The Full Text Of the Finding

Copy of Ruling Handed Down by His Honor Judge Lampman re Drawing.

Department of Education Upheld on Every Point—Review of Case.

Following is the full text of the finding of His Honor Judge Lampman, the commissioner who presided at the enquiry into the drawing books trouble in the public schools of the province:

Victoria, B. C., 23rd Feb., 1906.

To His Honor the Honorable Sir Henry Gustave Joly de Lotbiniere, K.C.M.G., Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia.

Sir,—On the 29th day of November A. D. 1905, a commission was issued to me under the provisions of the "Public Inquiries Act," directing me to enquire into all matters pertaining to the action of the Board of Examiners, the Department of Education, and Miss Agnes Deans Cameron in connection with the drawing books submitted by the pupils of the South Park school, Victoria, at the High school entrance examination, held in June, 1905, and pursuant to the requirements of the said "Public Inquiries Act," I have the honor to report as follows:

The drawing submitted by the candidates for examination consisted of the drawing books on which work had been done throughout the preceding term, and two samples of drawing done during the examination in the presence of presiding examiners: this latter is called the "time drawing" and about it no question arises.

The exercises in the drawing book which is called "Blair's Canadian Drawing Series, Book 4, Senior Grade," submitted for the examination were as follows:

Freehand—Exercise 1, Bowl; Exercise 4, design within rhombus.

Exercise 13, Bottle.

Model—Exercise 17, 3 chalk boxes; exercise 19, 2 cubes; exercise 21, 2 cylinders; exercise 23, 2 shallow square boxes.

And also some scale drawings and some problems in practical plane geometry.

To understand how the freehand and model drawings were to be done it will be necessary to consider the regulations or instructions which are contained in the drawing book, and in circulars issued from time to time by the Department of Education, and sent to the principals of the different schools throughout the province.

Inside the cover pages of Book 4, instructions for the use of the book are given and amongst them are the following:

"Free hand* * * The pencil may be allowed to test the judgment of the pupil as regards distance and direction, but on no account are distances to be measured in the first instance.

"Model Drawing. All the hints given above in connection with freehand apply to model drawing. In the matter of measuring the apparent lengths of foreshortened lines and surfaces the teacher should explain how the pencil held at arm's length from the eye, may be used for this purpose."

Mr. Blair's Report

On 2nd February, 1904, Mr. David Blair, the examiner in drawing, submitted his report respecting the drawing at the December, 1903, examination for entrance to High Schools to the superintendent of education, by whom it was subsequently distributed in circular form to the different principals.

The following are extracts from Mr. Blair's report:

"Freehand—A few large schools submitted good work in this section. The majority of teachers, however, require to be again reminded, as in my last report, that no part of a freehand exercise of the drawing books submitted drawing should be ruled. Over 73 per cent of the drawing books submitted show ruled construction lines not only around but across the example, with corresponding lines ruled on the pupil's drawing. In Ex. 7, where most of the forms of the object are straight, the pupils had in many cases been allowed to rule all these lines. In a few schools the method of enlarging a drawing had not been taught as it should have been. To enlarge a drawing is obviously a more difficult work than to make it the same size as the example. To do this in the right way, the leading proportion of, say, the width to the height must first be carefully judged, and, in the earlier exercises, the pencil may be used to roughly test the pupil's judgment (see Instructions Book IV.) On this leading proportion the drawing should be completed without further measuring. It is absurd to allow an elaborate series of measurements, even with the pencil, to be carried on throughout the drawing, as this defeats the very object enlarged work is intended to teach, namely, training the eye to judging distance. Certain teachers, however, adopted a still more objectionable method of dealing with this very important part of the work, as I found in these cases that all the 'pupils' drawings of each of the four exercises to be enlarged were exactly alike as regards the sizes. Take one example, say, that of the bottle, Ex. 13, in which its seven different diameters, and their positions on the centre line, give fourteen points to the class, or whether they were found by the pupils themselves. A mixture of measurement and arithmetic, with a little freehand such as is required from children in the second reader, cannot be accepted as the freehand drawing required from candidates for entrance to the High School. The result of this method was obvious in the drawings made in the examination room by candidate from these schools, as the proportions of their freehand time work were generally weak."

Freehand Drawing

"In freehand drawing the division must be judged. No ruling of any kind in freehand drawing is to be permitted. Every line must be sketched."

Mr. Blair's report on the June, 1904, examination, contains the following:

"Freehand Drawing: Here and there owing doubtless to a want of supervision, some of the work had been ruled, and tracing had without doubt been used in one city school.* * * Satisfactory work throughout was sent in from the Girls' Central and South Park, Victoria.* * *"

Stress was laid on this last quoted paragraph by Miss Cameron as showing that the school's work was satisfactory at that time, but at that examination there was not model drawing.

