be easily broken of. We didn’t intend originally to favor our contemporaries this month with a choice review of their merits and demerits, but as the time came around to go to press we felt an indistinct, indefinable longing for something—we didn’t know what—come over us, and sneaked stealthily away to the sanctum and buried ourselves in our beloved exchanges, and gentle satisfaction came and spread her mantle softly over us, and now we are at peace with all the world excepting that very important part of it which is presided over by the unabridged Genius of the Niagara Index. Even the irascible Ex-man of our old friend, the St. Joseph’s Collegian, has come around and admitted that the Journal is improving, whereat we turned up our editorial nose and held our head high, and came near overlooking a well-meant, but, in our opinion, entirely unjustifiable, castigation, by our very highly esteemed friend, the Ex-man of the Haverfordian. We won’t go into details, for our motto this month is “Peace at any price.” Indeed, save for a few petty instances of mean little snarls and sneers and harmless back-biting, all is lovely as a day in June in the ranks of college journalism, and verily has the Dove of Peace built its nest in the cannon’s mouth. Tears, loving farewells, lamentations, and tender wishes for the future, grace the editorial and exchange columns of our contemporaries, so that with difficulty did we restrain our emotion and were forced to turn for consolation to some of the back numbers of the Index, whose centenarian Ex-man will never cease to joy our soul as the only living, breathing illustration of “How to be Happy, though a Hundred.” By the aid of his jovial jocularities and Johnsonian ejaculations we regained our equanimity, and turned with a light heart to the exchange column of the Buff and Blue, which, through the diabolical machinations of the printer’s devil was erroneously styled in this column a month or two ago the Bluff and Blue. We turned to the exchange column, we say, and found the estimable “Exitior” in merry mood, naively wondering with what gender we were next going to honor her, inasmuch as we had already spoken of her as “her” and as “he.” And she suggested—rather cutely, if you don’t mind the expression—that “there are two conditions in which a person is naturally referred to as ‘it.’ The first is as a baby, and the second as a corpse. Now, we will soon be editorially dead, so why not clinch the matter by calling us ‘It?’ ” Of course, our gallantry will prevent us from
doing anything of the kind, and we take this opportunity to apologize to the young lady for having ever classed her among the hated race of men.

* * *

From the flood of editorial valedictories that has emptied itself upon the Ex-man, permit us to pick out the one written by the editor of the *Columbia Lit* as an example of what such a farewell should be like. He has managed to say something original, and he has said it in such a simple, unaffected, affecting and altogether delightful way, as to make us really sorry that he is going. We believe that a man who can bring so many embellishments to so trite a subject is destined for higher things.

* * *

Among the other poetical gems in the June issue of the *Laurel* is one addressed to "The Convent Bells." The second stanza runs thus:

"To think of four espoused to Christ
And four and one make five;
But soon the sad mistake appears,
For one is not alive."

There's poetry with a vengeance. Just think of the momentous thought contained in those four lines. We don't blame the poor man for writing it, and getting it off his mind. It must have been awfully hard to carry it around with him. And "four and one make five." Heavens! with what awful possibilities is that line fraught. Yes, yes, we know, like all great things, this line will have its calumniators, and some will sneer, and some will come to scoff, and go away in tears that such a thing could ever have happened; but we say, and ever shall say, that four and one *do* make five, yea, even though one is not alive, and some day, some dismal day the sad mistake will appear, and then will all acknowledge that four and one make five, not makes five, and Higgins, '05 will be acclaimed the Rejuvenator of Mathematics and an eternal Well-spring of Poesy throughout the length and breadth of this mighty but ungrateful republic.

* * *

Somebody ought to pat on the back the man who conducts the "Editor's Table" for the *Nassau Lit*. Here's an opinion that meets with our unqualified approval: "The story is generally detected by profusion of quotation marks, intermingled with "he said," and"she said;" verse is at once recognized by capital letters, but the essay has no hints for mortal ken. It is but a name which apologizes for the heterogeneous junk that helps the board feed an issue." As a general thing that description hits off the college magazine essay to perfection; that's why we are not fond of essays. The *Lit*, however, in its commencement number, has given us two scholarly productions, which may be called essays in the true sense of the word. The Baird Prize Oration, "Monuments," while not remarkable for depth of thought, is written, we think in the purest and most forcible English that we have ever seen in a college magazine. "Thackeray, the Satirist," is another excellent paper, in which the writer has given us his own reflections in a style that is at once easy and distinctive. The conclusion which the author draws may prove of interest: "And such apologies (for Thackeray's sourness) show the verdict that is coming more and more to be passed upon Thackeray, the satirist; that he was bitter and blinded, and that his satire is biting and ill-natured, because it is untrue. It will no doubt live, because much of it is woven into some of the finest novels in our tongue, but it will ever point as a warning finger that the same man may be both great and narrow."
The *St. Joseph's Collegian* comes to us with its usual quota of "solid matter." Solid matter, you must know, means essays, long, dry, uninteresting essays; and the *Collegian* has a reputation for solidity. It is so solid, in fact, that it is difficult to penetrate. We were surprised, however, to see in the *Collegian* this month two stories, and we wish to recommend to all lovers of the manly and heroic the description of the hero in "The Biter Bitten": "Joseph Martin, as before mentioned, is a noble and handsome boy, the recognized leader of those in whose company he is. Of medium height, he is a fine athlete, sturdy and strong; his brown eyes have a fearless look, and his manly bearing and character bespeak the nobleness of his soul." Ah! noble youth! What a picture for gods and men! Not Tom Brown nor Phil the Fiddler are in it with him. Even Frank Merriwell would pale into flabby insignificance were he placed alongside of J. Martin, and would feel, we are sure, like thirty cents. And then listen to this: "His companions, like himself, are actuated with all that is noble in life. Chums as they all are, they are at ease in each other's company, open and free, their happiness is beyond measure." Could anything be more redolent of roses and lush and mush than that? Imagine that delightful bunch of fair-haired, noble-purposed youths moving about among one another with perfect freedom, eyes beaming love to eyes, gentle words, prompted by purest hearts, falling from rosy lips; never a surly word, never a quarrel, but all peace and quiet and contentment. O love, O joy, O fudge!

Now let us turn to the other side: "But, sad to say, all are not like these. At some distance behind the rest is a crowd whose nearly complete silence is in ill accord with the noise of the others. Black sheep they are, the black sheep of Leighton College. Of morose dispositions, they hang back, unable to bear the happiness of their companions. With sullen looks they watch those ahead. Some are reading dime novels, while the rest are conversing in low tones, and occasionally with a furtive glance cast about, spitting tobacco juice over the sides of the boat."

Ah, sad to say! 'Tis not all light and joy and celestial goodness. Nay, nay, likewise not so. There is the base, the dark, the wicked side. Morose wretches, ominous silence, sullen looks, dime novels—all these are there, and something worse, something even more devilish than these—tobacco juice! Horrors! And furtive glances! We shudder to tell the rest.

