

the plan—it is modest, and cannot bring upon us any disgrace, such as failure to maintain a high double-degree system would be sure to entail. Furthermore, the effect upon the secondary schools of raising the standard of matriculation would be most beneficial, and it seems very problematic whether the standard of university work can be raised much if the standard of High School work is not raised at the same time. There is such a close connection between these two parts of our system. The university needs the High Schools in so many ways—as feeders, to keep up the supply of good students as bonds of union between the university and the people, and as receivers of the best products of the university, that is, its brightest sons and daughters who are to devote themselves to the noble calling of teaching. The importance of this has not been fully realized in the past, but more and more does it become plain that the fate of the university is bound up with the fate of the High Schools. It will be difficult, perhaps impossible, to raise the university if we let the High Schools lie in their present situation. If the people of Ontario could be induced to increase the efficiency of the High Schools so as to make their programme cover what is now done in the universities up to the end of the second year, the difficulties surrounding the question of higher education would be for the most part solved.

Against adhering to the single-degree system as a permanent one, it might be said that the B.A. degree has fallen so low in public esteem in North America that our graduates would be always at a disadvantage, no matter how high their attainments might be. There is a probability, also, that, as the number of doctors of philosophy increases in the United States, the B. A. will sink still farther

in that country and in our own as well. Another thing is the difficulty of raising the standards of matriculation and graduation. Judging from the tone of the criticisms directed against the High Schools by tax-payers and by Public School teachers and Inspectors, it would seem to be almost impossible to raise the standard of all the High Schools much above what it now is ; and if an attempt were made to raise a certain proportion of them to a rank high enough to produce matriculants corresponding to those who enter the German universities, for example, it would be resisted most bitterly by the smaller schools. Every High School in Ontario wishes to have the opportunity of preparing students for the university—a laudable ambition, perhaps, but one which may help much to delay the coming of the time when the higher learning shall flourish amongst us. Nor is it quite clear that the teachers are much in favor of raising the standard of matriculation. Most of us will assent to the reasonableness of the abstract proposition that the standard ought to be raised, but when concrete proposals are made regarding the addition of subjects to the programme or the omission of subjects from the programme, or when rigid marking at examinations would tend to cut down the number of successful candidates from our own schools, then we enter vigorous protests against high standards. An objection against raising the standard very much may also come from the university. A very high standard means a smaller amount of fees from students, and as time goes on, students' fees will become of greater and greater importance to the very existence of the university.

*(To be continued.)*

In the name of all you hope to know, cling close to what you know already.—*Phillips Brooks.*