At the December examination, 1904, the exercises in model drawing were first required as a part of the entrance examination in drawing, and Mr. Blair in his report on this examination said:

"The drawng book work in this section of the subject cannot be considered as satisfactory. More than 75 per cent of the drawings were too small. The instructions say that the drawings are to be 'fairly large.' In many cases about 20 per cent of the pupils' drawings were actually less than the small sketches printed at the foot of the page. The words 'fairly large' in the instructions, might with advantage be replaced by 'about twice the size of the small sketches.'

"About half the teachers, as shown by the drawing books they submitted, had allowed the pupils to rule the lines of their model drawings, although the word 'sketch' is used in the instructions on every page; besides, the following occurs in my last report: 'No ruling whatever is to be allowed in model drawing.'"

This report of Mr. Blair was sent out in January, 1905, by the superintendent of education, who annexed it to a circular specifying the minimum work to be done in drawing book 4 for the High School entrance examination in June, 1905, which is the examination at which the books now in question were submitted.

In reference to the freehand and model drawing this circular directs:

"These drawings are to be about 4 inches across the longest size, certainly not less than 3 inches."

I now come to Mr. Blair's report (as sent out in the circular of 21st August, 1905), on the June, 1905, examination, and will quote some extracts from it:

"School Work, Drawing Book IV.—Freehand — Although this work was very good from a few schools, it was, generally, not equal to that sent in for the preceding examination. There was clear evidence of much ruling, especially centre lines; and although the instructions for examination work stated that Ex. 4 was to be enlarged, this was disregarded by quite half the teachers."

Model Drawing

Model Drawing.—With the exception of a few cases, teachers ignored the requirements regarding the size these drawings were to be made. They were to be 'about four inches across the longest size, certainly not less than three inches.' Many were again, as at the last examination, actually less than the small sketches printed at the foot of the page. A more important matter, and one to which the attention of teachers was also called in my last report, is that in most of the large school the parallel views of the cube and shallow square box were again made all alike as regards the relative position of their vertical edges. It is impossible, as I said in my last report, that from 15 to 20 pupils can see a model in this way. The obvious conclusion is that these drawings were not made from the model at all, but either from the small sketches at the foot of the page, or from a drawing on the blackboard. I referred this state of things to the seven members of the examining board, who were present, and they were unanimous regarding this view of the matter, and also as to the value such work in model drawing should receive.

"Another important question in connection with model drawing presented itself, namely, ruled lines. In my last report a paragraph is devoted to this, concluding with these words: 'No ruling whatever is to be allowed in model drawing.' In the books from a number of schools, cases of ruling were, on careful examination, obvious here and there. Pupils had occasionally ruled along a rough edge, or the actual ruled line was covered by a freehand line—cases that had probably escaped the supervision of the teacher. When, however, it was found that in such schools as Strathcona and Mount Pleasant, Vancouver, and South Park and North Ward, Victoria, ruled work was found not only in every book but frequently on every drawing, the matter became serious, especially, as in Strathcona, where a studied attempt throughout had been made to hide it. Under these circumstances I considered it necessary to bring this state of things also before the Board of Examiners, with the result that it was decided no marks should be awarded on the drawing book work from these schools."

The Examination

While the drawing books (29 in number) submitted by the candidates from the South Park school were being examined by Mr. Blair, he called the members of the examining board together and explained to them his conclusions as set out in his last mentioned report, and showed them the books. There were present Mr. George Robinson, a mathematicial master in the Vancouver High School, who acted as chairman; Mr. William Burns, principal of the Normal School, Vancouver; Mr. J. K. Henry, second assistant master, Vancouver High School; Mr. J. D. Buchanan, first assistant master, Normal School, Vancouver; Mr. E. H. Russell and Mr. S. J. Willis, masters in the Victoria High School, and Mr. Henry Dunnell, superintendent of the Manual Training Schools of the province. Mr. Allan C. Stewart, one of the inspectors for the province, and an examiner, was away at the time, but on his arrival in Victoria a few days later he was told of the action of the board, and after an inspection of the books, he expressed his satisfaction with the decision.

At this meeting it was unanimously decided that no marks should be awarded on this drawing book work and a recommendation to that effect was made; this step was taken so that effect might be brought definitely to the attention of the teachers with a view to impressing on them the necessity of more carefully supervising the work and seeing that it was done according to the regulations. Some of the members of the examining board possessed a knowledge of drawing and some of them did not, but they were all, after an inspection of the books, of the opinion that Mr. Blair was correct in thinking that a great deal of ruling had been done contrary to the regulations. Mr. Dunnell also agreed with Mr. Blair's criticisms of the model drawings, for criticisms see Mr. Blair's report of 21st August set out above), but the presence of unfair ruling was the feature that principally impressed all the examiners.

Mr. Alexander Robinson, the Superintendent of Education, was not present at the meeting, but on the recommendation being submitted to him he concluded to act on it, but on examining the marks of the candidates he found that only three candidates had, without counting their drawing book marks, obtained in drawing the minimum percentage, 33 1-3, although in the aggregate some of them had the necessary 550 marks. He then decided to allow 34 marks in drawing to any candidate whose aggregate marks would then be 500. By doing this, seven additional candidates had an aggregate of 550 or over, and were allowed to pass.