But the ending will appeal to everyone, we are sure. The hero, having saved the villain from a watery grave, the villain promises to stop spitting tobacco juice in public, and the following affecting scene is graphically depicted:

"'Joe'"—

"'Frank'"—

"The words, half whispered, break forth spontaneously, and in the hand-clasp that followed, the past was forgotten and a friendship renewed that lasted till death."

And the little birds began to sing, and the moon flooded the grove with mellow light, and the reunited friends kissed each other on either cheek and there was a general slopping over all along the line.

** * * *

Speaking of essays, of which we weren't speaking at all, there's a neat bit of writing in *The Williams Lit*, called "Two Views of the Fine Frenzy." It is couched in a semi-humorous vein that appealed to us, and ought to appeal to every Ex-man, for all the humor that we have run across among our ex-
changes would scarcely fill the diminutive X which we had the pleasure of reviewing some time ago. Well, to get back to our muttions, the writer in the Williams Lit, takes the view, if we understand him rightly, that the inspiration of true poetry does not come when one is under the influence of powerful emotions, but that “It is his shallower emotions that impel an artist to his art, and in these he lives for it, but he must have lived deeper to succeed.” The writer claims, for instance, that a man never writes a poem to a particular girl but that he is just in love in a general sort of way, and a love poem “To —” is “perfectly sincere.” This view has, at least, the merit of novelty, and, no doubt, might be strongly combated by a host of college poets. For ourselves, we believe that there is a grain of truth in it, and would hesitate to be the first one to take the opposite ground.

As we just now observed, and as has been remarked on more than one occasion by more than one Ex-man, there is a painful lack of humorous writing by college men. Humor, in our opinion, is one of those things that helps put fragrance into the flowers and melody into the songs of life, and to see the young men of the country who ought to be bubbling over with rich and original fun so terribly serious is really distressing; it’s almost enough to make one read locals for amusement. We noticed in one of our exchanges the favorable criticism of a humorous story in the Brunonian, and we’ve since been pinning away to get a glance at that story, but as the Brunonian, for some reason or other, doesn’t visit us any more, we fear that we are doomed to disappointment.

The Brunonian is always a most entertaining magazine, and we should be glad to see it once more on our table.

The Amherst Lit for June contains a poem of rare excellence, called “Law.” The thought is, in the nature of things, not new, but the diction is graceful and throbbing with life, and the rhythm of the verse is exceptionally fine. We quote the last few lines:

Through the great city’s multitudinous din,
Out o’er the swampland low,
And where the evening vapor gleameth thin,
Out o’er the wood’s autumnal glow,
Down in dark mines within the hostile ground,
Where light is sweeter than most precious stone,
Above the wintry ocean raging with no bound,
Thou rul’st, mighty lord, in might alone.

Man from a bestial wildness thou didst arise
Up to the gladness of the better days;
Unto the blessings of the good.
Strong to fulfillers of thy just decrees,
Swift as the rush of time,
Robed in a force sublime,
Instant to wrath, full-armed with woe and sharp disease.
Aid to the trodden, with thy circling fate
Thou keepest staunch the right in peasant or in state.

William Northrop Morse.

The Amherst Lit’s cover this month is artistic to a degree, and, as usual, its stories and sketches are in an original vein and very well written.

We are sorry that we have not before noticed our good friend, The Mountaineer, from Mt. St. Mary’s College. The Mountaineer’s contributions are often quite readable, and its verse, on occasion, is especially good. The Mountaineer has an Ex-man with puglistic tendencies and a ready pen, whose productions, while sometimes not in the best of taste, are always interesting, and frequently amusing.

Here is a sad, sad wail from New England, over which, we make no doubt, the reader, even as we, will shed many a pearly tear.
LEGEND OF THE CONNECTICUT.

Henry Stimson.

In the Connecticut
Wah lost her petticut,
So runs the legend
Long, long ago.
Sad was her lament
For her lost raiment;
Wroth was her parent
Long, long ago.
"Come back no more to hut
In the Connecticut
Without your petticut"—
Long, long ago.

In the Connecticut
Wah sought her petticut,
So runs the legend
Long, long ago.
Sought it in rain,
Sought it in pain,
Sought it, insane,
Long, long ago.
Sought it with fears,
Sought it with tears,
Sought it with jeers,
Long, long ago.

Often at full of moon
Mid the wild haunts of coon,
Mingled with cries of loon,
Long, long ago,
Heard was Wah's lament
For her lost raiment:
So runs the legend
Long, long ago.

In the Dartmouth Magazine.

The Hampden-Sidney Magazine, like many of its Southern contemporaries, makes a feature of love-stories that contain too much love and too many love-scenes, and too little action and strong, healthy sentiment. As a result, its stories make one feel like taking to the woods and trying to forget the existence of lovely woman. Love, we suppose, is a necessary requisite in the modern short-story, but then we don't think it need be all love. It's easy enough to ring in a baseball game or a railroad accident, or something else thrilling and wholesome. The style of the Hampden-Sidney Magazine's stories is not half bad, and we see no reason why we should not have better productions in the future. The Magazine's verse, too, mostly the work of a single writer, is considerably above the average.

* * *

There are two good stories in the Mt. Holyoke this month, "The Serenade," and "The Wrong Envelope." The latter gives a new twist to the old idea of mixing up the letters, and putting them in the wrong envelopes, and by representing the blunder as intentional, makes a sketch which is decidedly clever. "The Serenade" is told with simplicity and directness, and is, moreover, very wholesome and out of the common run of stories.

* * *

The Dooley articles running in the Syracuse University Herald are well done (pardon the pun), and in their own contracted sphere seem to be serving the same purpose that their models serve in the world at large.

* * *

Among our Southern contemporaries we wish to commend highly for neatness, good taste and literary tone The Tennessee University Magazine. "The Sequel" is a good specimen of the bright dialogue-sketch, and all the Magazine's departments are in capable hands.

* * *

With best wishes to all editors, exchange editors, local writers, printers, and printer's devils, we say "Farewell" and lock the Sanctum door.

Hall Stoner Lusk, '04.
LAW SCHOOL.

The thirty-second annual commencement of the law department of the Georgetown University was held on Monday evening, June 9, in the National Theater. A large class received the degree of bachelor of laws, and eight young men were given the degree of master of laws and invested with the hood. The address of the evening was delivered by Hon. John W. Yerkes, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The degrees were conferred by President Jerome Daugherty, of the University, and the prizes awarded by Hon. Seth Shepard, associate justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and lecturer on constitutional law in the law department of the university. Mr. George Moore Brady, of Maryland, won two prizes.

To the strains of a musical selection the classes marched to their places on the stage, the candidates for the degree of bachelor of laws coming first, followed by those for the degree of master of laws. President Daugherty and Hon. John W. Yerkes were seated at the front of the stage and members of the faculty and others on the right of the stage. Among them were Dean George E. Hamilton, of the law school; Hon. Seth Shepard, Hon. Harry M. Clabaugh, Hon. Ashley M. Gould, associate justice of the District Supreme Court; Judge D. W. Baker, Mr. J. Nata McGill, Judge Job Barnard, of the Court of Appeals; Mr. R. Ross Perry, Jr., Mr. Samuel M. Yeatman, secretary; Mr. Henry W. Hodges, assistant secretary; Hon. Charles C. Cole, Hon. Hugh Taggart, Judge Mills, Anson S. Taylor, and William L. Browning.

