

tions on the book, he will never acquire the art of questioning.

Why are the "leading questions," or questions that can be answered by Yes or No, objectionable? "Leading questions" are useful in recitation when it is desirable to have a pupil commit himself when he purposely or otherwise refuses to come to the point. But they are usually objectionable, 1. Because they provoke very little effort on the part of the pupil as to thought, and none at all in the expression of it. If there is no effort required in the recitation, no effort will be made for it. 2. Because the teacher has to do all the reciting, and it is not his business to recite.

Should the teacher reject partial answers and require every answer to be expressed in good language and in a complete sentence? Of course, every answer ought to be given in good language. I do not think, however, that every answer should be in a complete sentence. When a single pupil is asked a question I think the answer should be in a complete sentence, when

that sentence is not necessarily stereotyped. For example, take the following questions: What is the capital of Ohio? Ans. Columbus is the capital of Ohio. What is the capital of Pennsylvania? Ans. Harrisburg is the capital of Pennsylvania. What advantage have these complete sentences over the mere words Columbus and Harrisburg? Those who say every answer ought to be a complete sentence should require their pupils to say, "There are 16 drams in one ounce; there are 16 ounces in one pound," etc. But when the sentence admits of a variety of construction, and hence some ingenuity and effort on the part of the pupil, then they should be required; for one purpose of the recitation is to train pupils in correct expression.

In questioning a class as a whole, either the answer in a single word, or the stereotyped sentence is to be preferred to the other, because if each one of a dozen had a different sentence, there would be a Babel of confusion, and no answer understood.

Penn. School Journal.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We have received a communication in reply to the attack made on the management of the Hamilton Schools in the last issue of a contemporary educational journal. As the reply is written in the same style of personal detraction as the editorial in question, we must decline to give it publicity through the medium of our columns. We cannot consent to prostitute THE SCHOOL MAGAZINE to satisfy the personal animus of anyone, or to lend its pages to the furtherance of private, at the expense of public interests.

Industrial Education, we are told by the editor of an educational journal, is just the thing now for Canadian Schools. To amplify the public school course of study seems to be the aim of a few educational quacks; "rudimentary work-shops" are to be started in connection with the public schools for the boys, and the girls are to be taught domestic work. "If gown making, pie baking and carpet shaking are to be bundled into the curriculum of the female department of the public schools, why not teach