Rules of Department

One hundred marks constituted the maximum in drawing, and of these 66 2-3 were allotted to the time drawing, and 33 1-3 to the books. Candidates to pass had to obtain 50 per cent of the aggregate and 33 1-3 was the minimum in any one subject.

At the examination there were in all eleven subjects and the total number of marks was 1100. It will thus be seen that a candidate to pass must have at least 550 marks on the whole, and 33 1-3 in drawing.

By decision of the department none of the candidates were allowed any marks at all for the book work. They were given marks in drawing only on the time drawing, i.e., the marks actually obtained out of the possible 66 2-3, and then if a candidate has as many as 516 marks in the other subjects it was allowed 34 in drawing, and the total was then 550, the number required to pass. Three of the candidates who passed had 34 mark or more, and in their cases the raised mark was not necessary.

In order that this raised mark may be better understood I will give an illustration: Maude McB. Smith received for the 10 subjects exclusive of drawing, 517 marks; for her time drawing she received 23 marks, and for her book work she actually made 10 marks, but as these were not allowed, her total was only 540; her drawing marks were increased to 34, and her total thus raised to 551. Jessie C. Roberts for ten subjects, 523; for time drawing, 26; for book work not allowed, 10; total 549; drawing marks increased to 34, and total raised to 557.

In my opinion this action of the examiners or the department did not work a hardship on any of the candidates as the figures show that none of those who failed would have got as many as 550 marks even if the marks actually obtained for the book work were added to their total. But as Miss Cameron claims that with Ida McNiven and Sydney Wilson the examiners' action did work a hardship and that they should have passed, I will deal with their cases when considering their books.

After the result of the examination was announced and Miss Cameron had received the list giving the marks of her pupils who had taken the examination, she, on the 21st July, wrote to the Superintendent of Education calling his attention to the low marks in drawing, and stating "as during the term just closed very special attention has been given to this subject, I would ask you to kindly give me some idea of the point in which we have failed."

The Correspondence

Mr. Robinson replied the same day, saying that marks had been allowed only on the time drawing as the books showed evidence of ruling.

Miss Cameron then (on 24th July), wrote a letter to Mr. Robinson and enclosed with it a letter to her from Miss Fraser. Miss Cameron in her letter stated in part:

"In addition I would state that instruction in drawing for the school term just ended has been given under my personal direction and supervision, and of my own knowledge I testify that the work has been honestly and fairly done.

"This information I intended to convey by my endorsation of the individual books submitted.

Kindly let me know what steps your department intends to take in the matter."

Miss Fraser said in her letter:

"I read very carefully all the circular directions issued by Mr. Blair. I attended a number of Mr. Blair's lectures on the subject of drawing and have had at least four interviews with him in which I endeavored to find out exactly what course he wished pursued in taking up the various divisions of the subject.

"I have carried out the information thus obtained to the best of my ability during the past four years.

"I gave strict supervision to these books and it is my conviction that the work of the class was done honestly and in accordance with the printed directions.

"In regard to the patterns (freehand and model drawing) given in for the examination of June, 1905, I followed punctiliously Mr. Blair's directions that no ruling or construction lines or any other lines should be done."

Mr. Robinson replied that the department's decision would not be changed as the matter of the drawing books had first been dealt with by Mr. Blair, and afterwards by the whole board.

Miss Cameron then interviewed the Hon. Mr. Fulton, the Minister of Education, and protested against the action of the department. He asked her if it was not possible that ruling might have been done without her knowledge, but she said it was not, as the work was done under her supervision.

Books Examined

Mr. Fulton then made an examination of the books and concluded that there was ruling in the great majority of the books, if not in all of them, and he informed Miss Cameron by letter on 11th August. In his examination of the books Mr. Fulton was assisted by Mr. E. B. Mackay, Surveyor General, and Mr. C. H. Cookson, a bridge draftsman in the Department of Lands and Works.

Miss Cameron then applied to be allowed to inspect the books, and pursuant to an appointment with Mr. Robinson, she attended at his office on August 18th, but unfortunately both Miss Cameron and Mr. Robinson, between whom there has apparently been considerable friction for some time, overlooked the announced object of the interview, viz: an inspection of the books. During the preliminary discussion Miss Cameron protested against the marks allowed on the time drawing of the pupils of her school, and said it would compare favorably with that of the Girls' Central school. She then said she had heard that some pupils at some former examination had had supplemental oral examination, and asked him if it was true. Just what he said in reply, or what further remarks she made are not material, but she says she questioned the truth of his answer and said further that if he honestly thought that Miss Fraser and she knowingly put in dishonest work he should have cancelled their certificates, and that had he done so she would have had more respect for him than she then had.

The preliminary discussion was certainly not conducive to a peaceable inspection, and it is not a matter of surprise that the inspection ended with the 4th or 5th book.