STAGE PRETTILY DECORATED.

The large audience looked upon a prettily arranged stage. Palms and greens decked the rear, while rhododendron, red and yellow daisies and roses were gracefully fixed along the sides and front. In the proscenium, and suspended from the arch, was the emblem
of law, huge scales of justice, balancing two gorgeous bunches of roses, hung from the balance by strings of electric lights. Between the scales was suspended a large scroll of immortelles upon which were written the names of the graduating class. On the scroll was attached a large owl, whose eyes glared with the light of two electric lights.

The feature of the program was the conferring of degrees. The names of the candidates were called by Secretary Yeatman, and President Daugherty performed the ceremony. Mr. Yerkes delivered to the graduates an informal address, instilled with good advice and profitable hints of a close observer of men in the law.

"Commercialism has captured the outposts," said the speaker, "and the lawyers of to-day are playing dice with chance." He attacked the practice of accepting retainer fees, especially that of contingent fees. He warned the young lawyers when they reached that stage they were on the danger line. In closing he said that the graduates owed to the university a debt they could never repay, and their careers would reflect credit or discredit on the department.

ROSTER OF THE GRADUATES.

The candidates given the degree of Bachelor of Laws were:


Those given the degree of master of laws were:


PRIZES ARE AWARDED.

The prizes awarded by Justice Shepard were as follows:

Faculty cash prize of $40, George Moore Brady, of Maryland, for the best essay among members of the third-year class; Edwin Henry Flueck, of Wisconsin, honorable mention; faculty cash prize of $40, Everett Dufour, of District of Columbia, for best essay among members of the fourth-year class; set of law books, George Moore Brady, for best essay from members of both classes; Edward Thompson prize, Elwyn Thornton Jones, of Mississippi; American Law Book prize, Daniel S. Masterson, of Pennsylvania; special book prize, Hugh F. Taggart, of District of Columbia.

A cash prize of $50 to the member of the first-year class maintaining the best average in recitations and examinations during the year, was awarded to Edward J. Fegan, of Massachusetts. A cash prize of $25 to the member of the first year class maintaining the second best average in recitations and examinations during the year was awarded to Warren Greene Ogden, of the District of Columbia. A cash prize of $50 to the member of the second year class maintaining the best average in recitations and examinations during the year was awarded to Charles E. Shipley, of the District of Columbia. A cash prize of $25 to the member of the second year class maintaining the second best average in recitations and examinations during the year was awarded to John Francis Heffernan, of Rhode Island. A cash prize of $75 to the member of the third year class in recitations and examinations during the year was awarded to Henry Ittig, of Nebraska. A cash prize of $40 to the member of the third year class maintaining the second best average in recitations and examinations during the year was awarded to Edwin Henry Flueck, of Wisconsin.

CLASS BANQUET AT THE WILLARD.

After the commencement exercises the graduates repaired to the New Willard, where they celebrated the completion of their law course. The occasion was a joyous one. The dinner was served at 11 o'clock, and the speeches were made between the courses. Mr. Walter F. Albertsen was introduced as
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toastmaster by Elwyn T. Jones, President of the Class. He made a brief speech. Rev. Jerome Daugherty, S. J., President of Georgetown University, was presented and spoke.

The President of the class, Elwyn T. Jones, made an entertaining speech to the class. Philip A. Grau responded to the toast, "The University," and Mr. Albert E. Berry, "Our Future." "The Faculty" was the subject of an eloquent address by Henry Ittig. Mr. Francis H. Burke spoke of "The Lawyer, His Practice and Practices." The invited guests who replied to toasts were Hon. J. W. Yerkes, George E. Hamilton, Hon. Seth Shepard, Hon. Harry M. Clabaugh, Hon. Ashley M. Gould, W. D. Baker, J. Nota McGill, Samuel Yeatman, and R. Ross Perry, Jr.

MEDICAL NOTES.

To give our readers an idea as to how we have been occupying ourselves here at the Medical School during the past month we print the subjects which required our attention during that "time that tries men's souls"—examination month. The fourth year class, those staid and steady seniors who even now are probably practicing their dearly-bought art on the innocent and unsuspecting public, were thoroughly examined in the following branches: The Practice of Medicine, Surgery, Obstetrics, Gynecology, Laryngology, Physical Diagnosis, Ophthalmology, Otology, Hygiene, State Medicine, Mental Diseases, Animal parasites and Dermatology.

Of the third-year class, those who were lucky passed in the following studies: Physiology, Therapeutics, Practice of Medicine, Surgery, Obstetrics, Gynecology, Pathology, Hygiene and State Medicine.

The following are the subjects with which the second-year battled: Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, Urinalysis, Therapeutics, Pathology, Bacteriology and Toxicology.

The first-year men who have just taken their first strides toward their diplomas, were examined in: Anatomy, Physiology, Osteology, Embryology, Histology, Materia-Medica, Physics and Chemistry.

Captain Apperious seems to be much troubled with the base-ball finger split. Three times in one month is enough to try any one's patience. We would suggest that he might get better results by using Red Raven Splits. They are pleasant to take, anyway.

The latest news from Boston is that Doctor Jack Lyman cut three of his best friends on the street the other day. Some people get so used to dissecting that they can't forget it ever during vacation.

Mr. M. Ashford and Mr. R. Norris, both of the third-year class, have just returned from Reids, Va., where they have been hunting and fishing with a party of friends for the past ten days. They are members of the Camotap Hunting Club of that place.

Our sincere sympathies are extended to Dr. Wilfred M. Barton, professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics and lecturer on Pharmacy, because of the death of his father, which occurred while the examinations were in progress. The first-year class presented him with a floral design as a mark of their respect and sym-
pathy for Dr. Barton. There is not a more popular professor at the Medical School than the doctor, and his grief is shared by all.

We notice that our prediction to the effect that "Swan" Titus was a coming baseball player has been proven correct. He has had very little opportunity thus far to prove his merits in the box, but when he does pitch he acquires himself creditably.

