

**MINUTES AND APPENDIX**  
**of the**  
**METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD**  
**1956**





THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD  
OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
1956

---

Fred J. Boland.....	Separate School Representative
James T. Bonham.....	Swansea
Alan R. Campbell.....	Toronto, Ward 3
Harry Eve.....	Leaside
Gordon F. Ferguson.....	Toronto, Ward 8
B. Michael Grayson.....	Toronto, Ward 2
Joseph H. Hartley.....	York Township
William Lang.....	Toronto, Ward 1
Louis S. Lockhart, D.D.S.....	Toronto, Ward 5
John A. Long.....	Forest Hill
Reginald L. Martin.....	East York
Irene McBrien.....	Toronto, Ward 6
Percy G. Might.....	Toronto, Ward 4
Barnet R. Milgram.....	Etobicoke
M. Douglas Morton.....	Toronto, Ward 6
Ella L. Norman.....	Weston
George Peck.....	Scarborough
Margaret E. Perney.....	Toronto, Ward 9
George C. Power.....	Separate School Representative
Fred C. Stinson.....	North York
Mary Temple.....	Toronto, Ward 7
John C. Van Esterik.....	Lakeshore

Gordon F. Ferguson  
Chairman

John C. Van Esterik  
Vice-Chairman





# METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD INDEX, 1956

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Accommodation requirements:		
Study of secondary school accommodation requirements		
for students adjacent to North York-Scarborough		
boundary .....		104
Advisory Council:		
Appointment of members to .....		370
Amendments to Official Plans:		
Township of Etobicoke:		
No. 97 .....		105
98 .....		172
99 .....		172
100 .....		215
102 .....		334
103 .....		335
104 .....		335
106 .....		357
107 .....		357
111 .....	114	
112 .....	125	
113 .....	125	
Township of North York:		
No. 45 .....		71
46 .....		121
48 .....		363
50 .....	90, 91	251
51 .....		251
52 .....		251
53 .....	70	

# Amendment of Official Plans—Continued

55 .....			
57 .....			
61 .....			
City of Toronto:			
No. 39 .....			
40 .....			
42 .....			
43 .....			
45 .....			
Architects, representative of School Board to meet with to discuss school construction .....			
Assessment Revision:			
Procedure to be used by area boards re .....			
Replies of area boards to suggested procedure .....			
Report form approved .....			
Representatives of area boards to discuss methods of Uniform plan of, to be undertaken September 1, 1956 .....			
Attendance Areas:			
Advisory Council to study all future application for establishment of .....			
Comprehensive report re various attendance areas .....			
Areas approved .....			
Referrals to Advisory Council for report .....			
Report re number of students affected by establishment of attendance areas .....			
Various attendance areas approved:			
Elementary Schools:			
Hughes Public School .....			
Re-affirmation of area .....			
Advisory Council to give further study to .....			
John Wanless Public School .....			

## II INDEX TO MINUTES AND APPENDIX

MINUTES	APPENDIX
	335
113	336
	281
	336
	336
	336
	239
78, 79	271
	378
79	181, 182
	323
	302 to 310
	302, 305 to 309
	302, 309
	103
73, 86	177, 207, 208
	350, 351
139	322

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Secondary Schools:		
Bennington Heights District (East York Township) area defined and approved .....	67, 89	103, 214, 301, 338
Danforth Technical School .....	127	449, 450, 451
George Harvey Vocational School .....	68, 127	449, 450
New Toronto Secondary School .....	127	449
Northern Technical-Commercial School .....	127	449
North Toronto C. I. ....	127	451
North York-Scarborough boundary .....	56, 57, 65, 66	
Warden-St. Clair School (W. A. Porter Memorial School) .....	127	450
Western Technical-Commercial School .....	127	449
Weston Collegiate and Vocational School .....	127	301, 450
Report re attendance area .....		104
Swansea Board of Education to define area for secondary students .....	55, 67	104
York Memorial C. I. ....	68, 127	450
Attendance Counselling Service, Toronto Branch, use of Board Room .....	19	
Audit Department:		
Fee for audit service included in 1956 estimates .....		43
Report on audit of books and accounts for year ending December 31, 1956 .....		226
Auxiliary education (See Special education).		
Bennington Heights district (East York Township), attendance area for pupils to be reviewed in view of proposed Bayview Avenue extension .....	126	
Board:		
Appointed representatives .....	2	406
Caucus of 1957 members .....		

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Board— <i>Continued</i>		
Chairman, election of .....	2	
Inaugural meeting, 1956 .....	1	
Inaugural meeting, 1957 .....		406
List of elected members .....	1, 2	
Representatives to Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, appointment of .....	5	
Standing Committees, appointment of .....	3, 4	
Vice-Chairman, election of .....	3	
Boulton Avenue Junior Vocational School, optimum enrol- ment reached .....	89	
Building Applications:		
East York Board of Education:		
Plains Road Elementary School .....		179
Parkside Junior Elementary School .....	137	
Etobicoke Board of Education:		
Elementary Schools:		
Bloorlea Senior .....		293, 341
Elmlea .....		129, 197
Gainsford (J. G. Althouse) .....		209, 291, 327
Lambton-Kingsway .....	109	340, 342
Park Lawn relief (Etienne Brule) .....		117, 197, 350
Stock Farms estate (Hilltop Senior) .....		340, 342
West Humber estate .....		340, 342, 448
Westway .....	52	260, 342
Secondary Schools:		
Alderwood C.I. ....	105	361
Thistletown C.I. ....	38, 90, 91	72, 123, 362
Royal York C.I. ....	92, 103	363, 364, 388
Addition to cafeteria .....		108
		336, 337

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Administration:		
Administration Building .....		175, 201
Maintenance shop and warehouse .....	103	360, 361
Lakeshore District Board of Education:		
Elementary Schools:		
John English .....		81, 82
Long Branch Memorial, referred back .....		179
To be reviewed in September, 1956 .....		241
Second street .....	17	83, 84
North York Board of Education:		
Elementary Schools:		
Additional funds approved for Anthony Road .....	61, 75	262, 263
Almore Avenue .....	61, 75	262, 263
Baycrest Avenue .....	61, 75	262, 263
Roding Street .....	61, 75	130, 197
		130, 198
		376
Ancaster Street .....		326
Brian Drive .....		82
Gulfstream Road, application referred back .....		340, 343
Highland Hill (approval transferred to Elkhorn Drive) .....		
Keele-Sheppard .....	76, 77	
1st revision .....		137
2nd revision .....		107
3rd revision .....		
Three Valleys Drive .....		323
Wilmington Street .....		69
Yorkview Drive .....		130, 198
Tender for addition approved .....		325
Intermediate Schools:		
Bunty Lane (referred back) .....		362
Advisory Council to report re .....	132	

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
<b>Building Applications—Continued</b>		
Highland Hill .....		361, 389
Ledbury Park .....		361, 389
<b>Secondary Schools:</b>		
Bathurst Heights Collegiate and Vocational .....		72
Don Mills C.I., application withdrawn .....		195
Downsview C.I., additional capital financing .....		22, 23
York Mills C.I. ....	48	110
<b>Scarborough Board of Education:</b>		
<b>Elementary Schools:</b>		
Bendale .....		243, 292
Chine Drive .....		349
Churchill Heights (Chancellor Drive) .....		243, 293, 411
C.K.E.Y. (Glen Ravine) .....		294, 343
Clairlea (addition No. 2) .....		294, 343
Courcellette .....	110	409
Danforth Gardens .....		
Dorset Park .....	44, 50	
Galloway Road .....		294, 343
General Brock .....		243, 292
Gooderham .....		341, 344
Hunter's Glen .....		294, 344
Latham (Inglewood Heights) .....		69, 375
George B. Little .....		
Manhattan Park .....		291
Maryvale .....		69
Mason Road .....		373
Portable Units (2) .....		341, 344
Thompson Farm .....		375
Vradenburgh .....		
Watford Heights .....	94, 95, 117	
West Hill .....	75	
		294, 345
		196, 345

