

dore Roosevelt, John Hay, and others. All that Dr. Parkin meant to assert was that England has never lacked statesmen who were also eminent in literature. But what says the editor of the "Cosmopolitan"? "Seen through American eyes Oxford has not turned out two great statesmen of high integrity, broad conceptions, and personal courage to each of these three centuries."

Then he proceeds to offer a prize of one hundred dollars to any one who will name such statesmen. I should like to enter this competition and found with the proceeds a prize in the history department of the University of Wisconsin! Mr. Walker's remarks are practically an indictment, not of Oxford, but of English statesmanship for the last three hundred years. For it is true that a very great proportion of England's public men, during that period, were educated in Oxford: the rest had mostly the advantage of a Cambridge training. In our own day there have been from Oxford, Gladstone, Morley, Goschen, James Bryce, Asquith, and many more. A century ago there were Chatham, Fox, Carteret (the first Lord Granville); two centuries ago, John Hampden, Lord Clarendon, Sir Harry Vane, Sir John Eliot. That some of these not merely passed through Oxford, but retained her teaching in the deepest substance of their minds, may be inferred from the famous anecdote of Carteret told by Robert Wood, the author of the Essay on the genius of Homer. Wood called on Carteret a few days before his death, with the preliminary articles of the Treaty of Paris. He found the statesman so languid