

EXPERT ARTIST GIVES EVIDENCE

AT INQUIRY INTO DRAWING BOOK TROUBLE

The Commission Resumes Its Sitting
To-Day—Mrs Mary Daniels
—the Witness Stand.

(From Friday's Daily.)

This morning the commission appointed to investigate the South Park school drawing trouble resumed its proceedings.

R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, called upon Mrs. Mary Daniel. She had been a student of the Royal Academy in England for seven years.

Answering Mr. Elliott, witness explained the preliminary period necessary to secure such a position. Upon request she submitted her credentials. Her teacher had been Mr. Cary, of London, recommended by the highest authorities.

When about to produce other documents to establish her standing as an artist, both Col. Gregory and D. M. Eberts, counsel for the board of school trustees and the department of education, respectively, acknowledged the ability of the witness. They did not think it necessary to produce any further documents.

Subsequently, witness said she had studied the external and internal eye under Stanford Martin. The only way to obtain admittance to the Royal Academy was to fulfill the requirements. It was not an honor obtained through competition. Since taking up teaching she had followed the different systems of drawing in vogue with interest. She had gone through the "Blair's Canadian Drawing System."

"What do you think of it?" asked Mr. Elliott. "I object," said Col. Gregory. He did not think the question of whether the method was "good or bad" was at all relevant.

Mr. Elliott contended that as Examiner Blair had given evidence as an expert he was entitled to demonstrate how much credence could be placed upon his statements. The present witness was one whose right to speak as an artist was unquestioned. Surely, therefore, he was entitled to question her with reference to Mr. Blair's method of drawing.

Commissioner Lampman overruled the objection.

Witness did not think the system a "good" one. She could not remember having seen drawing taught in a similar way anywhere else. As far back as she could remember, she had seen some flat drawings. But the recollection was very vague.

Taking the books witness proceeded to criticize the instructions given and expressed the belief that they were misleading.

Speaking of exercise nine she said that there appeared to be considerable geometry mixed with the drawing. This was most unusual. Of the square designs she believed their method would be exceedingly hard upon a child's eye.

Coming back to free-hand drawing, witness believed that it was the art of drawing without the aid of mechanical appliances.

Looking through the book she pointed out a number of leaf designs as the best examples of free-hand drawing. She would not draw a child's eye with straight lines. Pointing out some flower pot figures given in the Blair books, witness would expect children of seven to do such drawing. It was a good deal of work to draw a flower pot with angles and the rudiments.

Answering Mr. Elliott, witness stated that in her teaching no limit would be placed upon the number of times a student might correct his or her work. Her practice was to allow such a thing to be done until all imperfections were overcome. She had not seen anything like the Blair methods within the past quarter of century.

Illustrating how she would teach free-hand drawing, Mrs. Daniel produced a number of portraits done by free-hand.

Asked for her opinion regarding straight lines, witness said: "My old master used to tell me not to bother drawing straight lines, to rule them if they were necessary." (Laughter.)

In her opinion the pupil having completed the Blair system would not be able to draw a child's eye. There was too much geometry involved, and too many straight lines. A child could not be taught to draw in such a manner.

Mr. Eberts asked witness what she would do if she had some hundreds of teachers, many of whom knew nothing of drawing, and thousands of children to be taught.

Witness was not prepared to say. Joseph London, an eminent educational authority, was then quoted by counsel. He advocated the use of tracing in writing, and also suggested that it might be employed with profit in the first stages of drawing.

This, witness said, was possibly correct as far as writing was concerned. She, however, would not sanction the use of such a method in drawing.

Referring to the mechanical drawings included in the Blair books she did not think they would train the eye. Witness thought anyone could be taught to draw, only some, however, could be artists. If she had some six or seven hundred teachers to instruct the best possible method would be adopted.

Questioned by Col. Gregory, witness said she would teach very little perspective. She would teach the child the use of the vanishing point, although if doing the work herself she would do it entirely by use of the eye.

providing the size of the paper and the material available were suitable. Col. Gregory then wanted witness to go to the blackboard and draw a cube without using the converging lines. Counsel contended that witness had stated that these tracings when extended would meet at a certain point. "Now we'll put that to a test," concluded Col. Gregory.

"I object," interjected Mr. Elliott. "That's a low down contemptible trap." Col. Gregory appealed to the commissioner.

The latter thought the remark was much too strong, and Mr. Elliott withdrew it, and substituted the statement that it was an "obvious attempt to trap witness."

Commissioner Lampman upheld the objection.

Taking a number of illustrations in Funch, witness contended that the converging lines used all came to a point, while those in the Blair drawings would diverge if extended.

Col. Gregory did not think so, and proceeded to complete some of the sketches. The test proved unsuccessful.

