

ANSWER KEY — 9 OCTOBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	D	A	C	A	D	C	B	D	A
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
B	A	D	A	C	B	D	C	A	C
Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24						
B	D	C	B						

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Inference - character motive **MED**

The narrator gives Sumitra's reasoning directly: 'There would be time for that, and he would say what everyone would say, that it was a shame and that nobody wrote letters any more, and she would agree, because it was true, and because agreeing was quicker.' She anticipates a predictable lament and prefers the easier path of agreement to a conversation she does not want to have that morning. That is exactly the option about foreseeing his lament and finding it easier to agree than to discuss. Nothing suggests she fears a complaint against her to the department; Mr Gurung complains about the bus, not about her. No instruction of confidentiality is mentioned anywhere, so that option imports a fact the passage never gives. The option about doubting that the order is final contradicts the text: she reads the letter twice, folds it and puts it away, and by evening she takes her ledger home, which shows she accepts the closure as settled.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option about doubting the order's finality attracts readers who expect denial, but Sumitra folds the letter away and takes her ledger home, plainly accepting the closure.

Q2 D Inference - symbolic detail (Stretch) **ELITE**

The green ledger records 'the name on every letter that had come to Tenmile and found no one to receive it', whether because the addressee had died, moved to the plains or never existed. For thirty-one years each line has been a name with no receiver. On the last day Sumitra writes 'not a name this time but the word Tenmile and the date'. The contrast the narrator draws ('not a name this time') invites us to read the village itself as joining the list: once its post office closes, letters to Tenmile will in effect have no one at Tenmile to receive them, and the place enters the record of the unclaimed. The option about official accounts fails because the ledger 'was not an official book'. The successor option fails because she takes the book home in her own bag rather than leaving it. The option about a final undelivered letter invents an event the passage never describes and ignores the pointed phrase 'not a name'.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option about a final undelivered letter attracts because the ledger records such letters, but the narrator stresses 'not a name this time', which points to the village itself.

Q3 A Inference - figurative remark **HARD**

The simile describes Mr Gurung watching Sumitra count his pension notes 'as though the money might become more if he watched closely enough'. The image is of someone who knows the money cannot grow, yet attends to it with a hope that close attention might somehow add to it. That suggests the sums are small and matter a great deal to him, so that he watches each note with anxious, hopeful care. The narrator adds that he did this 'as he always did', which marks a habit rather than a suspicion arising that day. The short-changing option attracts because watching hands can signal distrust, but the simile is about the money growing, not about catching an error, and Sumitra counts the notes 'twice, slowly', with no hint of mistakes. The fascination-with-routine option ignores that the object of his watching is the money. The failing-eyesight option supplies a physical cause the text never mentions and drains the simile of its emotional point.

Examiner's note — the trap: The short-changing option attracts because watching hands can suggest distrust, but the simile is about the money growing, and the habit is long-standing ('as he always did').

Q4 C Tone **HARD**

The passage never states Sumitra's grief directly. Instead it works through routine and small detail: she sweeps the step before reading the order, folds the letter 'along its creases', counts the notes twice, turns the ledger pages 'for a long time', watches the single bulb come on across the road, and tries the lock again and again. Feeling is carried by these quiet acts rather than by any declaration, which is what a restrained, melancholy tone means. The indignant option fails because the department's letter is called 'brief and courteous' and no one condemns it; even Sumitra simply agrees that the closure is 'a shame'. The comic option seizes on the boy by the stove and Mr Gurung's complaint about the bus, but these are drawn with sympathy, not to raise a laugh, and they sit inside a sad day. The

detached option misses the plain emotional charge of the ledger, the guessed contents ('a son, a debt, a proposal') and the closing gesture.

Examiner's note — the trap: The detached, documentary option attracts because no feeling is stated outright, but restraint is not absence: the ledger and the closing gesture carry strong, quiet emotion.

Q5 A Inference - closing image **HARD**

The final sentence stands alone as its own paragraph: 'Then she locked the door, and tried it, and tried it again.' Checking a lock once is ordinary caution; checking it repeatedly on the evening an office closes for good suggests something else. The office will not reopen under her care, so the act of securing it has lost its practical purpose, yet she repeats it, as she has repeated her routines for thirty-one years. The gesture expresses reluctance to let go of the place and the role. This matches the option about a reluctance to let go, expressed through an act of care that has lost its purpose. The burglary option reads the act literally; nothing in the passage mentions any threat, and the option ignores the emotional build-up of the ledger scene. The faulty-lock option invents a defect never described. The anger option misreads the tone, since Sumitra has shown no resentment towards the department at any point in the day.