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Secondary Schools:		
Warden-St. Clair (W. A. Porter Memorial C.I.) ...		109, 196
Toronto Board of Education:		
Elementary Schools:		
Alexander Muir (junior satellite school) .....		70
Application for additional financing with-		
drawn .....	32	180
Essex .....	38	
Garden Avenue .....	108	
Jesse Ketchum .....		261, 410
King Edward .....		349
Ogden .....		69, 70
Park .....		261, 345
Regent Park .....		260, 323
Rosedale .....		244
Sunny View .....	61	261, 262, 345, 447
Wellesley, acceptance of tender approved .....	60, 62	372
Secondary Schools:		
Danforth Technical .....		253, 337
Northern Technical-Commercial .....		216, 400
York Township Board of Education:		
Elementary Schools:		
Briar Hill .....	43	130, 131
Memorial .....	43	179
Rockcliffe Handicraft .....		241, 242, 244, 327,
		373, 374, 377
Report of Advisory Council re anticipated		
maximum enrolment .....	51, 52	
Report of Advisory Council re plans and		
facilities for .....	96, 97	381

## INDEX TO MINUTES AND APPENDIX

APPENDIX		MINUTES
Building Applications—Continued		
Secondary Schools:		
George Harvey Vocational .....	423	
Runnymede C.I. ....	255	
Application to be reviewed in light of withdrawal of Swansea students .....		119
Weston Board of Education:		
Elementary School:		
King Street .....		213, 216
Building and school site approvals to April 30, 1956 .....		241, 259, 410
Buildings and Sites Committee:		214, 224, 225
Report No. 1 .....	18, 68	
Report No. 2 .....	71, 80	
Report No. 3 .....	105, 115	
Report No. 4 .....	121, 129	
Report No. 5 .....	171, 179	
Report No. 6 .....	195, 196	
Report No. 7 .....	201, 209	
Report No. 8 .....	214, 240	
Report No. 9 .....	251, 257	
Report No. 10 .....	281, 290	
Report No. 11 .....	311, 323	
Report No. 12 .....	357, 371	
Report No. 13 .....	387	
Report No. 14 .....	399, 409	
Report No. 15 .....	423, 447	
Building code committee, establishment of uniform code for Metropolitan Toronto. (See Metropolitan Toronto Building Code Committee.) .....		
Buses, application of Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for not approved .....		
By-laws of the Board, amendment to No. 25 .....		12, 20
		377
		43



	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Capital Estimates:		
Comparison of 1956 estimates with approvals of School Board as of August 31 .....		315
Estimates of area boards of education to be approved by area councils prior to submission to Metropolitan School Board .....	35	124
Protest re elimination of any projects included in 1956 estimates .....	41	
1956 estimates approved .....	25, 26, 37	110, 125, 126, 134 to 148
Revised approval .....	30, 33	176, 184
1957 estimates to be submitted by area boards of education by October 1 .....	35	
Tentative estimates to be submitted by area boards of education .....	93	425
To be reviewed by area boards of education		
5 and 10 years estimated capital requirements to be submitted by area boards .....	35, 94	
Capital Expenditures, Division of Debt:		
Proposals to be discussed with Metropolitan Council representatives .....		44
Proposals to be discussed by Advisory Council .....		369
Report of special committee re .....		395
Caucus of 1957 Board members .....		407
Ceiling Formula for School Construction:		
1956 formula approved .....	114, 115	22
Details of formula .....		23 to 42
Junior vocational unit formula .....	58	215, 225, 226
Revision of requested .....	68	
Advisory Council to review formula for 1957 .....		318
1957 formula approved .....		424

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Ceiling Formula for School Construction— <i>Continued</i>		
Details of formula		425 to 445
Presentation of to Metropolitan Executive Committee	135	
Chairman of Board:		
Election of	2	447
Gift for		1
Inaugural address of	8	
Presentation of gavel to	139	
Chairmen's Committee, reports of		203, 238
Chairmen's Committee and Finance Committee, report of joint meeting		370
Committees, appointment of:		
Buildings and Sites	4	
Chairmen's	4	
Finance	4	
Legislation and By-laws	4	
School Accommodation	4	
Congratulations extended:	4	
C. W. Booth, upon appointment as Deputy Minister of Education	106, 113	
C. F. Cannon, upon appointment as Chief Director of Education	106	
F. S. Rivers, upon appointment as Deputy Minister of Education	106, 113	
Mrs. Mary Temple, upon being named "Woman of the Year"	20	
Conventions:		
Association of School Business Officials of United States and Canada		257
Canadian Education Association		256

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Ontario Association of School Business Officials .....		256
Mid-winter conference of .....		42
Delegations:		
Metropolitan Council requested to include representation		
from School Board when brief re capital financing		
presented to Provincial Government .....	30	
Requests presented to Minister of Education		
(i) re increased grants .....		339
(ii) re payment of maintenance assistance payments		
on current years' average daily attendance .....		339, 396
(iii) re method of determining Metropolitan and		
local share of capital costs .....	134	339
(iv) re increased financial assistance .....		396, 397
Dental service for North York pupils in attendance at To-	95	392, 393
ronto schools .....		
Disbursement Lists, approval of:		
No. 38 .....	7, 8	8
No. 39 .....		79, 84
No. 40 .....		111, 119, 120
No. 41 .....		127, 131, 133
No. 42 .....		176, 181, 183
No. 43 .....		200
No. 44 .....		202, 211
No. 45 .....		227, 245, 249
No. 46 .....		256, 270, 279
No. 47 .....		283, 295, 298
No. 48 .....		339, 352, 353
No. 49 .....		319, 329, 354
No. 50 .....		369, 378, 380
No. 51 .....		391, 394, 395
	36, 39	

## XII

## INDEX TO MINUTES AND APPENDIX

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Disbursement Lists, Approval of <i>Continued</i>		
No. 52		405, 412, 421
No. 53		447, 456
Downsview C.I., additional capital financing re re-location of Downsview R.C.A.F. Station:		23
Dissolution of R.C.A.F. School Board		366
Enrolment of pupils from in Metropolitan schools	105	367
Grant to be paid by Federal Government, query re	106	367
Interest of School Board to be clarified	106	391
Legal obligations of School Board re pupils resident on station		368
Payment of legislative grants, policy re	106	367
Responsibility for education of pupils from assumed by North York Board	84	391
Status of pupils to be clarified	106	367
Enquiry re responsibilities and activities of School Board to be undertaken by Legislation and By-laws Committee		111, 114
Report of Legislation and By-laws Committee		407, 412 to 421
Equipment, purchase of authorized:	122	
I.B.M. electric typewriter		111
Estimates:		
Capital	25, 26, 37	111, 125, 126
	30, 39	134 to 148
		175, 184
Revision of		123
Request for increase of for installation of swimming pool at Runnymede C.I. not approved		425
Preliminary 1957 capital programme		80, 86 to 101
Current		202
Revision of	16	
Supplementary taxes (1955)	25	
Uncollectible taxes (1955)	16	
	16	

