

THE DURHAM CHRONICLE

Published every Thursday morning at the office, Garafraxa Street, Durham, Ontario, by Frank Irwin, Editor and Proprietor. The Chronicle is mailed to any address in Canada at the rate of \$2.00 per year, \$1.00 for six months, 50 cents for three months. To any address in the United States of America, \$2.50 per year, \$1.25 for six months, 65 cents for three months. Foreign subscription rates on application. Member Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association

Whoever is afraid of submitting any question, civil or religious, to the test of free discussion, is more in love with his own opinion than with truth.—WATSON.

Thursday, December 30, 1926

FUNNY FINANCING

In another column in this week's issue of The Chronicle we publish quite a lengthy letter from Mr. W. Calder giving several alleged reasons why the ratepayers of Durham should not vote YES on the High School Addition question to be placed before them on Monday. Frankly, we do not think any of Mr. Calder's "reasons" will be taken very seriously most assuredly they will not if the reader peruses his letter carefully and enlightens himself on the real facts of the case.

On Nomination night in the Town Hall. Mr. Calder attempted to draw a herring across the trail by stating that the High School Board were not sure what they wanted, that they were wrong in 1915 and that it was altogether likely that they were wrong on the present occasion. They asked for \$15,000 in 1915 and came back to the Council asking for \$5,000 more, but it was refused. Mr. Calder was not fair enough to tell his hearers that it was in 1913 that the High School question for Durham was first spoken of. It was in 1914 that the matter finally came before the Council, and the bylaw carried in January, 1915. The High school was built that year. It was not explained to his hearers that between the time of the estimates and the time tenders were called for, the Great War had broken out. Labor became scarce, prices on all building materials went sky-rocketing and it is no mystery or wonder to the most of us that the School Board could not, in 1915, keep within the estimates on a plan made in 1913.

At that time Mr. Calder was Reeve, and the main man in the attack to prevent the School Board getting the extra \$5,000. He was the man in the Council who was responsible for that body refusing to submit a bylaw for the amount, and when a meeting of the ratepayers was called, he took the platform and ridiculed the Board.

Even then the Board cautioned the people that they were not doing the right thing, and it is with no "I told you so" attitude that The Chronicle said editorially that we should build for the future and predicted that the building as authorized would be overcrowded in not more than ten years. The High School Board was right in 1915, not wrong, as Mr. Calder contends. He was wrong in 1915, and he is again wrong in 1926.

Mr. Calder argues that we are voting on a by-law which, if carried, will cost us \$44,000, interest and all included, in 20 years. This is hardly fair. It is true that this will be the total cost of the debentures in that time. He has either wilfully neglected or forgotten to take into consideration that during all this time the town will be receiving quite a considerable grant from both County and Province. Just what these grants will amount to exactly can not be reckoned as it will depend upon just how many country pupils will attend the school. If the school is there, however, there need be little fear that it will not be taken full advantage of. Country residents in the vicinity will not be foolish enough to send their children greater distances to other towns when they can get the same advantages nearer home. The same argument can be used if the bylaw does not carry. Country people will not be foolish enough to send their children to a half-equipped school in Durham when they can go a few miles farther and secure a Grade 1 institution. Instead of the High School addition costing \$44,000 in 20 years a nearer figure would be approximately \$15,000 over the whole period, and not this much if the school is kept up to the proper standard and country pupils made known its advantages.

Mr. Calder speaks of renting or buying the Armory for school purposes. There is no evidence that either one of these propositions could be put through. Supposing the town did buy it. What would it cost? We think it would be dirt cheap at \$10,000. Then the Education Department would step in and insist on an improvement in the lighting arrangements. The present windows would not do at all. The lavatory requirements are also very strict. Where could they be placed? Then there is the seating to be looked after, blackboards to buy, an additional caretaker to look after the building. Frankly, we think this proposition would cost the town close to \$20,000, probably much more, and then, what would we have. The best imagination in the world cannot picture this arrangement a success.