We would compliment our honored correspondent from the Dental School on his very cleverly worded paragraph in last month's issue of the Journal, concerning what he is pleased to call the "Knocking attitude of the Journal correspondent from the northern wing of the Dental School," were it not for the fact that the delicately worded satire is built upon an entirely erroneous hypothesis. In the first place, what an ill-proportioned, unsymmetrical kind of bird the Dental School must be to have its "northern wing" so much larger than itself! We could understand it, if this qualification were applied to its cranium. In his clever paragraph this word artist holds us up to ridicule for our alleged misuse of the word "anonymous." He very kindly explains for the benefit of our readers and ourselves, that "anonymous" does not mean "unsigned" but, rather, "of unknown origin." He makes the foregoing statement as the opinion of authorities—but he carefully omits to state who his authorities are. They certainly could not have been Greek scholars, for, had they, the derivation of the word must needs have immediately presented itself to their minds. "Ἀνωνύμος" meaning "nameless," "without name." In all good nature we refer our would-be corrector to Webster's Dictionary or the Century Dictionary to satisfy himself that the definition "of unknown origin" is not to be found for the word "anonymous." He also calls attention to the fact that his article each month is unsigned and he uses this as an argument to prove that we are ignorant as to what is and what is not good form. With the same good feeling which we have entertained throughout this paragraph, let us respectfully suggest that it is good form in Rome to do what the Romans do. We other correspondents sign our articles. "Quisquis plus justo non sapit, ille sapit."

J. A. Gannon, '06.

ALUMNI MEETING.

A general meeting of the National Alumni Association was held in Gaston Hall, Tuesday evening, June 9th. Many old graduates were present, besides a number of new members. Dr. C. H. A. Kleinschmidt, Second Vice-President, presided. After resolutions had been passed in memory of Mr. Charles A. Hoyt, late President of the Association, a new set of officers were elected for the ensuing year.

After the meeting, luncheon was served in the Students' Dining-Hall. Addresses were made by Reverend Jerome Daugherty, S. J., Rector of the
University, and by several of the Alumni. We reprint in full the speech of Dr. George W. Kober, Dean of the Medical School.

SPEECH OF DR. KOBER.

Reverend Father Rector and Fathers.
Members of the Society of Alumni:

Another collegiate year is drawing to a close, and once more we have met to exchange greetings and pay homage to our ancient and honorable Alma Mater. On behalf of the Medical School, I am very glad to report a successful year. We have enrolled 144 students, which is a larger number than ever before in the history of the School. Of these 42 students only are residents of the District of Columbia, and the remainder have come to us from nearly every State in the Union, and even from our Colonial possessions.

It is gratifying to know that 27 of our students hail from Massachusetts, 26 from New York and Pennsylvania, and 12 from Rhode Island, Connecticut, and other New England States. Another encouraging feature is that quite a number of students have come to us from other schools, joining our advanced classes, which may reasonably be construed to mean, that our School offers certain advantages over other reputable Medical Schools, even in New York and Philadelphia.

As a matter of fact, our methods of instruction and comparatively small classes enable each student to come into more intimate relation with his teachers and therefore makes the instruction more directly personal and adapted to the special needs of the individual.

Apart from this, it may be justly claimed that our corps of teachers compares favorably with that of any other school, and as students are very apt to form ideals and be inspired by the examples of their preceptors, the personal element of the teacher and student constitutes an important factor in education. At all events the faculty has reason to be proud of the product of the school. Five of our graduates passed the rigid examination for admission into the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy during the past year, one making 964 out of a possible 1000; indeed, I am informed that four of the five candidates made most creditable records in their professional examination. This is an excellent showing when we consider the size of our graduating classes, which rarely exceeds twenty-four a year. The result of the recent competitive examination for hospital positions in this city shows that the class of 1903 is determined to maintain the standard of the school; indeed it has captured 15 out of 18 available positions.

Gentlemen, in congratulating you upon this splendid record, let me assure you that herein lies our chief reward, for nothing is more gratifying to us than the success of our students.

Those who are familiar with the financial resources of the institution must and do know that the small stipends
which remain for distribution after all expenses are paid, offer no special inducement to the members of the teaching staff, and their chief and in some instances the only reward, consists in seeing the fruits of their labors develop and ripen into complete maturity.

In this connection let me remind you that the cost of a modern medical education is greater than the tuition fees, and if it were not for the self-sacrificing efforts of the Reverend Fathers who have consecrated their life to Christ and the diffusion of useful knowledge, our efforts would surely be in vain. We certainly owe a debt of gratitude to this community of Christians who by personal sacrifice have made it possible for us to offer adequate facilities for a medical training, and this brings us to a question, not what the University can do for us, for she has already done more than she receives, but what we can do for the University, and my answer is, let us at least be loyal and true to our Alma Mater.

At a recent meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges, I met the Dean from another school who informed me that he had observed a striking example of loyalty on the part of an Alumnus of Georgetown, which he never failed to impress upon his own students. The instance referred to being an elderly physician in New York, who was always interested in the result of the competitive examinations for medical positions; his inquiries and attendance were so earnest and constant as to attract attention, and when asked why he took such an interest, replied that as an Alumnus he deemed it his duty to encourage by his presence the Georgetown men in their struggle for victory. This example, friends and colleagues, is well worthy of our emulation. I hope that every graduate will enter the ranks of the Society of Alumni to-night and henceforth hand in hand, with heart and tongue, join in promoting the welfare of each other and the good name of our Alma Mater, for her fame is our gain. Let us add to her strength and reputation, not necessarily by monetary contributions, but by an earnest effort on our part to swell the number of students in all of her departments, and the character and quality of her product.

In conclusion I am pleased to announce to you that the construction of a wing for the hospital, 90 x 30 feet, on the corner of 35th and N streets, has been begun, and the new building is under roof. This, when completed, will afford facilities for the treatment of about 90 inmates. The cost will be over $30,000, and I hope our friend Mr. Hamilton will take the matter in hand, and with some of his associates and friends, raise at least $1,000 a year as a Guarantee Fund to pay the interest. His heart is in the work, and where there is a will there is a way.

To indicate the extent of this noble philanthropy, let me tell you that the number of indoor patients treated in the hospital last year was 401; number of surgical operations, 125; number of cases treated in the Dispensary, 1,312; number of Emergency cases, 1,169. Among the Emergency patients were
nineteen severe burns, fourteen cases of concussion of the brain, fourteen cases of syncope, sixty-six contusions, seventeen dislocatures, seventy-nine fractures, seventy-seven cases of lodgement of foreign bodies, eighteen cases of poisoning, twenty-one gunshot wounds, ninety-one sprains, five hundred and fifty incised, lacerated, and punctured wounds, thirteen cases of sunstroke and fourteen cases of profuse hemorrhage. Ninety per cent of all these cases were charity patients, and all of this work was done without a dollar from the general or local government, and could never have been accomplished without the self-sacrificing labors of the Sisters of St. Francis.

Let us follow their example in practical Christianity, and thus render some personal service in the name of the Divine Physician, and in the name of Him from whom all blessings flow.

EIGHTY-SIXTH ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT.

The College, Medical and Dental Departments held their commencement on Wednesday, June 10th. The following account is taken, with some changes, from the Washington Post of the following day:

Gaston Hall, Georgetown University, a mass of flowers, bunting, and flags, was the scene yesterday morning of the closing exercises of that famous institution. An assemblage of many hundreds was present to witness the eighty-sixth annual commencement. A notable feature of the occasion was the bestowal of honorary degrees upon George Bruce Cortelyou, Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and Hon. Harry M. Clabaugh, Chief Justice of the District Supreme Court.

