

relative position of the most attentive and the most indifferent may be identical.

The question of cheating in examinations is a very grave one, and the extent to which it is carried on is quite unknown by the average teacher. In many cases they refuse to acknowledge that it is as general as it really is, and will close their eyes to it. Yet the present writer has attended examinations in which the object seemed to be, not who would write the best paper, but who could cheat the most without being detected. He has seen the professor who was conducting the examination take out a book and begin to read, and it is needless to add that simultaneously there were numerous other books taken out, and some very hard and careful reading ensued, in which all the participants save one made copious notes.

In no part of an undergraduate's career does so much duplicity, so much fraud, so much absolute theft occur, as during an examination. A teacher will spend six months in teaching the elements of moral science. He may illustrate his subject with a wealth of illustration taken from all time and all sources. He may bring it vividly before his students and impress firmly upon their minds the importance of the precepts laid down, and yet when he begins an examination he will have his most elementary law violated. Just so long as there are written examinations with set questions and marks, just so long will the laws of moral science be thrust to one side, and our young men familiarize themselves with methods of throwing dust and of fraud they will not be apt to forget in after life. It may be somewhat novel to advocate the abolition of examinations on moral grounds, but there are certainly reasons for so doing. Leaving aside all questions of religious or sectarian influence the fact remains that it is

thoroughly inconsistent with modern ideas of correct morality to afford young men such ample and complete facilities for the practice of deceit as are furnished by an ordinary collegiate course. And in these days when fraud and corruption are rampant on every side, and are rapidly eating away our social and political life, every element that tends in this direction, in ever so small a degree, should be at once abolished.

To return once more, however, to the original question: Do written examinations afford a safe criterion of knowledge? it may safely be affirmed that with set questions they do not. As has been remarked, the good and the bad students are not unfrequently on the same footing. Papers are exchanged and answers copied with a surprising facility. Nor is this all, for while one's general knowledge may be very complete, a date or a specific piece of information may be forgotten in the heat and worry of the final test.

In a subject like history, for illustration, the teacher may have spent some time on the philosophy of the branch—a part having peculiar fascination for the better class of students—while the examination paper, being prepared for the average student—a term frequently synonymous with the worst—is made up of subjects which, being in the text-book, may have been but lightly touched upon, and which may, therefore, have been overlooked by the very men who have followed the teacher most attentively. In examinations of this kind, therefore, we do not obtain information as to a student's general knowledge, nor do we learn whether one man knows more than another. All that is ascertained, at the best, is that some men know some facts. As to their general knowledge or even as to the identity of the particular student—owing to the various methods in