

not reason him, but may persuade or overawe him into striving to improve the study of his subject by introducing new features into his questions.

Under the influence of these numerous requirements — requirements which multiply as he thinks of this and that inspector, professor, and high school master—or of the varied objects of study, varied conditions of schools, and endless variety of students; under these influences he finds it almost impossible to please all, or indeed to avoid offending many who have strong claims upon his consideration.

Would it not be as wise to deal with the subject quite independently, but upon common-sense or philosophical grounds? Is it not certain that there is a sound method of examining as there is of teaching, and that questions may be asked which cannot give offence to any and yet can be difficult enough to constitute a thorough test of knowledge and training?

In order to produce efficient examiners the training institutes of all grades should give prominence to the subject of setting examination papers, a subject of great importance to teachers and pupils in all schools, and especially in advanced schools. Suppose then that we enquire tentatively what the tests of examination questions should be. It will be readily seen that much greater care will be required in setting provincial papers than in setting merely local papers, inasmuch as differences of method, of text-books, of individual inclinations of teachers, and many minor differences must be allowed for. When a master is examining his own pupils he may simply desire to know whether they have given intelligent attention to his instruction, and hence may ask questions of a minute and even technical nature, but such questions would be serious

grievances in papers intended for the pupils of a whole province.

With regard to the provincial nature of questions then it may appear sound to hold that:

(a) They should be of such a kind that no fairly efficient master would have failed to inculcate the principles with which they deal.

(b) They should deal rather with principles than with minute or detailed information.

(c) They should employ no technicalities not common to the authorized text-books (in some cases two or more text-books are authorized).

(d) In English grammar, where the range of questions is unlimited, the authorized text-books should be the examiner's guide, and only such subjects as are common to the different grammars authorized should be dealt with.

No doubt these tests appear to lay great stress upon the text-books and to that extent curtail freedom of teaching, but if this is an objection it is an objection springing from the very nature and essence of a centralized system of examining and finds an offset in the advantages of that system over others.

Having thus guarded against unfairness in the general nature of the paper the examiner would do well to apply methodically certain tests to the individual questions, and if these tests were applied several times after the first draught of the questions and at long intervals they would do much to remove the most exasperating features of weak papers. Without prolonged argument the following rules for the guidance of examiners are suggested, not as exhaustive or absolute, but rather that they may lead to a better understanding of this vital question:

(a) A question should have some educative value; it should be a test of mental power, knowledge or train-