Examiner's note — the trap: The burglary option attracts as the literal reason to check a lock, but the office is closing for good, and the scene's build-up points to reluctance, not security.

Q6 D Detail - EXCEPT (unsupported statement) **HARD**

An EXCEPT question asks for the one statement the passage does not support, so each option must be checked against the text. The first is supported: she had opened the office 'for thirty-one years', which is more than three decades. The second is supported almost word for word: 'The letters themselves had gone back long ago, as the rules required.' The third is supported too: old Mr Gurung 'had come for his pension and stayed to complain about the bus.' The fourth is the exception, because the narrator says plainly of the green ledger, 'It was not an official book.' It was written 'in her own small hand' and kept on her own initiative, which is precisely why she can take it home in her bag at the end of the day. Its unofficial character is the point of the passage: the department closes the office and its accounts, but this private record of unclaimed names belongs to Sumitra alone, and so the statement that the department required it is contradicted, not merely unstated.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option about the letters being sent back attracts readers who half-remember the ledger, but the passage states that rule outright; only the 'official record' claim is contradicted.

Q7 C Main idea **HARD**

The passage opens with a familiar account on which wrongs are harms and the dead cannot be harmed, so 'a promise to her, it seems, dies with her'. The author then tests this, rejects a weaker reply, and finally defends 'a better reply': the mother's 'interest was in the hill, not in her own state of mind about the hill', and interests of that kind 'can be satisfied or defeated after their holder is gone'. The conclusion follows: 'the son has wronged his mother, though she will never know it'. The option combining a wrong to the dead with interests about the world rather than experience states this thesis. The option locating the wrong in harm to a practice the living depend on restates the reply the author says 'proves too little'. The option that promises to the dying cannot bind is the familiar account the author argues against. The option about wills as mere social habit repeats a consequence the author presents as unacceptable, not as a recommendation.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'harm to the living' option attracts because the author agrees it is true, but the author says it 'proves too little' and replaces it with the interest-based reply.

Q8 B Application of principle - RC (Stretch) **ELITE**

The author's view is that some interests are interests in the world, not in one's own experience, and that such interests can be defeated after death, so breaking a promise that served one wrongs the dead person even if no one ever knows. The diary case fits exactly: the friend made a specific request, a promise was given, her interest was that the diaries be destroyed unread, and the secret reading defeats that interest. Secrecy does not matter on this view; that was the point against the 'harm to the living' reply. The holiday option attracts because the aunt would disapprove, but the will allowed the spending and no promise or expressed interest is broken; mere disapproval is not an interest the author protects. The forgotten birthday involves no request and no promise at all. The house sale was carried out exactly as the will directed, so the father's expressed wishes were honoured, and the family's private dislike of the buyer concerns the living, not him.

Examiner's note — the trap: The house-sale option attracts because the family is unhappy, but the will's directions were honoured, so no interest of the dead father was defeated.

Q9 D Paragraph function **HARD**

The second paragraph begins 'Consider what follows if it is true' and then lists results of the familiar account: a dying person would have no reason to trust any promise, since it 'would lapse at the moment it mattered most'; wills would rest on nothing firmer than a convenient social habit; and the son could have promised insincerely from the start. Each consequence is presented as hard to accept, and the paragraph opens by saying people resist the conclusion 'not merely out of sentiment'. Its role is to draw out unwelcome consequences of the view in order to show that it is hard to accept, a reductio-style move. The option about the author's own positive theory fails because that theory arrives only in the final paragraph. The option claiming the paragraph concedes the account is correct reverses its purpose. The option about the history of wills misreads a single illustrative consequence as a historical description; nothing is said of how wills came to be enforced.

Examiner's note — the trap: The positive-theory option attracts because the paragraph opposes the familiar account, but it only shows its unwelcome consequences; the author's own theory comes in the final paragraph.