Preparation for the occasion was made on the campus, but a drizzling rain swept the green lawns, and the exercises were carried out inside the building. It was the first time Georgetown University arranged for an outdoor festival in celebration of the close of the school term, and considerable disappointment was expressed on account of the weather. For the first time in the history of the college the medical and dental degrees were conferred with those of the college.

At the last moment, however, Gaston Hall, was placed in readiness for the event. The big room presented an exquisite picture when the invited guests of honor took their places. The Marine Band was in attendance and rendered a pleasing program throughout the exercises. The overture from "William Tell," and Prof. Santelmann's march, "Thomas Jefferson," were rendered while the big hall filled rapidly with a large concourse of people.

On the stage, draped with many colored buntinings, were seated the guests of honor, Secretary Cortelyou, Judge Clabaugh, Dr. Thomas Herran, charge d'affaires of the Colombian Legation; Gen. Coppinger, of the army; Rev. J. Abell Morgan, of Baltimore, formerly President of Loyola College; Rev. Father Semple, of New Orleans; Dr. G. L. Magruder, D. S. S. Adams, Dr. George T. Vaughan, Dr. George Kober, Dean of the Georgetown Medical School; Dr. Taber Johnson, Dr. Byrne, Dr. W. N. Cogan, Dean of the Dental School;
Dr. Mann, of Baltimore; and Dr. Brad- eaux, of New Orleans. Fifty-four de- grees were conferred, the gowned ap- plicants presenting a picturesque ap- pearance as they took their places upon the platform.

The program opened with the doctors' oration, delivered by George Moore Brady, of Baltimore, whose subject was "The Modern University." "The prob- lem which is to be solved in America by university education," said Mr. Brady, "is not the creation of a civilization, but the development and perfection of that which we now enjoy. As in the Middle Ages the institutions of learning were the instruments used to prepare and create the civilization to which we have fallen heir, so in turn the American universities should be the means of preserving this civilization by aiding in the development of all our physical and natural resources, and of perfecting it by increasing the love and practice of the Christian religion.

Universities Must Go Forward.

"To fulfill this duty the universities must rear great, intellectual, and conscien- tious leaders of progress. They are increasing man's knowledge of the natural sciences. Perfect education means the development of the whole man—body, intellect, and will. If our republic is to endure; if its social, economi- cal, and political problems are to be correctly solved, the modern university must be the cradle of leaders, who will guide the people through the troubles which beset a nation. The first univer- sities, which produced such men as Roger Bacon, Dante, Petrarch, and others made it their primary function to teach students to think. On the contrary, the modern universities generally let the student solve for himself the problem and method of thinking logically. They train his eye, but they often leave his intellect swamped in his infantile and unlearned method of thought and reason."

Music by the Marine Band followed Mr. Brady's address, after which the Master's oration was delivered by Joseph Arthur Lennon, A. B., of Massachusetts, whose theme was "The Medieval University." A cornet solo, "The Whirlwind Polka," by Mr. Frank Todhunter, was given, followed by the feature of the impressive ceremonies, conferring of degrees by Rev. Jerome Daugherty, President of the University.

Rev. John A. Conway, S. J., Vice- President of the College, announced in the following terms the honor to be conferred on Secretary Cortelyou:

"Georgetown University, ever proud of the success of her children, loves to honor them; especially when the nation approves of their success. It is then no small gratification for her to-day to honor herself by honoring one who is an alumnus of this venerable institution, whom the nation has honored, after three chief executives had found him worthy. George Bruce Cortelyou is that man, known to all for his untiring industry, rare prudence, and devoted loyalty. He served faithfully three of our Presidents, so as to win for himself universal esteem; and to
one of them he was literally faithful unto death, as the whole country is the grateful witness. In consequence of his virtues, whilst scarcely beyond the years of youth, he has been selected to a seat among the high and responsible advisers of the nation's chief executive.

"For this reason it is that Georgetown University, by authority conferred by the Congress of these United States, creates and declares Doctor of Laws George Bruce Cortelyou, on this tenth day of June, nineteen hundred and three."

Secretary Cortelyou was then vested, amid applause, with the purple hood of distinction. Secretary Cortelyou is a graduate of the Georgetown University Law School, and was honored yesterday for the achievements which he has accomplished as a distinguished official of the government.

Judge Clabaugh, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, was honored with the same degree, after the following eulogy by Father Conway:

"Since all men acknowledge that Harry M. Clabaugh is a man conspicuous for the integrity of his life and knowledge of the law and fairness and fearlessness as a judge, who, with universal approval, and with the admiration of our students, has labored in our law school, until recently called to grace the highest seat in the Supreme tribunal of justice in the District of Columbia, this University, moved thereunto by the request of many reputable citizens, and by her own feelings of gratitude, by authority vested in her by these United States, creates and declares Doctor of Laws the afore-named Harry M. Clabaugh."

Following the conferring of the honorary degrees of doctor of laws, the degrees of doctor of philosophy were conferred, followed, in turn, by the master of arts, bachelor of arts, the medical degrees, and the degree D. D. S., of the dental school. Dr. George M. Kober announced the candidates for degrees in medicine, and Dr. W. N. Cogan, those of the dental school.

The names of those taking degrees follow:

Doctor in Philosophy—George Moore Brady, Ph. L., Maryland; Bernard Joseph Ford, Ph. L., Colorado, and Roman Jose Lacson, Ph. L., Negros, P. I.


Bachelor of Arts—William Henry Byrnes, Jr., Louisiana; Edward Bernard Dreaper, Alabama; Sylvester Brozel Eagan, New York; Cyril Francis Ginther, New York; Frank Anthony Kane, Pennsylvania; Nicholas Edward Kernan, New York; William Patrick McEniry, New York; Bernard Charles McKenna, New Jersey; George Le Guere Mullally, Louisiana; Harold Aloysius Reiley, New York; Francis Leo
Degrees of M. D.—Horatio Ely Abraham, Texas; Joseph Breckenridge Bayne, District of Columbia; Caryl Burbank, District of Columbia; John D. J. Curran, Pennsylvania; John Henry Digges, Maryland; Caryl Bernard Flynn, Massachusetts; Robert Stanislaus Garnett, A. B., Florida; James Aloysius Grady, Connecticut; John Gilluly, Rhode Island; William Joseph Holland, Massachusetts; Stanton Wren Howard, District of Columbia; Theodore Gilman Howe, New York; Edwin Clarence Hunter, District of Columbia; John Patrick Hussey, Rhode Island; Francis Joseph Kerns, Massachusetts; William James Lamb, Pennsylvania; Francis McQuillan, Rhode Island; Bruce McVean Mackall, District of Columbia; John Joseph Mundell, District of Columbia; Samuel Logan Owens, Louisiana; Isaac Stockton Keith Reeves, Maryland, and Oden Rochester Sudler, Phar. D., District of Columbia.