MINUTES	APPENDIX
Ewing, Dr. and Mrs. A. W. G., honorarium for .....	
Finance Committee:	
Report No. 1 .....	42, 70
Report No. 2 .....	79, 84
Report No. 3 .....	110, 119
Report No. 4 .....	127, 131
Report No. 5 .....	176, 181
Report No. 6 .....	196, 200
Report No. 7 .....	202, 210
Report No. 8 .....	226, 245
Report No. 9 .....	256, 270
Report No. 10 .....	283, 295
Report No. 11 .....	316, 328
Report No. 12 .....	364, 377
Report No. 13 .....	390, 393
Report No. 14 .....	403, 412
Report No. 15 .....	445, 448
Financial Reports:	
Estimated gain or loss for 1956 .....	319
Statement of gain or loss in terms of tax dollars for area municipalities for schools in 1955 .....	319
Gorman Park Site:	
Conference with representatives of North York Township Council re sale of .....	133
Valuation approved .....	109
Home Instruction:	
Cost of to be paid by Metropolitan School Board up to maximum of \$5.00 per hour .....	445

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Hughes Public School: School Accommodation Committee requested to study use of classroom facilities by York Township and Toronto pupils .....		115
Highbury Development Limited: Appeal to O.M.B. for approval of plan .....	62	209, 210
Metropolitan Solicitor authorized to support Board in regard to appeal .....	63	319, 365
Humberside C.I.: Accommodation available for approximately 150 addi- tional Swansea students .....	48, 55	
Inaugural Meeting of Board for 1957 .....		406
Jacques, Richard: To be admitted to Sunny View School upon payment of non-resident fee .....		208
Junior Kindergarten Facilities: Recommendation against provision of .....	74	
Legislation and By-laws Committee: Report No. 1 .....		111
Joint report of Legislation and By-laws and Chairmen's Committees .....		406
To consider suitable amendment to permit School Board to pay a portion of non-resident fees on basis of cur- rent average daily attendance .....		284
Legislative Grants: Capital Expenditures for renovation, motion referred by Metropolitan Council .....		43
Request that Provincial Government pay grants for		

MINUTES	APPENDIX
(1) rehabilitation and renovation of existing accommodation .....	397
(2) gymnasia-auditoria, cafeteria, home economics and shops .....	397
Request that percentage of approved cost paid in legislative grants be increased .....	397, 404
Increase of grant in support of current operations requested .....	397, 404
Legislative Grant Losses due to establishment of Metropolitan School Board:	
Conference with Department of Education representatives re .....	45, 57 to 64
Legislative Grants for Capital Construction:	
Request that such be in the form of cash payments rather than as contribution towards annual debt charges .....	239
Maintenance Assistance Payments for 1956 .....	45, 51 to 56
Amendment proposed by Department of Education to give effect to payments on basis of current year's A.D.A. ....	128-9
Audited 1955 average daily attendance of area boards .....	
Officers of area boards to indicate status of each student .....	
Request that payments be based on current year's A.D.A. ....	129
Meetings of Board:	
January 10 .....	1
January 31 .....	9
February 14 .....	15
February 28 .....	19
March 13 .....	23
March 27 .....	29
	368
	56
	390, 396

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Meetings of Board— <i>Continued</i>		
April 10 .....	33	
April 24 .....	41	
May 15 .....	47	
May 29 .....	55	
June 19 .....	65	
July 24 .....	81	
September 18 .....	83	
October 16 .....	89	
October 30 .....	99	
November 13 .....	113	
November 27 .....	119	
December 18 .....	125	
Meeting Dates:		
Changed .....	39, 83, 106, 116	
Members of Legislative Assembly (representing Metropolitan area):		
Proposal to meet with to discuss Metropolitan problems:	140	
Memorials:		
Arthur M. Charlesworth, Deputy Metropolitan Solicitor:	23, 29	
Metropolitan Conference of Ratepayers:		
Invitation to attend conference .....	41	
Metropolitan Council:		
Requested to support requests of Metropolitan School Board re increased legislative grants and other matters .....	134	395 to 397
Metropolitan Toronto Building Code:		
Advisory Council requested to present recommendations re Board representation .....	34	
Preparation of brief approved .....	70	296



	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Representation from school boards thereon .....	24	
Status of Committee to study building code to be determined .....	24, 33	
Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board:		
Appointment of representatives of School Board confirmed .....	25	
Metropolitan Act, The Municipality of:		
Amendments requested .....		58, 396, 397, 390
Minutes of Board:		
Quotation for printing of accepted .....		446
Non-Resident Fees:		
Billing of fees .....		285
Billings for non-resident pupils to be on per diem basis .....		227
Fees for '56 non-resident pupils to be paid in 1957 .....		365-6
Fees for regular class pupils to be charged on per diem basis .....		227
Fees on per pupil day basis approved .....		285, 287
Legislation and By-laws Committee requested to consider amendment to enable Board to pay portion of non-resident fees on current A.D.A. ....		285
Meeting of Business Administrators to determine method of calculating per pupil cost .....		42
Method of calculating per pupil costs for regular class and ancillary classes approved .....		227 to 238
Payment of part of by Metropolitan School Board .....		45, 46 to 49
Revised fee schedule of 1955-56 approved .....	11	317, 320 to 321
Statement of fees paid in 1955 by boards to other area boards to be secured .....		317

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Non-Resident Fees— <i>Continued</i>		
Students in graduating year who move prior to September to be permitted to continue in attendance at school enrolled in without fee .....		446
Study to be made of dividing expenditures as between academic, commercial and technical pupils .....		285
Weighted average per pupil fee where board does not offer either academic, commercial or technical education approved .....		285, 287
Non-Resident Pupils Admitted on Compassionate Grounds:		
Carruthers, Ruth .....		295
Dewis, James .....	27	131
Fallon, Charles .....		239 to 240
Romanoff, Sgt.'s daughter .....	27	131
Northview Heights Collegiate Institute:		
Purchase of additional 10 acres for site .....		19, 253, 256
Ontario Municipal Board:		
Advised of status of York Mills C.I. and Don Mills C.I. applications .....		195
Advised of withdrawal of Stratheden Site application .....		117
Application for capital funds for Buntz Lane Junior High School Site extension dismissed .....		402
Final approvals reported .....	99, 100 101, 128	18, 19, 121
Metropolitan Solicitor requested to make presentation re application of intermediate schools in North York .....	115, 116	
Ontario School for the Deaf:		
Visit to by officials .....	121	405
Ontario School Trustees' Council:		
Extending thanks for use of Board Room .....	15	

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Operations of Metropolitan School Board: Report of Legislation and By-laws Committee .....	122	407, 412 to 421
Park Lane Circle and Lawrence Avenue: Clarification of attendance area requested by North York Board .....	95	
Parking Authority of Toronto: Arrangements for parking space for Board members .....		364-5
Parking for Board Cars: Arrangements made for parking at 20 Eglinton Avenue East .....	84 67	
Expropriation of lot by City Parking Authority .....		283
Petty Cash Fund: Reduction of amount of .....		377
Polling Booths: Use of classrooms for .....		293
Portable Classroom Units: Enquiry of Scarborough Board re availability of Sale of by Etobicoke Board approved Units to be transported from East York Board if avail- able .....	108	375
Public Schools Act (Section 3): Invoked in Town of New Toronto .....	31	177
Legal Opinion re .....		
Rockcliffe Handicraft School: Report of Advisory Council re anticipated maximum en- rolment .....	52	248, 249
Report of Special Committee re capacity of school and suitability of plant as junior vocational school .....	96	382, 383
Royal Ontario Museum: Urging schools in the Metropolitan area to visit the Museum during the autumn and winter .....	84	318

MINUTES	APPENDIX
Scarborough Board of Education:	
Enquiry re authority of separate school board outside Municipality to collect taxes in Scarborough for attendance of Scarborough Roman Catholic pupils in attendance at separate school in Township of Pickering .....	328-9
Schools:	
Operation of discontinued (Elia Public School) .....	326
School Accommodation Committee:	
Report No. 1 .....	11, 67
Report No. 2 .....	103, 115
Report No. 3 .....	167, 176
Report No. 4 .....	207
Report No. 5 .....	213, 239
Report No. 6 .....	301, 321
Report No. 7 .....	385, 392
School Financing and Ability of Metropolitan Area to Finance Education:	
Advisory Council requested to undertake study of .....	36
Board's staff authorized to undertake preliminary work re study .....	48
Interim report of Advisory Council .....	47
Statistician to be engaged re study .....	
School Sites:	
Per foot frontage levy in new subdivisions suggested for purchase of .....	245
School Sites, Purchase of Approved:	
Etobicoke Board of Education:	390, 403
Alderwood C.I. site extension .....	175
Castlebar Public School site .....	198
Flagstaff Public School site .....	371



