

look at the question in its broadest aspect, or to select for their point of view an impartial or practical standpoint.

Of what nature are these objections? Here is a typical one which, at first sight, appears to have some weight: The awarding of a scholarship, a prize of money offered for competition, is asserted to be conducive to wrong methods of study, to induce the student to load his memory with masses of undigested facts and formulas, with the object of deceiving the examiner into the belief that the candidate is more proficient than he is in reality. Ergo, from this assertion: "Scholarships are hurtful; they lead to 'cramming.'"

Let us examine this claim a little. There are at least two factors to be considered, the examination and the competition. It is asserted that erroneous methods and motives are the direct consequences of the competition. Suppose that instead of a competitive examination, which, among other purposes, serves that of deciding scholarships, we have a standard of eighty-five per cent. fixed for first-class honors. Does any one suppose that an ambitious student is going to make less effort to win a first-class than he made previously to excel his competitors? If the "cramming" is induced by the desire to do well, we contend that the motive will be just as strong when the student is working against the inflexible standard as when he is working against the best that his competitors can do. It is true, the task before him will not be enlivened by any of the sense of exhilaration, which any properly constituted young man will feel, and should feel, when competing generously with his fellows; but the dread of failing will be present with increasing force, and we repeat that if the desire to do well makes him resort to unworthy means, it is idle to

say that the temptation with an eighty-five per cent. standard (representing as it does about the possible maximum) will not be as great as in a competitive examination. Viewing the question from this side, the only possible motive for intellectual obliquity is the desire to excel, a desire equally present under either system. Therefore, it is obviously unfair to saddle it upon the competitive examination. The only remaining excuse must be in the nature of the examination itself. We suspect that the number of students has been infinitesimal, who have won scholarships by the methods above indicated, methods which presuppose enormous credulity and inefficiency on the part of examiners, and an equal lack of common-sense, and common prudence on the part of the candidate in adopting so unlikely a plan of study, a plan so silly upon the face of it that nothing short of a succession of the worst sort of examiners could induce any young man of ordinary intelligence to attempt it.

With extreme regret and reluctance, we refer to another objection which is rather strongly urged. It is stated that the competitions for honors and scholarships lead to a bad state of feeling among the students—rivalry, envy, pride, self-conceit, selfishness are some of the words which express the feeling supposed by some to prevail among our generous youth. To be obliged even to discuss the probability of the presence of such a condition of affairs is humiliating, and we view this and similar assertions as a slander upon our young men, gratuitous as it is false, and affecting not only the reputation of the present generations of undergraduates, but that of hundreds of honourable men who won the highest honors of our universities without a thought of the contemptible meanness, which, it is stated, prevails among competing candidates. Where is the proof? Where