Selections by the Marine Band were followed in turn by the valedictory address, delivered by William Henry Byrnes, of Louisiana, after which President Daugherty, of the University, awarded the prizes of merit. The students of the District of Columbia took the honors of the year of study just passed, distancing their competitors and capturing practically all the handsome gold prizes offered as rewards of merit.

The chief honors, however, were taken by William H. Byrnes, of Louisiana, who won the medal for rational philosophy, the highest honor bestowed by the college. The second highest honors were taken by John H. O'Brien, of Massachusetts, who captured the Merrick debating medal. The latter is even more desirable than the medal of philosophy, and is as greatly prized. Mr. O'Brien was congratulated for the honors won.

In addition to these, prizes were awarded as follows:

The concluding address was delivered by Dr. Ernest Laplace, President of the Medico-Chi College, of Philadelphia, who spoke to the graduates in medicine concerning the duties of the physician.

It was announced that S. Logan Owens, of Louisiana, and Horatio Ely Abrahams, of Texas, in competitive examination, had won positions as resident physicians at Georgetown University Hospital. It was also stated that fifteen of the twenty-three graduates of the medical school had obtained positions by examination in various hospitals throughout the country.

CLASS PRIZES.

GRADUATE SCHOOL.

Cash prize of $75.00 (given by the College for the highest average in the courses of the Graduate School,) awarded to Edward John Fegan, A.B., Boston College, Quincy, Mass.; average, 97.5.

Cash Prize of $25.00 (given in memory of Bernard A. Kengla, LL.B., to the student of the Graduate School gaining the second highest average in the graduate course), awarded to Joseph Arthur Lennon, A.B., Boston College, Jamaica Plains, Mass.; average, 97.5.

Cash prize of $25.00 (given by an “Old Friend of the College,” to the best student in biology), awarded to Sylvester Broezel Eagan, New York.

UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL.

SENIOR.

Medal for Rational Philosophy, awarded to William Henry Byrnes, Jr., Louisiana. Prize, Frank Anthony Kane, Pennsylvania.

JUNIOR.

A gold medal (founded by Mrs. Lawrence O'Brien, of New York, in memory of Francis X. O'Brien, of the class of 1900), awarded to Hall Stoner Lusk, District of Columbia. Prize, Joseph Gelpi, Louisiana.


English Composition—Prize, Maurice Joseph Gelpi, Louisiana.

FRESHMAN.


English Composition—Gerald Maurice Egan, District of Columbia.

CHEMISTRY.

General Chemistry—Silver Medal—Francis Simpson, District of Columbia. Prize, Thomas Francis Desmond, Jr., Massachusetts.

MATHEMATICS.


MODERN LANGUAGES.


The Dixon Elocution Medal (founded by Mrs. William Wirt Dixon, in memory of her son, William Wirt Dixon, Jr., of the class of 1898), awarded to Don Carlos Ellis, District of Columbia.

The Merrick Debating Medal (founded by Richard T. Merrick, LL.D.), awarded to John Henry O'Brien, Massachusetts. Subject: Resolved, That the State
Government should interfere in strikes which affect the welfare of the whole people.

The Dahlgren Medal for Calculus (founded by John Vinton Dahlgren, LL. M., A. M.), not awarded.

The Father Murphy Medal (founded in memory of Rev. John J. Murphy, S. J., by his personal friends for the best metrical translation of three odes of Horace), awarded to Gerald Maurice Egan, District of Columbia.

The Toner Scientific Medal (given by Joseph M. Toner, M. D., Ph. D., Washington, D. C., for the best collection of specimens in some branch of science), not awarded.


The Philonomosian Medal (given by the Philonomosian Debating Society), awarded to Albert Briscoe Ridgway, District of Columbia. Subject: Resolved, That it is for the best interests of the United States to form an alliance with the British Empire.

AWARD OF PRIZES.
DISTINGUISHED AND HONORABLY MENTIONED.

PHILOSOPHY.
Honorably Mentioned—Edward Bernard Dreaper, Francis Leo Rogers, Bernard Charles McKenna.

JUNIOR.
Distinguished—George Colliere, Harry Vincent Carlin,
Honorably Mentioned—Louis Thomas Cassidy, Cornelius Murphy.

SOPHOMORE.
Distinguished—James Philip Burns.
Honorably Mentioned—Maurice Joseph Gelpi.

FRESHMAN.

CHEMISTRY.
Distinguished—Lawrence Virgil Canario, Edward Vincent Oblinger, James Philip Burns.

FRESHMAN MATHEMATICS.
Distinguished—Alston Cockrell, Harlow Pease, Harry Hanigan.

FRESHMAN FRENCH.
Distinguished—Joseph Nicholas Shriver, Sidney Emmanuel Mudd, Jr.
Honorably Mentioned—Joseph Francis Lawler.

FRESHMAN GERMAN.
Distinguished—William Vlymen, Geo. Rex Frye.
Honorably Mentioned—Robert Elmer Brown.

PREPARATORY SCHOOL.
AWARD OF PRIZES.
DISTINGUISHED AND HONORABLY MENTIONED.

CLASS PRIZES.
First Preparatory—First Prize, Francis Thompson, District of Columbia.
Second Prize, William Brawner Hefield, District of Columbia.
Distinguished—Francis Roach.

English Composition—Prize, Francis Thompson, District of Columbia.
Distinguished—Adrian Van Lindsley, John Wesley Gaines, Walter Griffin Mudd.
Honorably Mentioned—Allan Wilson, Norman Degnon, Berkley Leo Simmons.
English Composition—Prize, John Hood, District of Columbia.
Third Preparatory—First Prize, Hall Brown, District of Columbia. Second Prize, Thomas Boyle, Pennsylvania.
Distinguished—Francis Hartnett.
English Composition—Prize, Hall Brown, District of Columbia.
Fourth Preparatory—First Prize, Reilly Stanton, District of Columbia. Second Prize, Roscoe Ridgway, District of Columbia.
Honorably Mentioned—John Gottron, Joseph Walsh.
English Composition—Prize, Reilly Stanton, District of Columbia.
Distinguished—George Rex Frye, John Francis Desmond, John Wesley Gaines, Joseph Reagan, George Cogan, Joseph Shriver, Joseph Bister, Walter Griffin Mudd, James Ryon.
Second Preparatory—First Prize, Thomas Boyle, Pennsylvania. Second Prize, Conor Coppinger, District of Columbia.
Third Preparatory Mathematics—First Prize, Hall Brown, District of Columbia. Second Prize, Oswald Cook, District of Columbia.
Distinguished—Antony Adams, Robert Kelley, Joseph Cook.
Fourth Preparatory Mathematics—First Prize, Paul Reid, District of Columbia. Second Prize, William Low, Massachusetts.
Distinguished—Robert McKnight, Thomas Keefe.
Distinguished—Frank Rend, William Hetfield, Berkley Leo Simmons.
Distinguished—Francis Hartnett, Charles Williams, Kemp Edmonston, Joseph Cook.
Honorably Mentioned—Thomas Keefe, Russell Daly, James Ryon, Joseph O'Neill.
Distinguished—Oswald Cook, Antony Adams, Charles McCahill, William Keane, Benjamin Jeffs.
Spanish—Prize, Robert Kelley, District of Columbia.
Distinguished—John Welsey Gaines, Joseph Bister.
The Elocution Medal, awarded to Adison Lusk, District of Columbia.
Cornell's clean sweep at Poughkeepsie this year was a great victory; but Georgetown men regard their victory as a greater. Cornell was the favorite, a sure winner before the race, and all Cornell men expected victory, and were neither surprised nor very much elated when they got it. But Georgetown, the rank outsider, despised in the betting, picked by the self-constituted experts for last place, the youngest, the greenest, the lightest crew on the river, scarcely hoping themselves for better than fifth place—Georgetown, with a slow, even, rhythmical stroke, rowing the race just as the great Dempsey wanted them to row it, went in and took second place over her four seasoned, older, and heavier opponents. And therein lay Georgetown's victory.