School Sites, Purchase of Approved— <i>Continued</i>	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Page Avenue Public School site .....		411
Sheppard Avenue-Bayview .....		346
Sheppard Avenue-Keele Street .....		347
Silverview Drive .....		117
Stanley Road .....		347
Three Valleys Drive .....		117
Underhill Drive (East) .....		347
Underhill Drive (West) .....		348
Scarborough Board of Education:		
Bendale Park Public School site .....	123	
Cedar Brae Secondary School site .....	102	
Chancellor Drive Public School site .....	123	
Dorcot Public School site .....	77	
Dorset Park Public School site .....		292
Guildwood Village .....		348
Highland Heights Public School site .....		80
Hunter's Glen Public School site .....	77	
Inglewood Heights Public School site .....	123	
Ionson Farm Public School site .....		292
Manhattan Park Public School site .....		258
Masaryktown Public School site .....		81
Mason Road Public School site .....		257
Megan Road Public School site .....		199
Morrish Road Public School site .....	40	
Poplar Road Public School site .....	77	
W. A. Porter Memorial Collegiate (St. Clair-Warden) site .....	102	257
Wanita Public School site .....		81
Warden-Finch Public School site .....		258
Warden-Hydro Line Public School site .....	123	
Watford Heights Public School site .....	123	

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Toronto Board of Education:		
Administration Building (Parking Lot) .....	81	
Essex Senior Public School site .....	136	
Garden Avenue Junior School site .....	136	348
Givins Public School site .....	80	
Huron Public School site extension .....		374-5
King Edward Public School site .....	136	258
Malvern Collegiate Institute site extension .....		338
North Toronto Collegiate Institute site extension .....		254
Ogden Public School site .....	136	
Palmerston Public School site extension .....	39, 136	411
Park Public School site extension .....	107	
Queen Alexandra Public School site .....	136	258
Queen Victoria Public School site .....		258
Regent Park Public School site .....	137	348
Rosedale Public School site .....		258
Ryerson Public School site .....		258
Wellesley Public School site .....	137	
School Sites, Applications for Purchase of Withdrawn:		117
Bayview-Blythwood area (Stratheden site) .....		
Site Conditions:		
Buildings and Sites Committee to establish policy re extra allowance for abnormal site conditions .....	94	387-8
Site Extensions, not approved:		
Park Lawn Public School, Etobicoke .....		118
Schools or Sites, Sale or Leasing of:		
Elia Public School, sale of authorized .....		326
Lillian Street Public School, part of site:		
Appraisal of land to be secured .....	53	242
Sale of .....	13	68, 290

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Schools or Sites, Sale or Leasing of— <i>Continued</i>		
Steeles Avenue between Bathurst and Dufferin Streets, sale of .....	31	74, 271
Westminster Parkway Site (Clanton Road):		
Conference with North York Council representatives re purchase of .....	133	73
Leasing of .....		338
Sale of site .....	57, 72	
Yonge Street School site .....	109	
Sick Leave Plan:		
Establishment of for Metropolitan School Board employees .....		45, 64 to 67
Site Purchase Fund:		
Application for Bulk Site Appropriation .....		425
Application for 1956 funds .....	6, 7	346
Application for capital funds for site purchases which cannot be completed by December 31, 1956, to be re-moved from 1956 capital programme .....		403
Maximum size of school sites .....	35	119, 215
Sites:		
Request that Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended to permit Metropolitan School Board to assume 50% of the capital expenditure for .....		397
Special Education Classes:		
Academic Vocational Classes to be paid on basis of per pupil cost in school in which class is operated .....	70	
Allowance for initial equipment for Speech Correction classes not increased .....		182
Commencement of reimbursement of operating cost of Opportunity Classes .....		67



MINUTES	APPENDIX
Enrolments:	
For Opportunity, Academic Vocational and Special Vocational classes amended .....	386
Recommendation of Summer Committee referred to Advisory Council for study and recommendation	323, 352, 386
Gifted pupils, classes for not eligible for reimbursement	11
Meeting of Business Administrators to determine method of calculating costs .....	42
Method of reimbursing area boards for operation costs of special education classes for 1956 approved .....	227, 285, 286, 289
Payment of operating costs for period June to November, 1956, approved .....	130
Reimbursement of operating cost, report re .....	11, 12
Report on operation of Etobicoke Classes for exceptional pupils .....	385
Review of report on reimbursement in 1957 .....	11
Special Education Classes, Reimbursement of Operating Costs Approved:	
Etobicoke Board of Education:	
Franklin Horner (Handicraft) .....	452
Islington Public School (Handicraft) .....	452
Rexdale Public School (Opportunity) .....	452
Sir Adam Beck (2 Opportunity) .....	452
Wedgewood Public School (Handicraft) .....	452
North York Board of Education:	
Downsview Collegiate Institute (Special Vocational Class) .....	69
Maple Leaf Public School (Opportunity) .....	74
Saranac Public School (Opportunity) .....	74

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Special Education Classes—Continued		
Scarborough Board of Education:		
Corvette Public School (Opportunity) .....	127	453
Eastview Public School (Opportunity) .....		178
General Crerar Public School (Senior Academic Vocational) .....	127	453
Ionview Public School (Opportunity) .....		67
Latham Public School (Opportunity) .....	127	453
G. P. Mackie Public School (Opportunity) .....		67
G. P. Mackie Public School (Senior Academic Vocational) .....	127	453
West Hill (Senior Academic Vocational) .....	127	453
Toronto Board of Education:		
Bruce Public School (Opportunity) .....	127	454
Central High School of Commerce (Academic Vocational Class) .....	69	
Duke of Connaught (2 Academic Vocational) .....	127	454
Duke of York (Opportunity) .....	127	454
Earls court (Opportunity) .....	127	454
Eastern High School of Commerce (Academic Vocational) .....	69	
Kent Senior Public School (Academic Vocational) .....	127	454
King Edward (2 Academic Vocational) .....	127	455
Leslie (Opportunity) .....	127	454
Orde (Opportunity) .....	127	454
Parkdale Collegiate Institute (Academic Vocational Class) .....	69	
Perth Senior Public School (Academic Vocational) .....	127	455
Rose Avenue (Academic Vocational) (3) .....	127	455
Sunny View (3 deaf) .....	127	455
Sunny View (2 Orthopaedic) .....	127	455

MINUTES	APPENDIX
Western Technical-Commercial School (Academic Vocational Class) .....	
York Township Board of Education:	
Opportunity Classes (2) (schools not designated) .....	456
Warren Park (Handicraft) .....	456
Special Education Class Personnel, Reimbursement of Salaries Approved:	
Assistant teachers of speech correction (Scarborough Board) .....	392
Special Summer Committee:	
Authorized to process urgent building applications .....	286
Authorized to transact necessary business during summer adjournment .....	286
Report of .....	330 to 352
St. Andrews Golf Course:	
Subdivision of .....	
Study of Activities and Responsibilities of Metropolitan School Board authorized .....	111 to 114
Subdivision Plans, Consideration of Deferred: Executive Secretary authorized to advise Department of Planning and Development reason for delay in commenting on plan .....	
Pending decision re capital estimates .....	201
Subdivision Plan Referrals:	201
East York Township:	
T-9343 .....	172
Etobicoke Township:	
T-9171, 9202, 9315 .....	20
T-9189, 9215, 9264 .....	75
T-8990, 9333 .....	105