Mr. Calder estimates that the proposed additional four rooms would entail an extra expense of \$4,500 annually. He grants that the Board might get an additional grant of \$500. Taken from the \$4,500, this leaves a net \$4,000 increase in maintenance. This he adds to his other estimate of \$9,000 annually for the present school and says that in 20 years the school would cost us over \$120,000.00! Is he serious, or joking? He does not explain why he makes an estimate of \$9,000 a year for upkeep on the present school, and fails to acknowledge that of this \$9,000 the County and Province pay over 60 per cent. of the cost. If he is willing to allow an extra grant on the \$4,500, surely he knew that there was a grant from both County and Province on the \$9,000 required to finance the present four-room school.

Mr. Calder's well-known "economy" cry is also placed in the limelight. He appeals to the ratepayers to save their money and pay off their debts, or else go in for the erection of a new Town Hall, a waterworks system, or paved streets. Is he sincere in his cry for economy? Personally, we don't know, and would like to be enlightened. Everyone knows Mr. Calder's stand on the waterworks question. In his opinion, two years ago it was unnecessary. Last Monday night he referred to it in the same manner. Now, he ushers it in as one of the town's necessities!

Two years ago he worked tooth and nail against the waterworks bylaw. It was snowed under, because the ratepayers believed the cry that the town was not in a position to stand such an expenditure, and besides, we must practice economy. It was not long after that that the matter of a Town Hall was before the Council and Mr. Calder favored, even sponsored the erection of a \$26,000 Town Hall. Then the pavement question came up. Mr. Calder sponsored that, too.

There is no need in saying otherwise than that

Durham is in need of both a Town Hall and a paved street. And a waterworks, too. But which of the three is the most necessary. Which would the average ratepayer sooner have—a waterworks system and fire protection, with modern conveniences in every home—something that would be useful to the individual ratepayer every day of his life,—or a paved street or town hall? Evidently it was the intention to keep up to our well-known records in the matter of economy—put in the paved street and then tear it up again to put in the waterworks.

Personally, we don't like to get nasty, but we think we are perfectly within our rights in saying that the 1915 Town Council and those at the public meeting who voted with them, are the cause of conditions as they appear today. There is no use in mincing matters. Had the Council given the question the consideration it deserved, had Mr. Calder as Reeve of the town used his foresight and supported the request of the School Board for that extra \$5,000, our High School today would have been graded as in first position and there would have been no necessity for the Board coming before the people for years to come, if ever.

The School Board is placing the matter before the people in as fair a manner as they possibly can. The necessity for an addition to our High School is quite apparent. The Board is in constant touch with the Education Department. They know what is going to happen and have the facts and figures to prove it. The whole question has now resolved itself into an argument of Government facts vs. Mr. Calder's opinions. Many citizens of the town opposed the question at first. An examination of the facts as in the possession of the High School Board have convinced them favorably and they will vote "Yes" on the question. Not so with Mr. Calder. He took a stand against the building of the addition at the start and he has never changed his mind. He has never asked to see the figures or information in possession of the High School Board. How, then, can he be expected to be fully enough informed to give advice to the electors on how they should vote, or how or what they may expect if the bylaw carries? We do not wish to appear to say that a man should have an opinion on the matter. But we do say that the opinion of a man who doesn't know the details is not worth very much.

The School Board was justified in the attitude it took in 1915. Mr. Calder opposed them. The condition of affairs in 1926 proves this, for they are in the shape the School Board said they would be. Newspaper files of that date will bear us out in this latter statement.

Ratepayers should bear in mind that the School Board is not arbitrary in its attitude. They are giving the plain, unvarnished facts, which may be seen at any time. The School Board is not attempting to tell us how to vote. They are merely telling us the conditions under which our school is functioning. As in 1915, they are warning us. If we need that warning and good; if we don't, then the blame be on our own heads. As financiers, Mr. Calder and his supporters guessed wrong in 1915 and the chances are that their powers of prophecy have not improved. The School Board was right in 1915, and it is up to the ratepayers, under these circumstances, to decide who is right today.