It was indeed a most beautiful day. For a whole week the skies had been gray and sombre, cold rains had fallen incessantly, and a chill, east wind had stiffened the muscles of the oarsmen. But on the day of the race the clouds broke, the sun shone as never sun shone before; the air was at a delightful temperature and the Hudson flowed between its high green banks as calm, as placid as an inland lake.

Poughkeepsie, lazy, picturesque little Poughkeepsie, "Queen City of the Hudson," they call it, had awakened, as it does once every year, from its state of continuous slumber, and now was throbbing with life and gaiety. The college man was in his glory and his fair companion shared it with him. Everybody wore colors, and nearly everybody wore Cornell colors. Cornell was slated to win, and the townspeople had taken the tip and were flying the red and white. Nearly every store on the main street was decorated with it, and nearly everyone, who didn't care anything about the race except to be with the winning crew, wore it. The blue and gray was seldom seen, for scarcely twenty-five Georgetown men were there; the poor showing of the year before had had its effect.
Up at the Morgan House, Georgetown's headquarters, the men who were to win fame for their Alma Mater sat around in the lobby, reading the newspapers or talking to their friends. They were nervous, that was plain to see, but less so than one expected to find them, considering their youth and inexperience. They nearly all expected last place, and were hoping for fifth. One man told me of the only time they had rowed the entire distance under the watch; they did it in a little over 23 minutes. He explained, however, that a sub was in the boat, and the conditions were not good. Moreover, on another occasion, he said, they rowed alongside of Cornell for a mile, when Cornell was pulling her hardest, and without much trouble kept up with the Ithacans. Dempsey was around, quiet as ever; it was impossible to tell from his demeanor what he expected. About 2 o'clock Capt. Russell gave the word, and the men, amid lots of wishes for good luck, shook hands with their friends, and boarded the car for the boat-house. There they were to wait three long hours before the big event of the day.

It's not a long distance from Poughkeepsie to the west shore where the observation train runs, but on regatta day it takes a long time to make the trip. A single ferry, of rather a primitive type, is employed to carry across the river the thousands of people that come up to the races. Of course, it is loaded to the gunwales; someday there will be a terrible accident, and then, I suppose, better means of transportation will be provided. However, it does the best it can, and the crowd is good-natured, as such crowds always are, and if you reach the other shore safely, you consider yourself lucky, and make for the observation train. This is made up of flat cars, fenced in, and provided with benches that rise in tiers. At the beginning of the races every seat was taken, no tickets were to be had at the place of sale, and even the speculators had sold out. Moreover, the west shore down to the finish line was thickly dotted with people, parts of the east shore were occupied, hundreds of persons were on the bridge, and a great fleet of yachts, launches, sail-boats, row-boats, and canoes, all gaily decked with pennons, were clustered around the finish. It is estimated that thirty thousand people were present. The spectacle was an inspiring one, and was worth travelling many miles to see.

I shall pass over the four-oared and Freshman races, both won by Cornell, for they are of little interest to Georgetown men, and tell, as best I can, of the Varsity event.

At about ten minutes after six the crews began to paddle to the start, Cornell was first to get into position, the others coming leisurely after her. As the Georgetown shell started from the boat-house, four Princeton men wearing class numerals, came down to the float and gave them a rattling good cheer. The men at the oars returned the compliment with a "Hoya." At 6.20 the six shells lay in position, the rudder of each held by a man in a skiff. Referee John E. Eustis shouted, "Are you ready?" There was no reply, and he fired the pistol. The forty-eight oars struck the water, and a great shout of "They're off" arose from the observation train. Georgetown and Syracuse got bad starts. The referee had directed his megaphone to the right, so that neither had heard his words, and were not prepared when the pistol was fired. At the beginning of the race, indeed, it looked as though the predictions of fifth and sixth places for Syracuse and Georgetown were going to be verified.

The Columbia crew at once sprung into the lead, their panic-stricken stroke hitting the pace up to thirty-six to the minute. For the first half-mile Co-
lumbia retained her lead, still holding to the killing thirty-six stroke, Cornell second, rowing thirty-one, Wisconsin third, rowing thirty-five; Georgetown fourth, thirty-three, and Pennsylvania last, thirty-two. During the whole race neither Cornell nor Georgetown rowed above thirty-two to the minute, and the power that lay behind their long, steady strokes was what told in the end.

At the three-quarters Cornell began to forge ahead, and at the mile her shell shot past the Columbia crew, already beginning to feel the effect of the terrific pace they had set. Georgetown was still in fourth place, rowing strongly and steadily. Dempsey had taught his men well. There was no mad rush to get into the lead. They simply held to their slow, powerful stroke, and almost imperceptibly crept up on their opponents.

At the mile and a half Cornell had gained a commanding lead of three lengths, and was increasing it with almost every stroke. Barring accident the Ithacans were sure winners, and all interest now began to center in the fight for second place. This was really the best race of the day, and a good one it was to look at.

Columbia still held second place, but her men were weakening, and Wisconsin was gaining on her, hard pressed by Georgetown, keeping their stroke down to a slow, powerful thirty to the minute. At the mile and three-quarters Wisconsin passed Columbia, and then the small body of Georgetown men on the observation train burst into an exultant cheer as the blue and gray shell went by Columbia and with no increase in the stroke drew a length away from her and started after Wisconsin in handsome style. At the two mile Cornell had increased her lead to five lengths, and Georgetown led the field. It was hard for a Georgetown man to believe, even though he saw it with his own eyes, that his poor, despised representatives for whom he had not dared even hope for better than fifth place, were actually in second place at the two-mile mark, taking things easily and coolly, and rowing their opponents to a standstill. Once in the lead Georgetown was never headed. “There’s another, boys,” they would shout as they passed an opponent’s shell, and once ahead they knew they were going to stay there. “Why, look, fellows,” pleaded the Wisconsin’s coxswain, as the blue and gray shell shot past them, “even Georgetown’s ahead of you.” “Yes,” joculatorily shouted a Georgetown oarsman, “and we are going to stay ahead!” And everybody knows that they did.