MINUTES	APPENDIX
Subdivision Plan Referrals— <i>Continued</i>	
T-9334, 9335, 9351, 9383, 9411, 9443 .....	106
T-7365 .....	123-4
T-7801R2, 9156, 9376, 9485, 9453, 9133R, 7341R3 .....	173
T-9585, 6737R, 9577, 9667, 9702, 9729, 9751 .....	217
T-9665, 9688, 9594 .....	222
T-6782R .....	223
T-9775, 9795, 9807 .....	281
T-9829, 9830, 9771, 9532, 9720, 9785 .....	282
T-7341, 9111R, 9280, 9768, 9849, 9882, 9919 .....	331
T-9948 .....	332
T-10034 .....	357
T-10037, 10060, 10109, 10166, 10178, 10180 .....	358
T-10228, 10312, 10346 .....	399
T-9953, 10396, 10408 .....	
Leaside, Town of:	
T-8521 .....	252
T-8521 (3rd Revision) .....	359
North York Township:	
T-8302R, 8771R, 9164, 9180, 9183 .....	21
T-7811R, 8211R2, 8276R, 8371R, 8381R, 8816R, 8954 .....	76
T-9187, 9203, 9257, 9303, 9311, 9328, 9338, 9347, 9368 .....	77
T-9250 .....	78
T-8344R2, 8345R, 8359R, 8675R, 8824R2, 9401 .....	107
T-6981R, 9180R, 9217, 9337, 9479, 9502, 9508, 9524 .....	174
T-9555, 9605, 9628, 9640, 9661, 9676, 9679, 9685 .....	218
T-9641, 9561, 9586 .....	220
T-9631, 8641, 9539, 9560, 9560R .....	221
T-9217 .....	252
T-9714, 9590, 9682, 9718 .....	253
T-9803 .....	
130	
71	

MINUTES	APPENDIX
T-9831 .....	311
T-10010 .....	311
T-10032 .....	312
T-10022, 10023, 10029, 10040, 10046 .....	313
T-10090, 10115, 10127, 10072 .....	332
T-9851, 9873, 9876, 9893, 9904 .....	333
T-9915, 9920, 9937, 9955, 9978, 9990 .....	359
T-9859, 10008, 10251 .....	
T-10047, 10157, 10290, 10291 .....	104 to 105
T-10310 .....	114
T-5644 .....	120
T-10324, 10352, 10354 .....	120
T-9876R, 10399 .....	133
Scarborough Township:	
T-8848R, 8907R, 9056, 9161 .....	21
T-9079R, 9246, 9249, 9252, 9265, 9267, 9284, 9306 .....	78
T-8515R, 9267R, 9377, 9384, 9412, 9427, 9361 .....	108
T-9424 .....	122
T-9246 .....	218
T-9252, 9298, 9476, 9505, 9507, 9516, 9519, 9537, 9644, 9653 .....	219
T-9022 .....	223
T-9565 .....	253
T-9186 .....	333
T-9570, 9932, 10041, 10055, 10077, 10079 .....	334
T-9834 .....	
T-9663 .....	423
Toronto, City of:	
T-9983 .....	334
T-9987 .....	359
T-10128, 10176, 10184, 10184R, 10226 .....	360
	101

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Subdivision Plan Referrals— <i>Continued</i>		
T-10274 .....	126	387
T-10444 .....	131	
Weston, Town of:		
T-9566 .....		175
York Township:		
T-9107R .....		78
T-9361 .....		108
T-9459, 9467 .....		122
T-9633, 7511R .....		220
T-10348 .....	131	
Summer Committee:		
Report of .....		330 to 352
Sunny View School (Toronto):		
Future to be studied by Advisory Council .....	60 to 61	
Luncheon expenses for Committee authorized .....		329
Swansea Secondary School Students:		
Attendance area for .....	55	
Swimming Pools:		
Application for capital funds for provision of in Runnymede and Vaughan Road C.I. not approved .....		400
Funds for construction of to be provided by area councils .....		128
Report on function and importance of .....		127, 149
Tax Relief:		
Suggestions for .....		203 to 205
Tax levy against new buildings for school purposes on per foot frontage .....		206, 207
	42, 50	205, 238, 239

MINUTES	APPENDIX
Teachers' College: Possible use of by East York Board of Education .....	
Teachers, Employment of: Resolution of Lakeshore District Board of Education requesting Minister of Education to study advis- ability of establishing central office to engage teach- ers in Metropolitan area received .....	302
Technical School Expansion: Accommodation needs for Lakeshore, Etobicoke Town- ship and Township of Toronto to be studied .....	
Provision of junior vocational units .....	169
Temple, Mrs. Mary: Congratulations extended upon being named "Woman of the Year" .....	
Expressing appreciation for expressions of sympathy in death of son .....	
Toronto Teachers' College (Earl Kitchener School): Enquiry re use of by East York Board of Education .....	302
Toronto Transit Commission: Acknowledgement of Board's proposed amendment .....	15
Amendment proposed by School Board .....	11
Application for amendment to Municipality of Metropoli- tan Toronto Act .....	9
Tours, Arrangements for: Etobicoke Township .....	59, 86
Scarborough Township .....	29
Transportation Costs for Legge Perthes Pupils: To be assumed by Metropolitan School Board .....	117
Vocational Grants: Payment of on behalf of pre-tech. students .....	58

	MINUTES	APPENDIX
Vocational Units, Junior: Ceiling formula for .....	58	215, 225-6
Welfare Council of Toronto and District: Inviting members to attend annual meeting .....	16	
Weston Collegiate and Vocational School: Review of projected enrolments to be made with view to reducing number of students in attendance for 1957-58 .....	127	



**MINUTES**  
**of the**  
**METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD**  
**1956**





# **Minutes of the Metropolitan School Board 1956**

---

## **Inaugural Meeting**

Tuesday, January 10, 1956.

The Metropolitan School Board met for organization purposes at 5:00 p.m. in accordance with a resolution of the Board dated December 13, 1955.

In accordance with the Board's By-laws, the Executive Secretary took the Chair and called the meeting to order. The Executive Secretary announced the names of those members who have filed certificates of the secretaries of the area boards of education for which they were elected entitling them to be members of the Metropolitan School Board for the ensuing year, viz.:—

Bonham, James T.	Swansea
Campbell, Alan R.	Toronto
Eve, Harry	Leaside
Ferguson, Gordon F.	Toronto
Grayson, B. Michael	Toronto
Hartley, Joseph H.	York
Lang, William	Toronto
Lockhart, Dr. Louis S.	Toronto
Long, Dr. John A.	Forest Hill
McBrien, Mrs. Irene	Toronto
Martin, Reginald L.	East York
Might, Percy G.	Toronto
Milgram, Barnet R.	Etobicoke

Morton, M. Douglas	Toronto
Norman, Mrs. Ella L.	Weston
Peck, George	Scarborough
Perney, Miss Margaret E.	Toronto
Stinson, Fred C.	North York
Temple, Mrs. Mary	Toronto
Van Esterik, John C.	Lakeshore District
Boland, Fred J.	Separate School Representative—Toronto
Power, George C.	Separate School Representative—Suburban Area

The Separate School Representatives were appointed by the Metropolitan Separate School Board for the years 1955 and 1956.

The Executive Secretary reported that all duly qualified members had completed their Declarations of Office.

Present: Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Ferguson, Grayson, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

#### Election of Chairman

The election of the chairman was proceeded with by written nomination and vote by ballot in accordance with By-law 2 (5).

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that Scrutineers be appointed by the Chair. The motion was carried.