Miss Cameron would not acknowledge that any lines in the books shown were ruled, so Mr. Robinson said it was a waste of time to go on, and refused to show any more books.

I now come to the main question, i.e., was there ruling contrary to the regulations and if so, was it so general throughout as to justify the action of the department?

Before considering the different books, it is necessary to determine whether the regulations permit a so-called "datum" line to be ruled in Exercices 17, 19 and 23, and whether the instruction "The pencil may be allowed to test the judgment of the pupil as regards distance and direction, but on no account are distances to be measured in the first instance," permits the measuring with the pencil of say the size of two cylinders to be drawn on the same page.

Wide Difference

On this point there is a wide difference between what Mr. Blair says is permissible and that which the pupils were allowed to do.

The teachers construed the rule in this way: In the drawing of a cylinder they would draw first the axis and then the top and bottom diameters or vice versa; then an outside line joining the diameters, and then on the opposite side of the axis another outside line; then they would measure with the pencil to see if these outside lines were parallel with the axis and equally distant from it; if not a new line would be drawn and then measured, and so on until the line was in the desired place.

In all the different exercises this same measuring of distances was allowed, and Mr. Blair in looking at the completed figures concluded that the uniformity in size had been obtained by some mechanical means.

It seems clear that in freehand drawing measuring is not allowed.

Mr. J. V. Vaughan, superintendent of drawing and manual instructor, Glasgow School Board, late art master School Board for London, says in his Teachers' Handbook (Drawing), p. 25:

"Correctness in proportion is more difficult to attain than skill in execution. Both scholars and teachers feel this; and in order to produce a drawing somewhat like the copy, various expedients—such as ruling, and measuring the construction lines, or squaring the paper—are resorted to. This should never be done. The very commonness of the errors shows how widespread the weakness is."

"First recognize that proportion is difficult, and take steps to master it instead of eluding it. One often sees the construction lines of a freehand copy ruled and measured in order to secure correct proportion. There is little wonder, when such a method is adopted in the earlier stages, that the scholars fail to grasp the proportion of a simple vase in a model drawing at a later stage. One excellent feature of free-arm drawing is that such a course is scarcely possible. Proportion depends upon a proper appreciation of space; therefore teach the children always to look at the space first, and correct proportion will then certainly come in due time."

Regulations for Pupils

The teachers apparently construed "on no account are distances to be measured in the first instance," as allowing unlimited measuring, provided only the position of the first line or point was not measured; the pupil was not allowed to find out by measuring where the line should go, but he was allowed to find out by measuring if the line was in the correct place after he had drawn it, and if it was not he drew another, and kept on till he got it correct. Such a method does not seem reasonable; in fact, it seems absurd, as by it only practice in using the rubber is obtained, and if measuring at all is to be allowed, why not use a square for it?

This regulation, which has given rise to so much contention and discussion, is very difficult to construe, and might well be amended or eliminated, but I think the construction given it by the teachers is a very strained one. In this regard Mr. Blair in his circular of 2nd February, 1904, says in his suggestions as to freehand work, "In freehand drawing the division must be judged." And see also his remarks in his circular of February, 1904, quoted near the beginning of this report.

In model drawing, although the instructions say that "All the hints given above in connection with free-hand apply to model drawing," I think it is clear the system of measuring with the pencil, which was allowed, was not warranted by the instructions. These instructions should all be read together and from them it is clear the measuring mentioned refers to measuring with the pencil held at arm's length from the eye.

I cannot see any justification whatever for the ruling of the so-called datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23. These lines are ruled across the page and form the base line for each of the boxes or cubes drawn on the page. The teachers gave the pupils permission to rule these lines, and in justification refer to an examination paper in freehand drawing of midwinter, 1903. In that examination the candidates were required to draw a bottle and a pitcher, and on the paper on which the drawings were to be done the top and bottom lines were given and the directions stated that these were to be the highest and lowest lines of the drawing.

But in the circular of September, 1904, it is clearly stated that "no ruling whatever is to be allowed in model drawing." Besides in Mr. Blair's criticism, in the circular of January, 1905, of the December, 1904, examination, he draws attention to the presence of ruling in the model drawings and refers to the circular of Sentember, 1904.

Main Objections

One of the main objections to the model drawing was that lines vanishing to the right and left ere made to vanish on the same horizontal line; in many cases the vanishing points were at the top of the page and in some cases they were on a line (sketched sometimes ruled) across the page near the top.

Now, this is not model drawing at all, and if this system is allowed, the pupil might just as well commence at the vanishing points and draw to the datum line.

The circular of January, 1905, required the model drawings to be not less than three inches across their longest size, but in nearly every case the drawings were less; had they been of this size it would have been almost impossible, certainly much more difficult, to have had the vanishing points on the book.

I will now deal with the 29 books put in at the examination in question. The main issue was whether or not there was ruling.