Witness said the teaching of the use of the vanishing point did not train the eye to a great extent. It was more a mechanical thing. She disapproved of the use of straight lines. Although looking up the Encyclopedia Britannica on free-hand drawing, she had been unable to find any reference to it.

Counsel then read the highest authorities on the subject. Witness said the effect that true and straight lines were the natural beginning for a student. The round lines of a figure were the natural foundation for a higher course in drawing.

Pointing out that witness would commence to draw such a figure.

She said a straight line would be the first step. It would be quite unnecessary to take twenty minutes on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

somehow interesting statement on the part of witness. Referring to the Blair line, she said that at first it had been faintly ruled by the child, but she had ordered its erasure. This she had done, re-drawing it free hand while witness stood by watching.

Later on Miss Fraser expressed some doubt as to some of the constructional lines used in the formation of the cylinder designs. Witness acknowledged that there might be ruling upon page 21 of Miss K. Jackson's book.

The Clarence Muirhead book had been taken part in the examination. The other had been handed to the examiner. She did not think it was possible for her to give any opinion on that work. It had not been done before her. That student, she remembered, had taken part in the examination on two or three occasions, using ordinary paper instead of the regulation book.

In the Clarence Mitchell book, Commissioner Lampman asked witness to look at the light blue lines and tracings indicated in blue by Examiner Blair.

After an inspection she replied that she saw the lines but could not say whether they were ruled or not. Handed a magnifying lens she admitted that there might have been a ruler in use in that instance.

Questioned on T. C. Briggs' book, witness said that she had been told that the pupil had made one line. She had no doubt that the line was there, but she was not sure whether the top line on one of the figures of the first page had been done in that manner.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

The commission then adjourned until Monday morning.

Before the resumption of the proceedings of the commission investigating the drawing book trouble on Saturday R. T. Elliott, counsel for Miss Cameron, objected to the drawing of Edna White and Maud McB. Smith. It had been said that Miss Fraser had acknowledged that ruling was prevalent in both cases. This was incorrect, and witness did not make three inches in size exactly because the instructions were that there was to be no measuring. Therefore the pupils were simply told to make the drawings according to the size of those at the foot of the pages.

quite willing to close his examination on that subject.

The commissioner thought that would be the best method.

Answering Mr. Elliott, witness told of her interview with Supt. Eaton of the city schools. She had gone to him because of certain children, not suggesting that she confine her teaching to class work. Witness wanted to know whether Mr. Eaton meant that she had been using unfair methods in her instruction of drawing.

Asked this Mr. Eaton had denied anything of the kind, stating, in explanation, that Miss Fraser had been placed. The children, she said, all got books when Mr. Eaton had stated that there was apparently considerable ruling.

At this juncture there was some debate between counsel regarding the ruling of the lines. Col. Gregory wanted Mr. Elliott to proceed with his investigation on the system in that point afterwards.

Commissioner Lampman thought it would be a waste of time to indulge in theoretical or academic discussions. Anything regarding the circulars or the following out of instructions would be admitted.

D. M. Eberts, counsel for the department, then proceeded with his cross-examination.

In 1902 witness visited Mr. Blair, who had pointed out that ruling had been used in the books. She had acknowledged that the ruling was there, but she explained it had been promptly corrected. She had only taken care of the class then, and was not sure regarding the instructions.

Reading the regulations, witness said that they were so scattered in books, circulars, etc., that it was difficult to get a complete knowledge of what was required. In fact it had been stated to her by teachers in consultation with reference to the custom and they had received first class marks.

Questioned regarding her letter to the department, Miss Fraser said that it had been written at Miss Cameron's house. She had first drawn up several drafts, the last of which was submitted to Miss Cameron. She had read the department's circulars carefully. It was provided in one of these that the drawing books should be returned home. This rule had been broken only towards the end of the term when it had to be done in some instances in order that the books might be completed before examination. The small amount of the drawing had been done in this way. She had had nothing to do with the Muirhead book. As far as she remembered there was no model drawing done at home, and very little free-hand.

Witness could not say whether one-tenth of the time of the school had been taken up with drawing. One afternoon a week had been devoted to the work. There had been no drawing, however, as she could recollect, in January.

Asked to give an opinion on a certain line, witness refused to speak. She was not an expert and had not sufficient experience, training and knowledge to do so. She had seen the line without knowing by whom it was done or under what conditions.

When the books were returned to her with the construction lines ruled Miss Fraser had examined them, very carefully, and had prevented counsel putting questions if he so desired.

Mr. Eberts then continued, taking witness through the book of Katie Maud Jackson. She was very nervous, and witness said that free hand was general throughout.

Upon being presented with another book witness was directed not to answer by Mr. Elliott, as counsel was endeavoring to entrap her. Witness acquiesced.