From the two mile to the finish Georgetown led Wisconsin by a length, while Georgetown men on the observation train shouted themselves blue in the face. Syracuse was next to Wisconsin, then came Pennsylvania, and Columbia trailed along behind, completely exhausted, and losing ground with every stroke. But before the finish line was reached Pennsylvania made a last supreme effort, and beat out Syracuse for fourth place.

At about two hundred yards from the finish line Wisconsin spurted in a last dying effort to get second place. Her shell actually came to within half a length of the Georgetown boat’s prow. For a moment Georgetown men held their breath. It looked as though the coveted position, so hard fought for, was going to be lost in the very end. But the Georgetown stroke was not even raised, and a moment later the Wisconsin men, exhausted by their effort, dropped back, and, amid a perfect bedlam of steamboat whistles, Georgetown shot across the line a length ahead of her nearest opponent. The Cornell men, who had finished eight lengths ahead of Georgetown, were resting on their oars, watching with
THE GEORGETOWN CREW AT POUGHKEEPSIE.

Kirby, Sub.
Atkinson, Stroke.
Bremner, No. 7.
Shepard, Bow.
Eagan, Sub.

Teevan, No. 4.
Hayden, No. 5.
Russell, Capt.
Curran, No. 6.
Graham, No. 2.

Curran, No. 3.
Graham, No. 2.
Shriver, Coxswain.
interest the struggle for second place.

During the first mile Georgetown labored under great disadvantages. Supposed to have the best course, she really had the worst. The men were forced to row the roughest kind of a course from start to the one-mile mark, and at the end the shell was half full of water. Here is what Champion C. P. Titus says, writing for the New York World:

"A greater surprise was the work of Georgetown in the 'Varsity event. The college men from Washington had been carded for last position in the judgment of those who claimed to know much about the merits of the six crews. Great sums had been wagered at even money that Georgetown would be last. Yet, with many disadvantages and the drawback of not getting away well at the start, and the additional handicap of being forced to row through a turbulent sea that was churned up by an acre of steam and canal boats going down the river just before the race started, Georgetown managed to show her unexpected superiority by fighting for second position to the very end, and finally winning that honor. This work is the more creditable in view of the fact that for one full mile she had to contend, as off-shore boat, with this heavy water."

While, of course, every man in the boat deserves the highest praise for the magnificent showing, there are four men who should be given particular mention. Russell has proved himself an ideal captain, always cool and watchful, and inspiring lots of confidence in those under him. Atkinson's work at stroke could not have been better, and it is generally agreed that there was not a better stroke that day on the river. With Atkinson in the boat next year, another good crew is assured. Bremner pulled a terrifically hard race, and was so completely exhausted at the finish that he keeled over. Curran has shown magnificent spirit all the year. It was only with the greatest difficulty that he could find time for practice, yet find it he did, and surely he has earned the lasting gratitude of all Georgetown men. Nor should little Shriver be forgotten, for he steered a course as straight as an arrow.

But then every man in the boat, and the "subs" too, have earned as high praise as ever fell to the lot of Georgetown athletes. The circumstances all during the year have been most discouraging. The student body have given them miserable support, and, indeed, from no source at all have better inducements been held out than the much-coveted "G," and a probability of last place in the race. Yet they stuck at it with as fine and as true college spirit as one could wish for, and their perseverance has been amply rewarded. Students, alumni, and faculty, all shower upon them thanks and congratulations. May they make it first place next year!

I have purposely put off to the last all mention of Coach Dempsey. To him more than to any other single individual is due, of course, the crew's showing. Without him such a showing would have been impossible. As has been said of Coach Courtney, he knows how to row, and he knows how to impart his knowledge to others. He has been the strictest, the kindest, the most efficient of teachers. The men have come fairly to worship him. They believe that with material not quite as good as Courtney's he can turn out a faster crew. Let Georgetown men come out for the eight next year and make good their belief. Dempsey has done wonders with the material he has had to work with, and it would be folly not to retain him as a coach.

So here's to Coach Dempsey; and here's to the tallest, the youngest, the lightest, the greenest crew at Pough-
keepsie—the second-best crew in the country!

The following is the make-up of the crew:

Bow—Seth Shepard, jr.'04 C 18 6.11 1/2 145
2—Wm. H. Graham... '05 C 20 5.11 153
3—James H. Teevan... '06 C 19 5.11 152
4—Reynolds Hayden... '05 M 20 6. 156
5—Murray A. Russell... '03 C 21 6.11 1/2 160
6—Jos. J. Curran... '05 L 21 6.1 165
7—Vincent A. Bremner... '03 G 20 5.11 158
Stroke—A. Lawrence... '04 C 20 511 158
Average.......................... 20 6.00 1/2 158
Cain—J. N. Shriver... '06 C 17 5 2 101

The official time was:

'Varsity Eights—Cornell, 18 m. 57 s.;
Georgetown, 19 m. 27 s.; Wisconsin, 19 m. 29 2-5 s.; Pennsylvania, 19 m. 33 3-5 s.; Columbia, 19 m. 54 s.

Shortly after the race, the members of the crew elected Vincent Bremner, of the Graduate School, who rowed Number Seven, Captain for the season of 1904.

In order to have a crew next year which will at least equal, if not surpass, the splendid showing of this year, one more element is required, in which unfortunately, Georgetown is sadly lacking. That is money. Rowing, unlike football and baseball, is not self-supporting. At the same time it is an expensive form of sport. During the past year, the Georgetown crew has been maintained by the college, but hereafter it will be altogether cut off from this means of support. Unless, therefore, the alumni, to whom Graduate Manager Thompson is making a systematic appeal, come forward with generosity at once, it will be impossible to have a crew even in 1904. This would indeed be most regrettable, as the Georgetown crew has done more than anything else to bring athletic fame to its Alma Mater, and there is prospect of enhancing that fame in no small degree. Consequently, all alumni and friends of the college are earnestly exhorted to contribute as much as they are able to the support of the crew in future years.

H. S. L., '04.

THE 'VARSITY "G."

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held on Wednesday, June 3d, the 'Varsity "G." was awarded as follows:

Field and Track, reawarded to Arthur Duffy, Law, '04, Joseph Reilly, Dental, '04, and William J. Holland, Med., '03.


NEW BASEBALL CAPTAIN.

On Friday, June 5th, the members of the baseball team elected James Morgan, our popular third-baseman, captain for the season of 1904. The choice is a good one. Morgan has played two years on the team, and, in that time, has endeared himself to all loyal Georgians by his brilliant playing and his steady, consistent work in the most difficult position on the diamond.

YARD ELECTIONS.

The following officers for the next scholastic year were elected at the meeting held on June 7th. President of the Yard, John V. Beary, '04; Secretary, Lawrence Hanretty, '04; Assistant Manager of Baseball, Joseph Lawler, '06; Assistant Manager of crew, Maurice Gelpi, '05; Assistant Manager of Field and Track, William Graham, '05; Manager of Tennis, Francis Palms, '04; Manager of Pool and Billiards, Lawrence Canario, '05.