Accordingly, the Chairman appointed the Assistant Secretary Finance and the Assistant Secretary Records as Scrutineers.

The following nominations were received:

Alan R. Campbell  
Gordon F. Ferguson  
Mrs. Irene McBrien  
Mrs. Mary Temple

With consent of the Board, Mr. Campbell, Mrs. McBrien and Mrs. Temple withdrew their names.

Accordingly, the Secretary declared Mr. Gordon F. Ferguson to be Chairman of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956.

Mr. Ferguson occupied the Chair and thanked the members for the honour conferred upon him.

#### **Election of Vice-Chairman**

The election of the vice-chairman was proceeded with by written nomination and vote by ballot in accordance with By-law 2 (6).

The following nominations were received:

Dr. John A. Long  
George Peck  
Fred C. Stinson  
John C. Van Esterik

With consent of the Board, Messrs. Long, Peck and Stinson withdrew their names.

Accordingly, the Chairman declared Mr. John C. Van Esterik to be Vice-Chairman of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956

#### **Appointment of Standing Committees**

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Stinson, the Board resolved into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of nominating members of the standing committees, the Chairman of the Board in the Chair.

The Committee of the Whole recessed at 6:20 p.m. to re-convene at 8:00 p.m.

---

The Committee of the Whole re-convened at 8:00 p.m., the Chairman of the Board in the Chair.

The Committee rose, the Secretary reported on behalf of the Chairman that the Committee of the Whole reports and recommends as follows:

1. That the Committee on Buildings and Sites be composed of Messrs. Boland, Campbell, Ferguson, Grayson, Lockhart, Milgram, Peck and Mesdames McBrien and Norman.

2. That the Committee on School Accommodation be composed of Messrs. Bonham, Eve, Ferguson, Hartley, Lang, Long, Martin, Morton and Miss Perney.

3. That the Legislation and By-laws Committee be composed of Messrs. Campbell, Ferguson, Long, Stinson and Van Esterik.

4. That the following members had been elected chairmen of the committees indicated:

Committee on Buildings and Sites—Mr. Peck.

Committee on School Accommodation — Miss Perney.

Committee on Legislation and By-laws—Dr. Long.

5. That the Finance Committee be composed of Messrs. Might, Power, Stinson, Temple, Van Esterik; Miss Perney, Chairman of the Committee on School Accommodation; Mr. Peck, Chairman of the Committee on Buildings and Sites; Dr. Long, Chairman of the Committee on Legislation and By-laws; and Mr. Ferguson, Chairman of the Board.

6. That Mr. Fred C. Stinson had been elected Chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mrs. Temple, moved that the Report of the Committee of the Whole be adopted, which was carried.

#### **Appointment of Chairmen's Committee**

The Secretary reported that in accordance with By-law 2 (10), the Chairmen's Committee consists of Mr. Ferguson, Chairman of the Board; Mr. Van Ester-

ik, Vice-Chairman of the Board; Miss Perney, Chairman of the Committee on School Accommodation; Mr. Peck, Chairman of the Committee on Buildings and Sites; Dr. Long, Chairman of the Committee on Legislation and By-laws; Mr. Stinson, Chairman of the Committee on Finance; and Mr. Morton, Chairman of the Toronto Board of Education.

#### **Appointment of Representatives to Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board**

Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Eve, moved that one representative to the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board be selected from the members of the Board of Education for the City of Toronto and that the other representative be selected from one of the suburban boards of education.

The motion was carried.

The following nominations were received:

Mrs. Mary Temple  
Mrs. Irene McBrien  
Fred C. Stinson  
Alan R. Campbell

With consent of the Board, Mr. Campbell withdrew his name.

In accordance with the above motion the Chairman declared Mr. Stinson to be the suburban representative of the Metropolitan School Board on the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

The Board then proceeded to vote by ballot on the following names, viz.:

Mrs. Irene McBrien  
Mrs. Mary Temple

The ballots having been cast, the Secretary reported that Mrs. Mary Temple had received a majority of the votes cast. Accordingly, the Chairman declared Mrs. Temple to be the Toronto representative

of the Metropolitan School Board on the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board for the year 1956.

PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING  
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**Communications**

The following communications were read:

1. From the Executive Secretary advising that the opening of the new Teachers' College in Toronto will be held on Tuesday evening, January 24, at 8:00 p.m., and that the trustees and their wives, or husbands, will be invited to attend. This matter was reported to the Board in view of the fact that the opening of the College conflicts with a regular meeting of the Board.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Martin, moved that the next regular meeting of the Board be held on Tuesday, January 31, instead of Tuesday, January 24.

The motion was carried.

Mrs. Temple, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that the next meeting of the Finance Committee be held on the Thursday preceding the Board Meeting, viz., January 26.

The motion was carried.

2. From the Executive Secretary reporting that it will be necessary for the Board to re-apply to the Metropolitan Council and the Ontario Municipal Board for the establishment of a bulk site purchase fund for the year 1956 similar to the fund approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in the year 1955. The Ontario Municipal Board Order authorizing the 1955 bulk site fund in the amount of \$3,419,100. expired at the end of December, 1955. Approximately \$3,000,000. of the fund was advanced to area boards during the year.

The Executive Secretary presented for information of the Board a summary of estimated costs of school



sites which the area boards hope will be acquired during 1956, viz.,

	Public	Secondary	Total
East York .....	\$ 25,000	\$ .....	\$ 25,000
Etobicoke .....	700,000	400,000	1,100,000
Forest Hill .....	.....	.....	.....
Lakeshore .....	35,000	.....	35,000
Leaside .....	.....	.....	.....
North York .....	750,000	400,000	1,150,000
Scarborough .....	2,300,000	345,000	2,645,000
Swansea .....	.....	.....	.....
Toronto .....	4,038,000	192,000	4,230,000
Weston .....	.....	.....	.....
York .....	25,000	70,000	95,000
	<u>\$7,873,000</u>	<u>\$1,407,000</u>	<u>\$9,280,000</u>

As it is not anticipated that the area boards of education will complete arrangements for acquisition of all the sites during 1956, the Executive Secretary recommended that the Board apply to the Metropolitan Council and the Ontario Municipal Board for approval of a bulk site purchase fund similar to that approved in 1955 in the amount of \$4,000,000. It was recommended further that the application include the provision that, in the event the proposed fund is exhausted before the end of 1956, a further application would be considered.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Stinson, the Board adopted the recommendation of the Executive Secretary.

3. From the Executive Secretary submitting Disbursement List No. 38, dated January 10, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$972,687.29, for approval. (For details of List, see Appendix, page 8.)

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Miss Perney, the Board approved Disbursement List No. 38, Part I.

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC  
SCHOOLS

## Communications

The following communication was read:

1. From the Executive Secretary submitting Disbursement List No. 38, dated January 10, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$2,304,085.39, for approval. (For details of List, see Appendix, page 10.)

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Stinson, the Board approved Disbursement List No. 38, Part II.

The Chairman here addressed the members and visitors outlining some of the problems the Board will face during the new year including the erection of new school accommodation, purchase of school sites, attendance area changes, and other matters. (For details of Chairman's address, see Appendix, page 1.)

The Board adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, January 31, 1956.

The Board met 8.00 o'clock p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present: Messrs. Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the inaugural meeting held on January 10, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

The following communications were read:

1. From Mr. F. J. Boland regretting his inability to be present.

2. From the Executive Secretary reporting for information of the Board that the Metropolitan Council recently had before it for consideration the following request of the Toronto Transit Commission for amendment to The Highways Traffic Act:

"Section 109(2) of statute 2, Eliz. II, Chapter 73, is repealed and the following sections substituted therefor:

(2a) Except in accordance with an agreement made under subsection (3) no person other than the Commission shall after the first day of July, 1954, operate, either by land or water, any local passenger transportation service within the Metropolitan Area.