Mr. Calder's appeal is made to those whom he thinks are not favorable to higher taxes. It is generally conceded by others than those on the School Board that taxes will be higher if the bylaw does not carry than if it does.

There are other financiers interested in Durham other than Mr. Calder, and they are heavy taxpayers, too, but their interest in the town in which they are heavy employers is not measured on the amount of their taxes. These two largest employers of labor in our town know that the town with the educational advantages is a lot better town than one without. They know, too, that labor is easier to obtain, easier to hold and more contented in a town with superior school advantages than in one with only a mediocre educational system. Read this telegram from Mr. John E. Russell of the Durham Stone and Sand Co., received at The Chronicle office on Tuesday:

Toronto, Ont., Dec. 28, 1926

To The Chronicle, Durham, Ont. We heartily approve of the movement on for addition to the Durham High School. Expenditures of this nature effect additional prestige upon the community at large. (Signed) DURHAM STONE & SAND CO., LTD., Jno. E. Russell, President.

And here is another statement from the Durham Furniture Company:

Durham, Ont., Dec. 29, 1926 The Directors and Management of the Durham Furniture Company, Limited, as the largest contributors toward school taxes in the town of Durham, wish to go on record as being in favor of the passing of the High School Extension question, to be voted on next Monday, January 3, 1927.

We believe that this addition is necessary if the educational facilities of the town are not to be impaired and would regard the defeat of the question at the polls as a calamity. (Signed) DURHAM FURNITURE COMPANY, LTD., P. Gagnon, Managing Director.

Surely the opinions, financially, of such strong companies as the Durham Furniture Company and the Durham Stone & Sand Company, should count for something, especially with those who hold a few paltry dollars in the way of voting for something they do not approve of. If the taxes are to be considered ahead of the benefits to be derived, then one would think these companies would oppose any additional expenditure in that line. Whether we care to admit it or not, the town with a poor school is a poor town in more ways than one, and Durham citizens may find this out to their sorrow if they are not careful. The big mistake was made in 1915. What could have been built then for \$5,000 will now cost \$25,000. Mr. Calder and those members of the Council who opposed the additional grant stand therefore guilty of the charge of having cost the town a cool \$20,000 just because they lacked foresight. It was a big mistake, that one in 1915, but it cannot be helped now. There is no use crying about it. The only thing that can be done now is to see that the same mistake is not repeated on Monday. Vote YES on the Bylaw.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A Happy New Year to all.

We have turned the corner—the days will soon commence to lengthen out perceptibly.

Vote "Yes" on the High School Addition question. A vote in the "Yes" column keeps the tax rate down, makes Durham a better town to live in, and retains her prestige among the progressive towns of the province. Vote "Yes" and do it early next Monday.

SOCIAL AND PERSONAL

Mr. and Mrs. F. C. Hopkins, of Egremont spent Christmas with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Kerr, Varney.

Misses Florence and Jeanette Kerr of Madawaska and Clifford, respectively are spending the holiday at Varney with their parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Kerr.

Mr. and Mrs. Finley Graham of Montreal are spending the holiday season with Mr. and Mrs. W. Calder. Mr. and Mrs. W. Duggan of Flint, Mich., spent the holiday with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Petty, Normanby.

Mr. Wilfred Barbour of Cache Bay, New Ontario, is holidaying with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Barbour, in Egremont.

Mr. George Dunn of Moose Jaw, Sask., is visiting with his grandparents Mr. and Mrs. W. Laidlaw. Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hay and family of Winnipeg are visiting with his brother near Drumore.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter Marshall of Rowley, Alberta, are spending the winter here with his mother and sisters.

Mrs. James Heppburn has returned from an extended visit at Sanford Maine, with her daughter, Mrs. E. Ackroyd.