Q10 A Meaning in context HARD

To say an argument 'proves too little' is to say it does not reach far enough: it establishes something, but not enough to cover the cases it needs to cover. The author grants that the reply is true ('This is true') and then explains the shortfall: 'It implies that a broken promise kept perfectly secret wrongs nobody', so the son who scatters the ashes unseen 'has done nothing amiss provided no one ever finds out'. Because the wrong is located in damage to a public practice, a breach no one discovers escapes condemnation entirely. That is the option about failing to cover a wholly secret breach. The option saying the reply claims more than its evidence shows describes proving too much, the opposite failing. The option calling its premise false contradicts the author's explicit concession that the reply is true. The option about tone treats a logical criticism as a complaint about manner, which the passage never makes.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'claims more than its evidence shows' option attracts by sounding like a standard logical fault, but that is proving too much, the opposite of the author's criticism.

Q11 B Purpose of analogy HARD

The author's key claim is that interests directed at the world, rather than at one's own experience, 'can be satisfied or defeated after their holder is gone'. Many readers will find that odd, so the author offers a familiar parallel: 'a parent's interest in the welfare of her children can be defeated by events she never lives to see'. Most people accept that a mother's interest in her children's flourishing is set back if they come to grief after her death, even though she never experiences it. The analogy therefore shows that an interest can be defeated by events its holder never lives to experience. The option about promises owed to parents mistakes the illustration for a new claim about obligations. The option about harm to the son's own children introduces a theme of moral example the passage never raises. The option saying interests end at death reverses the analogy's point, which is that they can outlast their holder.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option that interests end at death, as a parent's influence does, attracts by mentioning parents, but it reverses the analogy, which shows interests outlasting their holder.

Q12 A Author's view - agreement HARD

The author's own position appears in the final paragraph, which ends: 'the son has wronged his mother, though she will never know it, and a wrong that no one feels is still a wrong.' That is the first statement almost exactly, so the author would agree with it. The second statement is the reply the author considers in the third paragraph and rejects as one that 'proves too little', because it cannot condemn a breach kept perfectly secret; the author accepts that it is true as far as it goes but denies that it is the main reason. The third statement is drawn from the second paragraph, where the possibility of an insincere promise is listed as an unwelcome consequence of the familiar view, not as something the author endorses. The fourth statement is the very assumption the author's distinction attacks: the mother 'wanted them honoured', and 'her interest was in the hill, not in her own state of mind about the hill.' Only the first statement matches the author's conclusion.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option about harm to the living attracts readers because the author grants 'This is true', but the author goes on to reject it as the main reason.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q13 D Assumption - CR (Stretch) ELITE

The third paragraph reasons that a farmer 'must guess what price she will get in spring', and that 'if she has learned that high prices will be cut short by a ban whenever they arrive', she faces capped gains and uncapped losses and so 'plants less'. The step from past bans to reduced sowing works only if growers form their price expectations partly from how the state has behaved during earlier spikes. Negate it: if growers ignored past policy and expected spring prices to run freely, the record of bans would not alter how much they sow, and the conclusion would collapse. The option about farmers being poor food-buying households is irrelevant to sowing incentives. The option about foreign buyers paying more than domestic buyers concerns the size of the loss, not whether growers anticipate bans. The option that other crops are never controlled is too strong; the author needs only that some alternatives are left alone more often, since growers move 'to crops the state leaves alone'.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option that other crops are never controlled attracts as a needed premise, but it is far stronger than the argument requires; only expectations formed from past bans are essential.

Q14 A Main conclusion - CR HARD

The conclusion is signalled by 'therefore' in the final paragraph: 'Export bans therefore do not stabilise onion prices; over any period longer than a single season, they make prices more volatile, by shrinking the supply on which stability depends.' Everything before it supports this claim: the transfer from farmers, the reduced sowing that follows learned expectations, and the loss of foreign buyers who could absorb a glut. The option stating that bans make prices less stable over more than one season, by shrinking supply, captures it. The transfer option is a premise from the second paragraph, which feeds into the conclusion but is not itself the point. The foreign-buyers option is a supporting premise from the fourth paragraph. The option about shielding poor households is the author's recommended remedy, which follows the conclusion as a further proposal; it presupposes the conclusion rather than stating it, so it is not the main conclusion of the argument as a whole.

Examiner's note — the trap: The transfer option attracts because the author stresses it, but it is a premise feeding the 'therefore' conclusion about volatility, not the conclusion itself.

