

heart, solely the interests of his fellow-men? No. Class favoritism, social kotowing, cowardice in opposing popular measures" (whatever may be the meaning of that) "disciples of the has-been and commonplace, these are her graduates."

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am a graduate of Oxford, which I am proud to look back upon as my Alma Mater, and I must confess that I do not recognize my mother in this travesty and caricature. Mr. Walker states it as a fact that while Oxford-trained statesmen "follow in a gentlemanly way along the channels of personal advantage, of social success, of universal respectability, London has 22,000 homeless ones in her streets." He does not mention the number for New York. And he fails to recall—probably because he did not know it—that it was Oxford that first, in the foundation of Toynbee Hall, made the attempt to carry the influence of university men out among the masses of a great metropolis. If I mention the name of one more Oxford man of the last generation, Lord Shaftesbury, that will be enough to complete the refutation of the charge that English statesmen neglect the interests of their fellowmen.

I am sure there must be very few in this audience who have any sympathy with the statements I have quoted. But I cite them with a purpose. I have derived, on the other hand, some relief from the information that this sort of nonsense comes from the same omniscient editor who once stated in the pages of his magazine that in his judgment the late Queen Victoria was a much overrated woman, who wasted great op-