Dr. and Mrs. D. B. Jamieson and family spent the holiday at her home at Southampton.

Mrs. Peter Reid, Sr., and daughter Miss Jessie Reid, spent Christmas with the former's daughter, Mrs. Jack Ray, at Dornoch.

Miss Donald McEachern of the Public School staff is spending the holidays in New York and other American cities.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Thompson spent the holiday with her people at Dundas.

Mr. and Mrs. McKnight of Welland County, spent over the week-end with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ramage, at the Review office.

Messrs. Arthur and Harold Ramage, of the Thornbury Review-Herald, spent Christmas at the parental home here.

Mr. J. H. McClocklin of Trenton, manager of the Standard Bank branch at that place, is visiting his parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. T. McClocklin.

Miss May McClocklin of Toronto teaching staff, is spending the holidays with her parents in town.

Mr. and Mrs. David J. McGarrell and son William, of Toronto, visited her parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. Erwin Sr., her brother, Mr. and Mrs. W. Erwin Jr., over the holiday. Mrs. McGarrell returned to Toronto Tuesday, but Mr. McGarrell is remaining for a few days.

Mr. and Mrs. W. Heughan and daughter of Milverton visited over the holiday with her mother, Mrs. J. A. Adred, here. Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Edwards, of Shelburne, with their husbands, also visited their mother here over the holiday season.

Mrs. C. E. Heywood of Toronto is visiting with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Lawson.

Mr. Brock Grant, of Welland, Misses Edith and Allie Grant of Toronto, Mrs. A. S. Muir and son of Geylon, and Dr. and Mrs. Lynn Grant of Walkerton, were holiday visitors with Dr. J. F. Grant and Mr. and Mrs. D. McLean.

Mr. and Mrs. E. D. McClocklin were in Toronto over Christmas, visiting their son Lloyd, and the former's brothers and sisters.

Mr. W. Vollett was home from Toronto over Christmas.

Mr. Erben Schutz of the Royal Bank Staff, Montreal, spent the holiday with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. Schutz, here.

Mr. Ernest McGirr of the Galt Collegiate staff, is spending the holidays with his mother and sisters in town.

Mr. C. H. Darling was in Simcoe over the holiday.

Mr. and Mrs. T. A. Cook spent the Christmas season in Toronto visiting relatives.

Messrs. C. McLachlan and Harry Kress were home from New Ontario for Christmas, returning to their duties on Tuesday.

Mr. Willet Snell of Toronto is holidaying in town.

Mr. Archie King spent the week end at his home at Woodstock.

Miss Christie McGirr of Parry Sound is visiting at her home here.

Mr. Ed Kearney was home from Harriston over Christmas.

Dr. C. E. Wolfe of Toronto spent the holiday in town visiting his parents.

Mr. W. Petty of Streetsville visited his parents in town during the past week.

Miss Margaret Lennox of The Chronicle staff, spent Christmas at her home in Mount Forest.

W. Limin, over the holiday, left Monday for Ottawa, where they will reside.

Mr. and Mrs. G. R. Pearce and daughter Otilie, of Stratford, were Christmas visitors with Mr. and Mrs. E. W. Limin.

Mrs. Ed. Toben of Detroit is visiting with Mr. and Mrs. E. W. Limin.

Mr. Harold Sharpe of Toronto spent the week-end at the parental home here. He was accompanied by his brother, Irvin, who will visit in Toronto for a few days.

Mr. and Mrs. George Sharp and Mabel of Guelph spent Christmas with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Backus. Mr. Sharp returned Saturday, Mrs. Sharp and Mabel remaining over until the New Year, visiting friends in and around Durham.

Miss M. Petty, Matron of the Royal Alexandra Hospital, Fergus, visited her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Petty, for a couple of days this week.

Miss A. Plety, teacher, Toronto, is spending her holidays with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Petty, in Normanby.