Mr. Blair, Mr. Dunnell, Mr. E. B. Mackay and other witnesses called on behalf of the department gave it as their opinion that very many lines had been ruled. Miss Cameron testified that with the exception of one or two books the work was all freehand. Miss Fraser said that she believed that it was nearly all freehand, and that it was highly improbable that ruling had been done in more than two or three cases. Both these witnesses based their evidence on their knowledge of the pupil and the class of its drawing work generally, and also on statements made to them by the pupils. Nearly all the pupils appeared themselves before me and made statements as to how they did the work.

The examiners at the time they made their decision had before them only the books and the time drawings done in the presence of the examiners, and on comparing the character of the lines it was found that the lines in the time drawings did not compare at all favorably with those in the books.

It was very properly pointed out to me by Miss Cameron that the pupils did these time drawings in a limited time and besides they did not have the assistance of the teacher as they had in doing their book work. Some of the pupils also told me they hurried through so as to get out early. But making all due allowances it seems to me that in many instances pupils who could draw such good lines as were in the books would hardly draw such poor ones as appeared in many of the time drawings.

Samples of Drawings

However, I have not to decide on these alone, as some samples of drawing done by the pupils on 6th December, 1905, before Mr. J. G. Brown and Rev. Archibald Ewing, were submitted in evidence, and on 27th January I had certain of the pupils do some drawing for me at the High School. Miss Fraser was present and I allowed her to assist and go amongst the pupils and make suggestions.

And since the conclusion of the public sittings I have obtained from the Department of Education the drawing books submitted at the last December entrance examination by those of the pupils who submitted books in June last, but who failed in the examination, and tried the same examination in December. The drawing in these was done under the supervision of Miss Spears, and as it represents the result of about four months additional instruction, should afford a basis of comparison in every way fair to the pupils concerner—if in June, 1905, a pupil could draw freehand nice, straight lines, one would naturally expect the same pupil to be able to draw as good lines in December, i.e., if the pupil kept in practice, and of course all these pupils did keep in practice.

Therefore, in most cases I have three or four samples of the drawing in which it is known none of the lines were ruled, and all of these I have carefully compared with the drawings in the 29 books, the subject of the investigation, and in many cases I have been forced to the conclusion that there was ruling which was not admitted by the pupil.

As a preliminary remark I think I should say that nothing derogatory to the fairness of the work is to be inferred from the fact that lines have been erased. Erasing at pleasure was allowed, and in the tests before me I was struck by the amount of erasing—in fact, it seemed to me that the rubber was used more than the pencil.

I will now deal with each pupil's book separately:

Georgina Bebbington—Four samples. At the time of making her affidavit this pupil was not quite certain whether or not she had ruled the datum lines in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, so she admitted in the affidavit that she did rule them, but on looking at her book she says she did not rule any datum line. A close inspection shows that one was ruled and partly erased in Exercise 23. There was also a horizontal line ruled in this exercise and on it the lines of one figure converge. She says she commenced this line freehand and then erased it. In Exercise 19 Mr. Blair says the vanishing lines extended on to the tissue paper at the left were ruled, and from their appearance and the explanation the pupil gives I am inclined to think Mr. Blair is right. The lines have plainly been partly erased, and the marks of the carried onto the tissue paper and then rubbed on to new show. She says she carried the lines only as far as the tissue paper and did not use the rubber on it. Having regard to this pupil's uncertainty in regard to the datum lines, I think it doubtful if her memory is so good in regard to the others as she seems to think it is.

Samples of Work

Mabel Booz—Four samples of her work. She did not take entrance examination last December. Datum line admittedly ruled in Exercises 17, 19 and 23. This little girl can sketch a very straight line, and I am not satisfied that Mr. Blair was correct in his conclusion that there was ruling in Exercises 13, 17, 19 and 23 (other than that admitted).

Certainly her time drawing does not compare favorably with her book work, but she explains this by saying that she was hotbered to find out just what was required in it.

In Exercises 21 the bottom diameter of one cylinder is clearly ruled, and I rather think the top one was ruled also. She was an affidavit in which she stated that there was no ruling in Exercise 21, but on looking at it now she says she is not sure whether or not she ruled the bottom line but she said she was sure she did not rule the top one. How she could be so sure about one and uncertain about the other puzzles me. I think she is mistaken; she certainly impressed me that she was telling the facts exactly as she believed them to be.

Walter Harold Boyd—Five samples. This pupil was out of the city on 27th January and did not attend for the test before me, but some drawing done by him on 12th December last before Mr. J. G. Brown was put in.

Admits ruling only datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, and a horizontal line near the top of page in Exercise 17, and which was used for vanishing points. In exercise 17, most of the vanishing lines are ruled and those of the second figure are extended (ruled) on to the tissue paper on the left where they show very plainly. In exercise 23 there is a horizontal line, but the pupil says he does not remember this at all. As he admits ruling one in Exercise 17, it is probable that this one was ruled; it certainly looks as though it had been ruled. Boyd's attempt in the tests to duplicate freehand his lines in Exercise 17 was a failure, and the plain reason was that the lines in the book submitted at the examination were ruled.

