

In Ex. 17 there are traces of a horizontal line which he says he did not put there, but I think he is mistaken about it.

Is it not shameful that a young man should be condemned and punished as a cheat on such evidence as that, in order to punish the teacher?

### OUTRAGEOUS

The examiner stated on oath that he had deprived the pupils of their marks for having violated other rules besides ruling. I, in consequence of that statement, asked Mr. Blair at a teachers' convention at New Westminster when drawing was under discussion, to explain how he could draw 3 pictures (four inches on the longest side) of a chalk box on a page 8 by 10 inches. He replied that he was not there to answer questions about his drawing books. That individual who had deprived the pupils of their marks for having violated his rules, flatly refused to explain how that rule could be carried out.

This is so outrageous (pupils liable to be punished for not carrying out impossible or absurd rules) that it is hard to imagine that the Council knew that they were authorizing such absurd rules or that the pupils would be liable to such a punishment for violating them, when they authorized Blair's Drawing books to be used in the schools. Judge Lampman, however, decided that those rules were binding upon the teachers:

Judge Lampman's investigation proved also that the better a pupil could draw or sketch, the more liable he was to be condemned as a cheat.

### PROOF

Anton Henderson was condemned and punished as a cheat in Drawing. The department's examiner stated on oath that there was ruling in his book although informed that the pupil had made a Statutory declaration that he had