Mr. and Mrs. D. Allen and nephew Earl McKechnie, spent Christmas at Markdale, the guests of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Lyons.

Miss M. McKenzie of Toronto, is spending the holidays with her sister, Miss A. L. MacKenzie, and other friends and relatives in Durham.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Re High School Bylaw

To the Editor of The Chronicle:

Dear Sir,—Believing that the same prominence has not been given to facts and figures against the bylaw that has been given in favor of it, I am writing this letter to the ratepayers of the town so that both sides may be considered impartially. There is perhaps no person discussing the bylaw who does not believe that it is essential that every boy and girl living in the town or in the surrounding country should be given a good fair education to fit the child to meet others on an equal basis, and I believe nearly all will agree that our Public school and High school as at present situated is capable of doing this if practically applied. The argument given in favor of the bylaw is to establish Fourth Form work to fit the pupil for more advanced education, aiming at matriculation and university training. In the town or attending the High school there may be a few who would take up this work in some particular year, but the number will always be comparatively small, not more, I believe, than six or eight any particular year. There must be a limit to our educational aspirations at some point or other. Our town has a small population, about 1,600, and we cannot expect to have the same facilities or advantages that larger towns have, which have a population of three, five or ten thousand. We are at the present time spending nearly \$20,000 a year on education. Can we afford to spend four or five thousand more?

W. GALDER.

Therefore it is well that every ratepayer should know the cost of the proposed bylaw. It is proposed to issue \$25,000 of debentures. This with interest will mean in 20 years about \$44,000. A fairly good-sized mortgage, but this is only the small part of it. Extra teachers, extra taking, heating and lighting would cost a much larger sum, or in other words it will cost about \$2,200 annually to meet the debentures and interest. The present High school of four rooms is costing us nearly \$9,000 a year for maintenance. If an additional building the same size is erected and maintained, surely 50 per cent of the present cost would not be too much to apply to it, or \$4,500. It is contended that some additional grants would be received. These are always problematical, as changes are taking place yearly. But suppose we say that an additional \$500 would be received in 20 years mean a yearly maintenance of \$4,000 or in all \$80,000 yearly, or in 20 years over \$120,000. Assuming that my figures are correct, or perhaps below the mark, what does it mean to the property holder? If you are assessed \$500, the extra rate would be 8 or 10 mills, or \$4 to \$5 yearly. If assessed \$1,000 your extra taxes would be \$8 to \$10 yearly, or if \$1,500 assessment \$12 to \$15. It is also contended our High school is overcrowded. If so, it fortunately happens that a good building, the Armory, provided with good ventilation, heating and lighting, and at present very little used, could either be purchased or rented for a time. It is a well-known fact that the attendance of pupils fluctuates and in two or three years we may have fewer pupils attending or if a greater number were attending it would then be a reasonable time to look for further accommodation. The town requires many improvements such as street paving, new town hall, waterworks, and sewerage system if we could afford it. We have a debenture debt at present of \$85,000, including guaranteed debentures. Can we afford at the present time to take on an increased taxation, but rather would it not be better to wait for a few years until some of our present debt was paid off and then take on new obligations? Our taxes are very high at present. If the ratepayers wish for an increased taxation vote for the bylaw, if on the other hand you want some of the present indebtedness paid off and take on some other improvements which cannot be delayed, vote against the bylaw, which seems the reasonable and sensible thing to do.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your valuable space, I am,

Yours truly,

W. GALDER.

BORN

Caswell.—In Glenelg, December 25, to Mr. and Mrs. J. Caswell, a son.

CARD OF THANKS

The Rev. John E. Peters wishes to thank all those who have by word or deed expressed and shown their sympathy with him in the sad bereavement that has come to him this Christmas tide.

To Our Friends

Appreciating our pleasant relations with you

in the past, we wish you the compliments of the

season sincerely trusting that the New Year will

bring you greater happiness and prosperity than

you have ever enjoyed before.

