

pends not on the number of papers he examines, but in the time he spends in examining. Such is a brief sketch of the *modus operandi*, which to our mind seems to be pretty complete. But there are

OBJECTIONS TO THE OPERATION OF THE FOREGOING.

1. According to regulation, we believe, each examiner is to work eight hours a day on all days but Saturdays, for which day four hours is regarded as the proper amount of time. As a matter of fact, however, members do work ten and twelve hours a day, and in this way make up lost time and secure other advantages. The regulation we submit is a proper one, and in the interests of the candidates and the Department, should be strictly enforced. No man can do justice to the papers and examine ten hours a day for any length of time. Every teacher knows this. True, the candidate can appeal; but matters should be so arranged that appeals would be unnecessary. We may say in passing that this year a very great amount of dissatisfaction prevails in regard to the valuation of the answers, and we prophecy a considerable alteration in some of the results.

2. There is no limitation to the number of papers one examiner may read each day; and at the late examination, we are credibly informed, no less than 120 different sets of answers, each set averaging six or seven sheets, were read in nine hours by one examiner. Arithmetic and algebra papers may be examined more quickly than the others; but the subjects we refer to were not mathematical. The Minister expects, the candidates hope for, and the country pays for, careful work. Both the length of time to be devoted each day and the maximum number of papers should be fixed and strictly observed.

3. No one should be appointed a sub-examiner who has not had experience both as teacher and examiner. Quite a large number of the gentlemen whose names we have given above, never taught a day, and cannot have a proper conception of the degree of accuracy and mental development to ex-

pect. The tendency is to err by going to one extreme or the other—to be too severe or too lenient. In the matter of selection, the line is drawn at University Graduates, Model School Masters, and Public School Inspectors. To the latter two no objection can be offered, so long as they possess the requisite amount of scholarship, but a B.A. with Honors is not the only qualification of an examiner. It is, to say the least, very improper to appoint as examiners raw graduates—men or boys who have just gone through the mill themselves and have not had that mental exaltation that so frequently characterizes the class, toned down by a little experience. We would respectfully suggest, too, to the Minister, that all the brains and scholarship of the Public School profession are not in the possession of Model School Masters. We do not attribute to the Department any other motive than a desire to maintain a high standard in the Examining Board, but we should like to see thereon more Public School Inspectors and Public School Masters. If there are any loaves and fishes, they plainly belong to the faithful and able teacher, not to the fledgling lawyer, however high may be his attainments as a scholar. Mankind is always going from one extreme to the other. In the anxiety to secure a high scholastic standard, the absolute necessity for teaching experience and examining ability is left out of sight in too many instances.

4. The sub-examiners should be required to devote all their time to the examination while it lasts. As a matter of course some of the law students, by working late and early, had four or five hours to devote to their own office work and the attractions of Osgoode Hall. How can one feel satisfied with the eight or nine hours examining of a young man who devotes four or five other hours of the same day to other work, and that too amid the tropical heat of last July. This must be altered. The Minister cannot but see the impropriety of the course we object to.

5. Mr. Tilley, it is said, allots to the different sub-examiners the subjects they are to