To this Mr. Eberts took objection. He remarked that opposing counsel was acting more like "a wild man" than anything else. (Laughter.)

Witness said that she had never seen any such action in his eighteen years legal experience.

Commissioner Lampman remarked that witness was free to answer or not, as she wished. He was not justified, however, in preventing counsel putting questions if he so desired.

Mr. Eberts then continued, taking witness through the book of Katie Maud Jackson. She was very nervous, and witness said that free hand was general throughout.

Upon being presented with another book witness was directed not to answer by Mr. Elliott, as counsel was endeavoring to entrap her. Witness acquiesced.

To this Mr. Eberts took objection. He remarked that opposing counsel was acting more like "a wild man" than anything else. (Laughter.)

Witness said that she had never seen any such action in his eighteen years legal experience.

Commissioner Lampman remarked that witness was free to answer or not, as she wished. He was not justified, however, in preventing counsel putting questions if he so desired.

Mr. Eberts then continued, taking witness through the book of Katie Maud Jackson. She was very nervous, and witness said that free hand was general throughout.

Upon being presented with another book witness was directed not to answer by Mr. Elliott, as counsel was endeavoring to entrap her. Witness acquiesced.

To this Mr. Eberts took objection. He remarked that opposing counsel was acting more like "a wild man" than anything else. (Laughter.)

Witness said that she had never seen any such action in his eighteen years legal experience.

Commissioner Lampman remarked that witness was free to answer or not, as she wished. He was not justified, however, in preventing counsel putting questions if he so desired.

Mr. Eberts then continued, taking witness through the book of Katie Maud Jackson. She was very nervous, and witness said that free hand was general throughout.

Upon being presented with another book witness was directed not to answer by Mr. Elliott, as counsel was endeavoring to entrap her. Witness acquiesced.

To this Mr. Eberts took objection. He remarked that opposing counsel was acting more like "a wild man" than anything else. (Laughter.)

Witness said that she had never seen any such action in his eighteen years legal experience.

Commissioner Lampman remarked that witness was free to answer or not, as she wished. He was not justified, however, in preventing counsel putting questions if he so desired.

Mr. Eberts then continued, taking witness through the book of Katie Maud Jackson. She was very nervous, and witness said that free hand was general throughout.

Upon being presented with another book witness was directed not to answer by Mr. Elliott, as counsel was endeavoring to entrap her. Witness acquiesced.

work she would say that no ruler had been used. She did not know how it was done.

In her interview with Supt. Robinson she had told him that the instructions with regard to free hand had been carefully collected out. She had not found that there had been ruling until very shortly before the publication of a letter. She had never seen any pupils use paper for ruling or measuring.

Answering inquiries respecting models, witness explained how they were placed. The children, she said, all got books when Mr. Eaton had stated that there was apparently considerable ruling.

At this juncture there was some debate between counsel regarding the ruling of the lines. Col. Gregory wanted Mr. Elliott to proceed with his investigation on the system in that point afterwards.

Commissioner Lampman thought it would be a waste of time to indulge in theoretical or academic discussions. Anything regarding the circulars or the following out of instructions would be admitted.

D. M. Eberts, counsel for the department, then proceeded with his cross-examination.

In 1902 witness visited Mr. Blair, who had pointed out that ruling had been used in the books. She had acknowledged that the ruling was there, but she explained it had been promptly corrected. She had only taken care of the class then, and was not sure regarding the instructions.

Commissioner Lampman thought it would be a waste of time to indulge in theoretical or academic discussions. Anything regarding the circulars or the following out of instructions would be admitted.

D. M. Eberts, counsel for the department, then proceeded with his cross-examination.

In 1902 witness visited Mr. Blair, who had pointed out that ruling had been used in the books. She had acknowledged that the ruling was there, but she explained it had been promptly corrected. She had only taken care of the class then, and was not sure regarding the instructions.

Commissioner Lampman thought it would be a waste of time to indulge in theoretical or academic discussions. Anything regarding the circulars or the following out of instructions would be admitted.

D. M. Eberts, counsel for the department, then proceeded with his cross-examination.

In 1902 witness visited Mr. Blair, who had pointed out that ruling had been used in the books. She had acknowledged that the ruling was there, but she explained it had been promptly corrected. She had only taken care of the class then, and was not sure regarding the instructions.

Commissioner Lampman thought it would be a waste of time to indulge in theoretical or academic discussions. Anything regarding the circulars or the following out of instructions would be admitted.

D. M. Eberts, counsel for the department, then proceeded with his cross-examination.

In 1902 witness visited Mr. Blair, who had pointed out that ruling had been used in the books. She had acknowledged that the ruling was there, but she explained it had been promptly corrected. She had only taken care of the class then, and was not sure regarding the instructions.