(2b) The term "local passenger transportation service" in the next preceding paragraph shall be

deemed to include school buses and chartered vehicles other than taxis, but not steam railways or taxis."

During 1955, area boards of education indicated that since the formation of the Metropolitan area and the granting to the Toronto Transit Commission of exclusive public transportation franchise in the Metropolitan area the cost of chartering buses for transporting pupils had risen substantially. At that time the School Board requested the Chairman of the Board, the Chairmen of the Finance and School Accommodation Committees and the Executive Secretary to meet with representatives of the Toronto Transit Commission in an effort to secure concessions in the matter of chartering buses. However, the meeting recommended by the 1955 Board was not held due to the fact that more specific information was required from area boards on the cost of chartering buses before and after January 1, 1954. The Executive Secretary presented for information of the Board a statement of estimated costs of chartering school buses before and after January 1, 1954.

The Secretary noted that two important principles arise as a result of the application of the Toronto Transit Commission for amendment to The Highways Traffic Act, viz.,

1. Will the proposed amendment in any way affect the rights of local boards of education to own and operate their own transportation services.

2. The amendment, if passed by the Legislative Assembly, will grant to the Toronto Transit Commission a monopoly of transportation services which does not exist in any other area of the Province.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Might, moved that the Executive Secretary be directed to advise the Minister of Education that, in the opinion of the Metropolitan School Board, any amendment to the Act be so worded as to ensure the continued right of boards of education in the Metropolitan area to own and operate buses for

the transportation of school pupils and further that the Board suggest to the Minister that the following be substituted for section 2b of the amendment proposed by the Toronto Transit Commission:

“(2b) The term ‘local passenger transportation service’ in the next preceding paragraph shall be deemed to include chartered vehicles other than taxis, but not steam railways, taxis, or school buses owned and operated by a board of education in the Metropolitan area.”

The motion was carried.

3. From the Executive Secretary submitting for information of the Board, as requested by the Finance Committee, a list of area boards of education operating cumulative sick leave plans for employees which have unlimited sick leave credits for any one illness of an employee. Received.

#### Consideration of Reports.

Report No. 1 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, dated January 17, was adopted. Appendix p. 11.

Report No. 1 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated January 17, was adopted. Appendix p. 18.

Report No. 1 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated January 26. Appendix p. 42.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that the recommendation having reference to payment of part of the non-resident fees by the Metropolitan School Board, referred to in section 7, be amended to read as follows:

“That the sending board shall pay a non-resident fee which together with the maintenance assistance payment is not greater than its own cost and the Metropolitan School Board shall pay any excess up to the per pupil cost of the receiving board and that this arrangement shall apply to all non-resident pupils residing within an attendance area approved

by the Metropolitan School Board and to all other non-resident pupils whose attendance in another municipality in the Metropolitan area is approved by the sending board."

The motion was carried.

Section 7, as amended was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

#### **Notice of Motion**

By Mr. Stinson:

That the By-laws of the Board be amended by adding the following as sub-section (c) of By-law 25:

(c) 1. That the Executive Secretary be authorized to requisition from the Metropolitan Council such funds as may be required for the regular payments to be made by the Board

(a) up to the total of the amounts shown in the current estimates of the Board when such estimates have been approved and

(b) up to the amount of the interim appropriation for school purposes as approved by the Metropolitan Council prior to the adoption of the estimates.

2. That the Treasurer be authorized:

(a) to transfer to the Metropolitan Corporation such funds received by the Board at any time as are not immediately required for the Board's operations.

(b) to pay for rent and salaries whenever they arise.

(c) to pay all accounts up to a limit of \$500.00.

3. That the Treasurer's name be stamped on Board cheques for use in payment of accounts up to \$500.00.

---

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING  
PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

**Communications**

The following communication was read:

4. From the Metropolitan Solicitor submitting a communication with respect to a request of the North York Board of Education to sell to the Corporation of the Township of North York part of the Lillian Street Public School site for park purposes, referred to in section 1 of Report No. 1 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

The Solicitor indicated that if the Corporation of the Township of North York pays to the Metropolitan Treasurer the sum of \$4,000.00 for the eventual retirement of a like amount of North York debentures issued for the purchase of this land and also a sufficient sum to cover the servicing of these debentures from January 1, 1954, he is prepared to approve the legality of the transaction.

The communication was received.

**Consideration of Reports**

Report No. 1 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated January 17, was adopted. Appendix p. 67.

Report No. 1 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated January 17. Appendix p. 68.

Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Hartley, moved that section 1 having reference to the sale of a portion of the Lillian Street Public School site be referred back for further consideration, which was lost.

The report was adopted without amendment.

Report No. 1 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated January 26, was adopted. Appendix p. 70.

The Board adjourned at 9.10 o'clock p.m.





## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, February 14, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting of January 31, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From the Ontario School Trustees' Council extending appreciation and thanks for the use of the Board Room for meetings of the Council during the past year.

Received.

2. From the Honourable the Minister of Education acknowledging receipt of a suggested amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act adopted by the School Board at its previous meeting which would safeguard the right of boards of education in the Metropolitan area to own and operate buses for transportation of pupils. The Minister indicated that he will attempt to ensure that the Board's request is implemented when the Toronto Transit Commission submits its application for amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act to limit the operation of public transportation in the Metropolitan area to the Commission.

Received.

3. From the Welfare Council of Toronto and District inviting the members of the Board to be present at the Council's Annual Meeting to be held on Thursday evening, February 16, in the Y.M.-Y.W.H.A. Auditorium.

Received.

4. From the Executive Secretary reporting receipt of the actual supplementary taxes and uncollectible taxes for 1955 together with 1954 adjustments for the foregoing items which will necessitate revision in the Board's 1956 current estimates as follows:—

	Public	Secondary
Supplementary taxes 1955 ...	\$442,855.13	\$206,125.23
Uncollectible taxes 1955 .....	\$ 91,025.48	\$ 41,917.92
1954 Adjustment—		
Supplementary taxes 1954		
(increase) .....	\$ 1,324.69	\$ 59.23
Uncollectible taxes 1954		
(increase) .....	\$ 5,855.20	\$ 3,104.55

The Board received the information for consideration with the 1956 current estimates.

### Consideration of Reports.

Report No. 2 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated February 7, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 71.

Report No. 2 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated February 9, 1956. Appendix p. 79.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mr. Peck, moved that Section 3 having reference to the Board's 1956 current estimates be adopted subject to necessary changes in the estimates as a result of receipt of actual 1955 supplementary taxes and 1955 uncollectible taxes and receipt of any further information with respect to surplus, assessment added to the rolls, etc., provided

however that all such changes are reported to the Board at a subsequent meeting.

The motion was carried.

Section 3, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

(For details of revised current estimates, see Appendix p. 86.)

## PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

### Communications.

5. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Second Street, addition of 4 standard classrooms.

Metro Share .....	\$ 80,000.00
Local Share .....	22,900.00
Total .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00

Date addition required—September, 1956.

Present enrolment—385.

Anticipated increase—165.

On motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Campbell, the Board gave FINAL approval to the application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education.

### Consideration of Reports.

Report No. 2 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated February 7, 1956. Appendix p. 80.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that the report be amended by adding the following as section 5:—

“That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Edu-

cation for capital funds for the erection of public school accommodation:—

Second Street, addition of 4 standard classrooms.

Metro Share .....	\$ 80,000.00
Local Share .....	22,900.00
Total .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00

Date addition required—September, 1956.

Present enrolment—385.

Anticipated increase—165.”

The motion was carried.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 2 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated February 9, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 84.

The Board adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, February 28, 1956.

The Board met at 8.00 p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Eve Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames Norman and Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on February 14 were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From Messrs. A. R. Campbell and B. R. Milgram regretting their inability to be present.