Thomas C. Briggs—Admits ruling datum line in Exercises 17 and 23; top and bottom lines in Exercise 1; in Exercise 17 there is a horizontal line on which converging lines of the three boxes vanish; this was very evidently ruled, but he did not remember it. Exercise 19, admits ruling one converging line; Exercise 21, admits ruling the top and bottom diameter of both cylinders.

Statements of Pupils

A. E. Carter — After hearing the statements of several that they had not ruled such and such lines, I began to think that some of them had forgotten just what they had done—it must be remembered that some of the drawings in question were done as long ago as last February, and these children did not have their minds called to it until August and September—and this boy convinced me that he had forgotten. He came into my room on 26th January, and after showing him all his drawings, I asked him to go to the window where he could get a good light, and take a look at Exercise 4, the design with the rhombus. He said quite cheerfully that he need not look at it as he was sure he did no ruling on it. However, he went to the window and on seeing the construction lines which had not been erased, and which quite evidently had been ruled, he seemed surprised, and in reply to my question as to what he thought, after looking at them, he said: "It looks pretty blue for me." He then said he must have ruled them. He has taken lessons from Mr. Binns at the Manual Training School, and showed me how he could draw a line by letting the fingers (holding the pencil) run along the edge of the book; some lines in both the freehand and model exercises he drew in this way. The cubes and the chalk he worked on with pieces of paper. He woud lay down a piece of paper, and along the smooth edge he would run the pencil or else make a line of dots, and then draw the pencil through the dots and then he had his line. I do not know of any technical name for this method of drawing a line, but I should say it comes pretty near to being ruling, and was against the regulations.

E. C. Casey—Admits ruling datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23 and the lower diameter of each cylinder in Exercise 21. Near the top of the page in Exercise 17 there are traces of a line evidently ruled but pupil says he remembers nothing about it.

This pupil made an affidavit saying the only ruling he did was the datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, but on looking at his book he says he ruled the diameters already mentioned in Exercise 21.

Margaret Jean Clay—In Exercises 17, 19 and 23 admits ruling datum line; Exercise 4 cannot say whether she ruled some construction lines; Exercise 21, cannot say whether she ruled lower diameter in each cylinder, but thinks they had permission to rule them; Exercise 23, may have ruled top line on which converging lines were to vanish.

I have no doubt several of the construction lines in Exercise 4 and the two diameters in Exercise 21 were ruled. This pupil used a piece of paper for measuring.

Nellie Coles—This pupil is now in Vancouver, and the only statement of hers that I have is contained in a letter to me, and in it she says she did no ruling whatever. She passed the entrance examination in December last from the Dawson School in Vancouver, and on the receipt of her letter advising me of that fact, I obtained her drawing book from the education department, and I now have three samples of her drawing before me.

As a rule the lines in her book of June are much finer than those in the December book, and a comparison therefore is difficult, but some of the lines in the former book are so clear and straight that I have come to the conclusion that they were ruled. I have no doubt whatever that the top line of the bowl in Exercise 1 was ruled. Miss Fraser says she would say it was ruled, and Miss Cameron would not swear that it was not. In Exercise 17 I think one of the lines in one of the boxes was ruled, and in Exercise 19 I think the datum line was ruled in part, at least, and two other lines in one of the cubes in this exercise have every appearance of having been ruled.

There is no indication of ruling in the December book.

Fred. C. Dougall—Admits ruling datum line in Exercises 17 and 23, and the lower diameter of each cylinder in Exercise 21. This pupil made an affidavit stating that he had only ruled the datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, but on looking at his book he says he sketched the datum line in Exercise 19, and ruled the two diameters of the cylinders in Exercise 21.

In Exercise 17 there are evidences of a line having been drawn across the upper part of the page, but he does not remember anything about this.

L. H. Ellis—Admits ruling datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, and a horizontal line at top of the page in Exercise 17.

Harold B. Godfrey—Admits ruling datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23. In Exercise 21 there is a ruled line across the page, used as the lower diameter of each cylinder. This pupil made an affidavit stating in effect that this line was not ruled, and when on making his statement before me he saw that it was ruled, he said that he did not do it—that he did the line freehand across the page, and then erased the parts not used for the diameter. What he apparently really did do was the exaact opposite, viz: partly erase the diameters and leave the rest.

Some Particular Cases

In Exercises 17, 19 and 23, he did not erase the parts of the bottom line between the boxes, and I do not see any reason that he should have erased these parts in Exercise 21, unless it was so that the ruling would not show as he did not have the teacher's permission to rule this, but he did have permission to rule the datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23. I have no doubt he does not remember just what he did, and that he made an effort to substantiate the unfortunate statement in his affidavit. Casey and Dougall found themselves in the same predicament, but they chose a better way out.

