TATEMENTS in criticism of the Institute such as have appeared in the Boston Herald, may have an influence on those having no better idea of the policy and workings of the Institute, than that displayed by their author and which may be quite independent of their actual truth or falsity. It is for this reason more than for any merit in itself that the article deserves to be noticed.

The first charge, and the less serious, is that of maintaining a too high standard of requirements for graduation. If the degree of the Institute counts for more than that of the average American college, it is only because it is obtained at the price of the increased labor and thoroughness which are demanded by the high requirements of the Course of study. A glance at the catalogues of the last few years will fail to show that an increase in the amount of work has been followed by a decrease in the proportion of graduates. Lowering the present standard of excellence would certainly be an easy way to "enable the largest number of students possible to graduate with honor," but such a cheap policy would never have built up the Institute's present reputation.

The arguments for more severe entrance examinations and a longer course, if ever they were of force, have ceased to be applicable to present conditions. The Institute offers, and in many cases recommends, a five years' course, and the recent revision of the requirements for admission brings them up to the standard of any college in New England. In comparable subjects these requirements are nearly uniform at all the colleges in this part of the country, and the Herald's suggestion of adjusting the course of studies in the preparatory schools to meet its other suggestions of raising the standard of examination here is not likely to be generally adopted. In the plan followed at the Institute, the first year is one of elementary studies for all Courses, and serves as an introduction to the more advanced work of the following years. Whether some of these studies could be dispensed with in an institution of this character is a question which is open for discussion.

The demoralizing effects of a four months' vacation are more noticeable in the editor's imagination than elsewhere, but if lengthening the term would lead to better work, it would be worth a trial.

The argument for the change is, however, based upon assumptions of overwork and undue crowding, which we believe to be essentially mistaken, while for students of limited means, as well as for the large number who spend the summer in professional practice, the present arrangement is of great benefit.