REPAIRING AS USUAL

J. S. McIlraith The Cash Durham, Ont. Shoe Store

McKECHNIE MILLS

A Happy New Year

Optimism, in the true meaning of the word, may well be accepted as a ruling principle for the New Year.

Authentic business statistics bear out the fact that Canada has entered a period of prosperity that is basically sound.

This is not an idle wish based on necessity but a positive reality with decided assurance of fulfillment.

And so our old time wish—centuries old—we repeat with all sincerity, may the year 1927 be to your and yours one of Health, Happiness and Prosperity.

J. W. Ewen & Son Phone 114 Durham, Ontario

SCHOOL HONOR

Durham Public Sr. IV.—Jose Falcon kingham, Earl MacLachlan, Tobin.

Jr. IV.—Doris Taylor, Frank Goodchild, James Henderson.

J. A. Gray Sr. III.—Gordon Young, Genevieve Sae, Allan, Wilfred Snider.

Sr. III.—Anna Goodchild and Cl Walker, Bernard MacDonald.

Jr. III.—A. Percy Greenwood, Margaret Sheld.

Jr. III.—Doris Moffat, Norman Fyly and Eric, Ben Firth.

Sr. II.—A. Lloyd, Susie Bell.

Sr. II.—Doris Vollett, Gordon Donald, Norman

Jr. II.—A. E. Eses MacArthur, Fred Hutchings.

Jr. II.—Peggy Holt, Bert Trainor, W.

Sr. I.—G. S. Milne, Perry Moore, Velma Down.

Jr. I.—Gordon Koo dock, Jack Lloyd, Jimmy Stacey.

Sr. Pr.—A. Helen and Helen Gerson, I. Boyce Howell, Eric and Louise Falconer.

Sr. Pr.—B. Margaret Spurling, Patrick Clarke, Alan

Sr. Pr.—C. Betty Grant, Lesna Schall, Donald Campbell.

Jr. Pr.—A. Lois Greenwood and Jean McEgrr, Ross Moore.

Jr. Pr.—B. Arlene Aljoe, George Ball, Beta Glenholm.

Jr. Pr.—C. Florence MacDonald, Clara Mline Vollett, May

Holstein Public SENIOR I

Sr. IV.—Basil Christie, Inez Leith, Irene McGill, Scott Allen, John Lewis, Cecil Johnson.

Jr. IV.—Margaret Heaney, Mary Heaney, Islay Simpson.

Sr. III.—Marie Nelson, Wilma Bibe George Stevenson, Ester Atkin, Norma

Jr. III.—Alma Le Mary Christie, Ed Troop, Helen Smith.

JUNIOR I

Sr. II.—Willard Christie, Albert Dall, Marjory Johnson, Frank Gadd.

Jr. II.—David Aik Esther Gadd, Clark McKenzie, Wallace

ler, Dick Fisher, Mather.

Jr. I.—E. Kathleen Law.

Sr. Pr.—V. Dyer, Lloyd Dyer, Dorothy Dyer, Elma Lambert, Bill Mather.

Jr. Pr.—J. A. M.

S. S. No. 5

Sr. IV.—Hopkins, Doris, Jr. IV.—John Brown.

III.—Irene Galloway, Lillian Galloway, Gladys Galloway, Sara Galloway, Doris Galloway, Nally.

Sr. II.—James Greenwood, Mr. Allie McGirr, John

Jr. II.—Margaret Sr. I.—Doris Brown, Jr. I.—Victor Lawrence, Harry Lawrence.

Jr. Pr.—Victor Lawrence, Arthur Greenwood, Clifford McNally.

Average attendance

U.S.S. No. 10. Glen Sr. IV.—Theresa MacLachlan.

Katie MacLachlan, Jr. IV.—Gladys, Bert MacLachlan, James Eckhardt, Fern.

Sr. III.—Anna "Mamie" MacPhail, Fern.

Sr. II.—Sadie Proudley, Donald