Mavis V. Hanna—Five samples. Admits ruling only the datum line in Exercise 17, 19 and 23.

A comparison of the different drawings convinces me that there is considerable ruling in Exercises 19 and 21. This pupil sketches a very nice line, but what strikes me is that in the drawings in which it is known there was no ruling there is nothing in the character of the lines to indicate that there was any ruling, while in the drawings questioned there are many indications of ruling. This same remark applies generally to nearly all the books.

Anton Henderson—No ruling.

Katie M. Jackson—I had five samples of her work, and although she stoutly maintained she did not rule, I am of the opinion that she did more ruling than she admits. In Exercises 1, 4 and 13 there are evidences of ruling; in Exercises 17 and 23 she ruled a top line and afterwards erased it, and says she thought they were allowed to rule it. In Exercise 17 I have no doubt that at least four lines in the chalk box farthest to the right were ruled. In Exercise 21 I have no doubt that every line in each cylinder was ruled. Even Miss Cameron would not say there was no ruling in this exercise, or in Exercise 13, and Miss Fraser said that some of the lines in Exercise 21 looked as though they were ruled. In Exercises 17, 19 and 23 the datum line was admittedly ruled.

Reginald Macfarlane—Four samples. Admits ruling only the datum line in Exercise 17, 19 and 23, and made an affidavit to that effect.

As to Exercise 21 this pupil got deeper into the difficulty than did Godfrey. On looking at the exercises he said he ruled the bottom line and sketched the top one. I asked him about this twice myself, as it seemed to me that both lines were ruled, and then when he was reminded of his statement in his affidavit that neither was ruled, he said he had made a mistake in saying the bottom line was ruled, as it was not. He would have made no mistake if he had said both were ruled, although I have no doubt that when he made his affidavit he did not know whether he had ruled them or not. As a matter of fact I think he was mistaken in admitting he ruled the datum line in exercise 17; it is quite evidently a freehand line. In exercise 23 there was a ruled top line partly erased.

Jessie Mackay—Five samples. Datum lines in exercises 17, 19 and 23, are the only ones admittedly ruled. That nearly all of the vanishing lines of the figures in exercises 17, 19 and 23 were ruled was the opinion of Mr. Blair, Mr. Dunnell and the other experts who examined them. This opinion is based on the appearance of the lines and a comparison with the time drawing. After comparing all the different samples, I am forced to the conclusion that this pupil ruled nearly every one of the vanishing lines in the said three exercises, and also the outside line of the right cylinder in Exercise 21.

Those Ruled Lines

I cannot believe that she lost so much skill in six months.

Miss Fraser thought that many of these lines looked liked ruled lines, and she said that while this pupil was doing Exercise 13, she found the centre line faintly ruled, and she (Miss Fraser) stood and watched the pupil completely erase it and put it in freehand.

Ida B. McNven—Four samples. Admits datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23.

In exercise 23 there has been a horizontal line but it was so lightly drawn and so completely erased that it is impossible to say whether or not it was ruled, and the pupil says she remembers nothing about it. This line was not used in any way.

This pupil is one of the two that Miss Cameron claimed would have passed had she been treated fairly in the matter of her drawing marks. According to the marking she received for her book she earned 12 out of a possible 66 2-3, and for her percentage in drawing 30. On the whole examination she earned only 520 marks, so she needed 30 marks more to enable her to pass. Had she received 60 per cent instead of 30 percent in drawing she would have passed. She told me drawing was not one of the subjects in which she was good—her best subjects she said were literature, grammar and composition. In literature she got 59 per cent in grammar and composition 55 per cent. In only one subject did she get as high as 60 per cent, and that was in reading, in which she got 65 per cent., but I notice in reading the whole class got very high marks—the average in reading being higher than in any other subject—many of the class got as high as 80 per cent, and only four out of the 29 were under 50 per cent, and they got 45 per cent. On consideration of these figures I do not think the action of the department worked any injustice in respect to this pupil.

R. W. Meyer—Admits ruling the datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, and a bottom line in Exercise 21; Exercise 1 he is not quite sure whether he ruled the top line or not; Exercise 13, admits ruling a line across the bottle; Exercise 17, admits ruling one line of the box and the extension of the line was worked on by a ruler, and part of it actually ruled; there are two lines next to this one that look as if they had been worked on with a ruler, but the pupil says they were not, though considering the number of lines ruled, I doubt if his memory is accurate as to which ones he did rule. Exercise 19, admits ruling 2 converging lines.

Harold Mitchell—Admits ruling datum lines in Exercises 17, 19 and 23, and the bottom line in Exercise 21.

Exercise 1, thinks he ruled top and bottom lines. Exercise 4, does not remember whether he ruled construction lines or not, but from their appearance he has no doubt he did rule them.

Exercise 13, does not remember whether he ruled any or not, but from the appearance of the centre construction line I think it was ruled; Exercise 21, the top line of the cylinder is run over a dark line on the opposite side of the page. In the cubes and boxes he says he did not rule any vanishing lines but did work on them with a ruler.

