

Education

the government started whole settlements in which there were no schools, and very little assessment for schools. In some cases, the only revenue was from the assessment on a quarter-section of land. New schools have had to be built, but no assistance has been forthcoming from the federal government.

Then you find that wages are going up. There have been grants, but the grants have amounted to practically nothing. I have a copy of an editorial which appeared in the *St. James Leader* on February 15. This paper is published in one of the municipalities in my constituency. I shall not quote the whole thing but I want to take time to quote a portion of it. It says:

The total grants for St. James will amount to some \$6,000 more than in 1950 for 1951. But St. James normal salary increases, plus additions to staff for increased school population, already total some \$20,000.

The teachers' society has now come forward with a demand for a flat increase per teacher in suburban schools of \$360 per year. This has not yet been negotiated but there is no doubt that considerable increases will be forthcoming.

Actually, and for St. James only, the government grant per teacher has decreased over 1950 by \$18 per teacher.

It is extremely likely that St. James taxpayers are going to be faced this year with a considerable increase in the rate of taxation in view of the foregoing analysis of the change in government school grants, coupled with the increased expenditures.

When it is recalled that a St. James teacher starts with a minimum salary of \$1,400 per year on the present basis, there can be no question of the justice of the teachers' claim for an increase in the annual increment.

Let us consider the inequalities in the educational system today. You have heard that in British Columbia they spend \$115 per pupil; in my own province we spend \$100 per pupil; in Prince Edward Island they spend \$45 per pupil. I do not need to tell the house the advantages the city boy or girl has over the country boy or girl because the cities pay higher wages. The teachers sell their labour on the highest market. School districts have little revenue to meet these additional salaries, and that is where the federal government could step in again.

In my own province there are permit teachers. This is a provincial matter, but if the federal government could give scholarships to these permit teachers it would help. I have every respect for them when they are trying to earn their way through normal school, but at the same time teaching school on a grade 11 certificate is not of advantage to the pupil in the country school where these teachers are used. Up until now teachers' salaries have never been sufficiently attractive to bring all the best brains to the

profession. If better salaries were paid, better people would be obtained. I think that many teachers leave the profession because they can command better wages elsewhere.

This resolution does not ask for equality in the different provinces. It merely asks for a more equitable distribution of the funds for educational purposes. I think far more financial aid could be given. We hear that there would be interference with the provincial educational program, but I am quite sure that this resolution does not ask for that. Every province would still retain its own program, and would be given more financial support to enable that program to be carried out.

Mr. G. A. Cruickshank (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief. I am entirely in accord with the suggestion that land taxes cannot support the cost of education today. I merely say that I am entirely in accord with the resolution.

Mr. H. O. White (Middlesex East): May I lend my voice, Mr. Speaker, to the support of this resolution. The member for Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) presented the views of most of us in a very concise way. There are a few things, however, that I should like to emphasize. The burden that is today being placed upon those who own property, as I mentioned in the throne speech debate, is almost unbearable. Some people are finding they have to sell their homes in order to gain relief from the taxation burden.

While I am referring to this question of the burden on land owners, I should like to have the privilege of reading an article to the house, and when I have completed it I shall tell you its origin.

I wish to say that a mighty change has come in the affairs of our city and our ideals are utterly unlike those of our leaders in a previous generation. When I was a boy it was considered not only safe but honourable to create an estate, so that almost all men of standing wished to add to their possessions and felt a certain dignified honour in prospering, but now one must apologize for any success in business as if it were the utter violation of the moral law so that today it is worse to seem to prosper than to be an open criminal.

Criminals can get off with a small punishment or a pardon but there is no escape for the prosperous, as they are doomed to utter destruction. You will find more men banished for their wealth than criminals punished for their crimes.

I should like the house to tell me who wrote that, and when.

Mr. Graydon: Was it M. J. Coldwell?

Mr. White (Middlesex East): No, sir, it was written by Socrates two thousand three hundred and five years ago. I believe that all provinces would welcome aid from the