Q15 C Weaken - CR HARD

The argument's central mechanism is that bans teach growers to expect capped gains, so 'fewer onions are sown, the next shortage comes sooner', and prices become more volatile. If onion acreage rose just as fast after seasons with bans as after seasons without them, the predicted fall in sowing did not occur, and the main link between bans and later volatility is cut. That option attacks the argument at its weight-bearing premise. The option about urban households spending a larger share of income on food, if anything, strengthens the case for protecting consumers but does not touch the claim about volatility. The option about some importers returning within a few years only slightly softens the subsidiary foreign-buyer point; the author says such buyers are 'slow to return', which is consistent with a return after some years. The buffer-stock option concerns the cost of the author's remedy, not the truth of the conclusion that bans destabilise prices.

Examiner's note — the trap: The importers-turned option attracts because it challenges a premise, but the author only says such buyers are 'slow to return', and the central sowing mechanism is untouched.

Q16 B Strengthen - CR HARD

The author's claim about sowing is a prediction about behaviour: a grower who has learned that high prices will be cut short 'plants less, or moves to crops the state leaves alone'. Direct evidence that growers actually reduced onion acreage after bans, and that they cited the risk of capped high prices as their reason, confirms both the behaviour and the motive the author attributes to them. The option about retail prices falling within weeks confirms the short-run effect the author already concedes ('A ban does lower the domestic price') and says nothing about sowing. The option that onion growers also grow pulses with little regulation shows only that an alternative exists, not that growers switch to it because of bans. The option about importers buying from two other exporting countries supports the separate foreign-buyer premise in the fourth paragraph, not the claim about how growers decide what to sow, which the question specifically targets.

Examiner's note — the trap: The importers-buying-elsewhere option attracts because it confirms part of the passage, but the question targets the sowing claim, which it does not support at all.

Q17 D Parallel reasoning - CR (Stretch) ELITE

The passage's reasoning has a distinctive structure: an intervention that caps prices whenever they rise teaches producers that their gains are capped while losses are not; producers respond by supplying less; reduced supply brings the next shortage sooner, and so the intervention recurs and defeats its own stabilising purpose. The rent-cap argument copies each step: rents are capped whenever they rise, landlords learn to build less, and housing shortages recur. The fuel-subsidy option is about distribution between rich and poor and targeting, which echoes only the author's closing remedy. The pesticide option contrasts short-run cost with long-run benefit, a different pattern altogether. The sugar-tax option attracts because it also describes a policy defeating itself, but its mechanism is falling consumption reducing tax revenue, not a cap on producers' prices that discourages future supply; the self-defeat comes from the demand side and involves no learned expectation by producers.

Examiner's note — the trap: The sugar-tax option attracts because it too describes a policy defeating itself, but its mechanism runs through consumers and revenue, not through capped prices discouraging supply.

Q18 C Evaluate the argument - CR (Stretch) ELITE

An evaluate question asks for the fact whose answer, one way or the other, would most change our confidence in the argument. The prediction rests on a causal chain: growers learn that high prices will be capped, so they plant less, so fewer onions are sown and the next shortage arrives sooner. The weakest link to test is whether growers actually respond by sowing less. If acreage fell after past bans, the chain is confirmed at its key step; if acreage held steady or rose, the mechanism the author describes did not operate and the prediction loses its basis. That makes the acreage option the most useful thing to know. Whether consumers also faced dearer vegetables concerns household budgets, not onion supply. Whether governments ban grain exports too says nothing about how onion growers behave. Whether farmers earn less than city workers bears on the fairness of the transfer in the second paragraph, but the prediction under evaluation concerns supply and volatility, not relative incomes.

Examiner's note — the trap: The option comparing farmers' and city workers' incomes attracts readers who recall the 'grower's loss' point, but that bears on fairness, not on whether shortages recur sooner.

Q19 A Main conclusion - CR MED

The final paragraph opens with 'The remedy is to reverse that burden' and states the proposal: 'An accelerated approval should carry a fixed expiry date... after which it lapses automatically unless the trial has reported and confirmed a benefit.' The earlier paragraphs build towards this: the bargain is sound, manufacturers and patients both have reasons to delay confirmatory trials, and regulators seldom use their withdrawal power. The option stating that approvals should lapse at a set date unless a confirmatory trial has shown benefit is the conclusion. The option that accelerated approval is sound in principle is a concession in the second paragraph, which the author grants before identifying the real difficulty. The option urging regulators to withdraw drugs more quickly misses the author's point that relying on active withdrawal is the problem; the proposal replaces that decision with an automatic lapse. The option barring sales until trials finish would abolish accelerated approval, which the author defends.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'withdraw more quickly' option attracts because the author criticises slow withdrawal, but the proposal deliberately replaces active withdrawal with an automatic lapse.