Clarence Muirhead—This pupil left the city before I had an opportunity of getting his statement. Mr. Blair said the centre line in Exercise 1 was ruled, and also that there was ruling in Exercise 19.

Muirhead came into the school late in the term and was allowed to do some of the drawings at home. A written statement signed by him was put in evidence; it was dated 22nd September, 1905, and in it he said:

"On these seven pages I used a ruler and compass wherever I could use them. Every straight line was ruled; and wherever a compass would work I used it; so far as I can remember not one line was done freehand if a ruled line could be used instead.

"I did not mean to cheat."

An Extraordinary Book

This was an extraordinary book as in it lines watch according to his statement were ruled did not indicate ruling. On his first examination of this book Mr. Blair did not detect any ruling, and out of this considerable was made by Miss Cameron as showing that the experts are not infallible. It is comparatively easy to take away from a ruled line the evidences of ruling, but it does not follow that is is easy to make an unruled line look like a ruled one without using a ruler. I do not think Mr. Blair's failure to detect ruling in this book detracts at all from the weight that should be attached to his evidence in respect to the other books.

Before accepting Muirhead's statement that he used a ruler wherever possible, I would like to question him when his book was before him. As he admits he did considerable ruling, I expect he did, but there are several lines in the different exercises that were not ruled.

Dorcas Pearson — Datum line in Exercises 17, 19 and 23 admittedly ruled, and also a top horizontal line in Exercise 17, but not used.

Mary Kathleen Roberts—Five samples. This pupil says she did no ruling whatever, but I cannot agree with her. At first sight the datum lines in Exercises 17 and 23 appear to have been ruled and now after putting the straight edge along them and comparing them with the long lines made in the tests, and with the datum lines in the book submitted at the last entrance examination, I have no doubt this pupil did not do them freehand. In Exercise 17 there is a high line extending on to the tissue paper, and this she denies having put there. In Exercise 19, vanishing lines appear on the tissue paper, and one of them looks very much as if it had been ruled; the pupil says she did not put them there. In Exercise 21, the lower diameter of one cylinder is is ruled, and in Exercise 23, the vanishing lines of one of the figures converge at the top of the page (extended) although the pupil says she did not intend them to do so—she must be mistaken in this. On the whole I was unable to receive any assistance from this pupil's statement.

Jessie C. Roberts—Four samples. Admits ruling datum line in Exercises

(Continued on Page Three.)

Estimates Are Knotty Pro

Mayor and Aldermen Fin Difficulty In Adjust Finances.

His Worship's Figures Tally When Settled Ex tures Are Stated

The city council was again gared last evening in discus estimates for the current yea a lengthy debate it was decl further into the matter at the ing. Although it was expect considerable reduction would in the expenditure over that of there is so far only a reduction $6,000.

In the list of routine busines discussed was a communicatio B. McMicking acknowledging a communication from the ci for a reduction of telephone was not aware what was bein in the other cities, but stated $3 for private and city use business houses in this city, as low as could be made.

Ald. Stewart thought the cation was not satisfactory that Mr. McMicking be so and he asked that the city be same rate as Vancouver, wh per month.

The motion of Ald. Stewart tried.

A communication was rece the secretary of the school trus mitting information as request G. L. Milne. The communic received and filed and the in sent to Dr. Milne.

Cabins on Herald Stre

Walter A. Chambers, for J. requested an extension of tim ing the removal of cabins o street on acount of the absen owner from the city. The re granted.

An offer to supply rock fro ner of Douglas and Superior st referred to the city engineer

Charles E. Clarke, of Wor requested an extension of th main in order to connect with residence.

Referred to the water com

Mrs. E. P. Luscombe, of street, requested that some taken to regulate the Chinese w on that street. She complained place was unsanitary, and that the Chinese be kept in on the city.

Referred to the sanitary and building inspector for rep

Ald. Hall desired to know if tary inspector was employed by ernment as well as the city. been informed that the officer giving instructions regarding matters outside of the city li said that there was a complai made.

Permanent Sidewalks

Mrs. A. Roper objected to manent sidewalk on Maclure The communication was recei filed and the writer notified will have the opportunity to obj the by-law is passed.

The city engineer reported had examined the following pl walks where it was intended to crete sidewalks, which were in dition:

Fort street from Stanley a Elford street, Belcher street fr to St. Charles street; Belche from Oak Bay avenue to Mr. residence, Elford street (both si Fort to Pandora streets, Qua Pandora to Mason, and Cale Pembroke, Rock Bay avenue street to Gorge road, Stanle from Fort to Pandora, Fisgu Quadra to Cook. The report on the table, to be considered by-law.

Communications Receiv

City Clerk Dowler reported ceived communications from Bale, J. O. Townsend and W. son, which had been referre streets, sewers and bridges com

The city engineer and city recommended that J. A. Sa Co. be given permission to co premises with Rock Bay bri vided that the bridge