Q20 C Paragraph function - CR **HARD**

The third paragraph says regulators 'already have the power to withdraw such approvals, but the power is seldom used quickly', because withdrawal is 'a visible act' while 'delay is invisible', so 'the burden of action... falls on the side that bears the greater political cost'. It explains why the existing remedy fails in practice, and that diagnosis motivates the next paragraph's proposal to 'reverse that burden' with an automatic lapse that requires no active decision by anyone. The option saying regulators lack legal power contradicts the paragraph's first words. The option that patients and doctors are right to resist withdrawal misreads a description of political cost as an endorsement of the resistance. The option that delay is harmless because invisible confuses visibility with harm: the second paragraph has already shown that drugs later found to have no benefit stayed on sale during such delays.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'patients and doctors are right' option attracts because the paragraph mentions their belief, but the author describes that resistance as a political cost, not a justified position.

Q21 B Weaken - CR **HARD**

The author says a manufacturer whose drug works 'would lose nothing, since it would simply complete the trial it had already promised to run'. That assumes an effective drug can in fact finish its trial before the expiry date. The passage itself reports a reason this may fail regardless of the drug's merit: patients are 'reluctant to enrol in a study in which they may receive a placebo' when the drug is available on prescription. If such recruitment problems often stop even effective drugs from completing trials within any fixed period, then honest manufacturers of working drugs would see approvals lapse, and they would lose a great deal. The option that most manufacturers already finish on time weakens the case for reform, not the 'lose nothing' claim. The option that surrogate endpoints are accurate addresses whether drugs work, not what happens to working drugs under the rule. The option about doctors prescribing such drugs less often is irrelevant to the expiry mechanism.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'most already finish on time' option attracts because it challenges the reform, but it does not touch the claim that a working drug would lose nothing under it.

Q22 D Flaw - CR (Stretch) **ELITE**

The final sentence claims that 'only a manufacturer content to sell an unconfirmed drug indefinitely would have reason to object', and dismisses that interest. This presumes that every objection must spring from a self-interested motive, overlooking legitimate grounds. Patients benefiting from a drug whose trial is delayed, or the maker of an effective drug whose trial stalls through placebo recruitment the passage itself describes, would have principled reasons to object to an automatic lapse. Characterising all opponents by the worst motive and then dismissing that motive is the flaw. The option about surrogate endpoints never predicting benefit misstates the passage, which accepts that surrogates are 'expected to predict real benefit'. The option about confusing a power with a duty attracts because the passage discusses withdrawal power, but the final sentence says nothing about withdrawal at all; it concerns who might object to the proposed expiry rule. The option about relying on opinions misdescribes the sentence, which cites no doctors or patients.

Examiner's note — the trap: The power-versus-duty option attracts because withdrawal power is discussed earlier, but the final sentence is about who would object to expiry, not about withdrawal.

Q23 C Strengthen - CR **HARD**

The proposal's case rests on two claims: an automatic lapse will make manufacturers finish confirmatory trials promptly, and effective drugs 'would lose nothing'. Evidence that where approvals lapsed automatically, trials finished on time far more often and few effective drugs lapsed supports both claims at once: the mechanism works, and its feared cost did not materialise. The option that patients with months to live accept unconfirmed drugs supports the case for accelerated approval itself, which the author already grants, not the expiry proposal. The option that regulators who withdrew drugs quickly faced public criticism does confirm the author's diagnosis that withdrawal is politically costly, which makes it the attractive choice, but it supports only the description of the problem; it says nothing about whether an automatic lapse would work. The option that confirmatory trials are usually larger than ordinary trials, if anything, suggests they take longer, which would weaken the proposal by making fixed deadlines harder to meet.

Examiner's note — the trap: The public-criticism option attracts because it confirms the author's diagnosis, but it supports only the description of the problem, not that the proposed remedy would work.

Q24 B Assumption - CR **HARD**

The third paragraph diagnoses the problem: withdrawal is 'a visible act' that carries a political cost, while delay is invisible, so 'the burden of action' falls on the side that bears the greater cost. The remedy is to reverse that burden by making approval lapse unless a trial confirms benefit. For this remedy to work, an automatic lapse must not attract the same resistance that deters a deliberate withdrawal; if a lapse were just as politically costly, regulators would face the same pressure to extend the date and nothing would change. That unstated premise is the second option. The first option contradicts the passage, which treats surrogate endpoints as measures 'expected to predict real benefit' and calls the bargain 'sound in principle'. The third option reverses the author's own premise that a drug which probably works today is worth more to a dying patient. The fourth contradicts the statement that regulators 'already have the power to withdraw such approvals'; the problem is that the power is seldom used, not that it is missing.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. How long had Sumitra Devi run the Tenmile post office? — **Thirty-one years**
2. At what time did Sumitra open the post office each morning? — **Nine o'clock**
3. What did Sumitra do before reading the closure order? — **Swept the step**
4. How does the narrator describe the department's letter? — **Brief and courteous**
5. When would the Tenmile branch close? — **At the end of the month**
6. Where would Tenmile's accounts pass after closure? — **To the town office down the valley**
7. How far away was the town office? — **Forty kilometres**
8. Where did Sumitra put the folded order? — **In the drawer with the rubber stamps**
9. At what time did the first visitor arrive? — **Eleven**
10. What did the Rai boy want at the post office? — **Only to stand by the stove**
11. Why had Mr Gurung come to the post office? — **To collect his pension**
12. What did Mr Gurung complain about? — **The bus**
13. How did Sumitra count Mr Gurung's notes? — **Twice, slowly**
14. What would everyone say about the closure, Sumitra expected? — **That it was a shame**
15. Why did Sumitra expect she would agree with Mr Gurung? — **Because it was true and agreeing was quicker**
16. What colour was Sumitra's private ledger? — **Green**
17. Was the green ledger an official record? — **No**
18. What did the green ledger record? — **Names on letters that found no receiver**
19. How many entries did the green ledger hold? — **Two hundred and eleven**
20. Name one guess Sumitra wrote beside an entry. — **A son, a debt or a proposal**
21. What had happened to the undelivered letters themselves? — **Returned long ago, as rules required**
22. What filled the valley in the afternoon? — **Clouds**
23. What came on in the shop across the road? — **Its single bulb**
24. What did Sumitra write as the ledger's last line? — **The word Tenmile and the date**
25. Where did Sumitra put the ledger at five? — **Into her own bag**
26. How many times did Sumitra try the lock after locking it? — **Twice**
27. Give one reason a letter reached no receiver at Tenmile. — **Addressee dead, moved or never there**
28. Where had some addressees gone, per the ledger? — **To the plains**
29. What did the dying woman ask her son to do? — **Scatter her ashes on her childhood hill**
30. Where did the son actually scatter the ashes? — **In the river near his flat**
31. On the familiar account, wrongs are what? — **Harms**
32. On the familiar account, what do harms need? — **Someone to suffer them**
33. On the familiar account, what happens to a promise to the dead? — **It dies with her**
34. Why, on the familiar view, would the dying not trust promises? — **They would lapse when they mattered most**
35. What would wills rest on if the familiar view were true? — **A convenient social habit**
36. Who does the first reply say is wronged by a broken promise? — **The living**
37. What does the first reply say breaking such promises weakens? — **A practice everyone depends on**
38. What does the author say the 'harm to the living' reply proves? — **Too little**
39. Which breach does the 'harm to the living' reply fail to condemn? — **One kept perfectly secret**
40. The better reply separates wanting from what? — **Experiencing**
41. Per the author, the mother's interest was in what? — **The hill, not her state of mind**
42. Interests of that kind can be defeated when? — **After their holder is gone**
43. What parental interest does the author use as an analogy? — **Interest in children's welfare**
44. Per the author, is a wrong no one feels still a wrong? — **Yes**
45. What is the government's reflex when onion prices climb? — **Banning onion exports**
46. Who is the ban defended as protecting? — **The poor consumer**
47. Whose loss is the consumer's gain, per the author? — **The grower's**
48. How many extra bulbs does an export ban create? — **Not a single one**
49. When must a farmer guess the spring onion price? — **In autumn, when deciding acreage**
50. Under repeated bans, whose are the losses to keep? — **The farmer's**