2. From the Toronto Branch of the Attendance Counselling Services expressing appreciation for the use of the Board Room for meetings during the past year.

The communication was received.

#### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 2 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, dated February 21, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 103.

Report No. 3 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated February 21, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 105.

Report No. 3 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated February 23, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 110.

Report No. 1 of Legislation and By-laws Committee, Part I, dated February 23, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 111.

**Consideration of Motion**

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Dr. Long, moved that the By-laws of the Board be amended by adding the following as sub-section (c) of By-law 25:

“(c) (1) That the Executive Secretary be authorized to requisition from the Metropolitan Council such funds as may be required for the regular payments to be made by the Board

(a) up to the total of the amounts shown in the current estimates of the Board when such estimates have been approved and

(b) up to the amount of the interim appropriation for school purposes as approved by the Metropolitan Council prior to the adoption of the estimates.

(2) That the Treasurer be authorized:

(a) to transfer to the Metropolitan Corporation such funds received by the Board at any time as are not immediately required for the Board's operations

(b) to pay for rent and salaries whenever they arise.

(c) to pay all accounts up to a limit of \$500.00.

(3) That the Treasurer's name be stamped on Board cheques for use in payment of accounts up to \$500.00.”

The motion was carried.

**General Business**

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that the congratulations of the Board be extended to Mrs. Mary Temple, a member of the Board, upon being named “Woman of the Year” by the B'nai B'rith Women of Toronto. The motion was carried.

Mrs. Temple acknowledged the Board's congratulations with thanks and stated that while she was pleased to receive the award she regarded it as a recognition of the work being done in education throughout the Province by trustees generally.

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**Consideration of Reports**

Report No. 2 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated February 21, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 115.

Report No. 3 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated February 21, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 115.

Report No. 3 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated February 23, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 119.

The meeting adjourned at 8.50 p.m.





## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, March 13, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

### Memorial

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that the sympathy of the Board be extended to the family of Mr. Arthur M. Charlesworth, Deputy Metropolitan Solicitor, who died on March 6th. Mr. Charlesworth, a specialist in municipal law, was appointed Assistant City Solicitor in 1930 and following the formation of the Metropolitan Corporation was appointed Deputy Metropolitan Solicitor. Active in the Boy Scouts organization and in the Lawyers' Club, Mr. Charlesworth's friendly manner and kindness endeared him to all who knew him. To Mrs. Charlesworth and family this Board extends its deepest sympathy.

The motion was carried.

The minutes of the meeting held on February 28 were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From the Lakeshore District Board of Education submitting a copy of a resolution adopted by that board petitioning the Minister of Education to study the advisability of establishing a central office to engage all teachers in the Metropolitan area.

On motion of Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Eve, the communication was received.

2. From the Executive Secretary submitting, as requested by the Finance Committee, an analysis of the 1956 Capital Estimates showing the original estimates as submitted by area boards of education to the Buildings and Sites Committee on February 21 and the changes in detail reflected in the estimates as presented for approval by the Buildings and Sites Committee.

The report was deferred for consideration with the Capital Estimates.

3. From the Etobicoke Board of Education expressing the opinion that the Etobicoke Building Code is more severe than necessary for the safety of school children and suggesting that if other area boards of education have had similar experience with the building codes in their municipalities, it might be desirable to seek representation on a committee which has been meeting for the purpose of drawing up a Metropolitan Toronto Building Code in order that school boards' points of view are considered.

As there was a divergence of opinion regarding the status of the committee preparing the Metropolitan Toronto Building Code, the Executive Secretary was requested to ascertain whether or not the committee is an official committee of the Metropolitan Corporation and to report thereon to the Board.

4. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following additional information regarding supplementary tax revenue for 1955 and estimated interest charges on debentures to be issued in 1956:—

(a) The City of Toronto has submitted revised figures on their net supplementary tax revenues for 1954 and 1955. The result is a net decrease in the surplus and hence the revenue of the Board in the amount of:

	Public	Secondary
re 1954 Supplementary		
Tax Revenues .....	\$6,397.00	\$2,653.00
re 1955 Supplementary		
Tax Revenues .....	923.00	417.00

(b) The Commissioner of Finance has informed the Board that adequate interest charges on the 1956 debenture issue would be \$90,000.00 for public and \$10,000.00 for secondary. The approved figures were \$150,000.00 and \$50,000.00 respectively.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that the Board approve the necessary revision in the Board's current estimates for 1956 in the light of the foregoing information.

The motion was carried.

Accordingly, the 1956 tax levies will be:—

Public .....	\$17,561,220.00
Secondary .....	8,952,788.00

5. From the Metropolitan Council confirming the appointment of Mrs. Mary Temple and Mr. Fred Stinson as the representatives of the Metropolitan School Board on the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

The communication was received.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 4 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated March 6, 1956. Appendix p. 121.

With respect to Appendix "A" of section 9, being the detail of the composite capital estimates of the Board, Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Morton, moved (a) that the following projects be added to the capital estimates of the Toronto Board of Education to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1956:—

Regents Park Public School (Jr. Kindergarten) .....	\$ 44,100.00
Parkdale Senior Public School .....	309,670.00
Huron Junior Public School .....	442,635.00
	<hr/>
	\$796,405.00

and (b) that the following project included in the capital estimates of the Toronto Board of Education to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1956, be deleted:—

North Toronto C.I. (Renovations) ..... \$70,000.00

The motion was carried.

Appendix "A" as amended was approved, increasing the total for new projects to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1956 from \$22,759,395.00 to \$23,485,800.00.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that paragraph 3 of section 9 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"It is recommended that the capital estimates as shown in Appendix "A", as amended, be approved, including the 1956 estimated site purchases, and presented to the Metropolitan Council."

The motion was carried.

Section 9, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 4 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated March 8, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 127.

## PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 4 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated March 6, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 129.

Report No. 4 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated March 8, 1956. Appendix p. 131.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that section 3 be amended by adding the following as sub-section (iii):—

---

“that the afore-mentioned pupils be admitted to Sunny View School until June 30, 1956, on the understanding re-admission of the pupils in September 1956 be subject to the agreement of the Department of National Defence and the North York Board of Education becoming effective September 1st, 1956, insofar as the agreement relates to the assumption by the Department of National Defence of non-resident fees for pupils in special education classes outside the Township of North York but within the Metropolitan area.”

The motion was carried.

Section 3, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

The Board adjourned at 10.15 p.m.



## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, March 27, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Hartley, Lang, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

Owing to the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. J. C. Van Esterik, occupied the chair.

The minutes of the meeting held on March 13, 1956, were presented for confirmation.

On motion of Mrs. McBrien, seconded by Mr. Martin, the minutes were amended by the addition of Mr. Martin's name among those present.

The minutes, as amended, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications.

1. From Messrs. Ferguson, Lockhart and Power regretting their inability to be present.

Received.

2. From Mrs. Arthur M. Charlesworth thanking the Board for its expression of sympathy on the death of her husband, Mr. Charlesworth, Deputy Metropolitan Solicitor.

Received.

3. From the Scarborough Board of Education inviting the members of the Metropolitan School Board to tour the Township of Scarborough to view new schools and new subdivisions and suggesting the dates of May 5th or May 12th for consideration of the Board.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that the invitation of the Scarborough Board of Education be accepted with thanks.

The motion was carried.

The Executive Secretary was directed to advise the Scarborough Board that the date of May 5th would be suitable to the members of the School Board.

#### **Consideration of Reports.**

Report No. 3 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, dated March 20, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 167.

Report No. 5 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated March 20, 1956. Appendix p. 171.

The Executive Secretary reported that, as directed by the Buildings and Sites Committee, a meeting of Chairmen and officials of the Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, Toronto and York Township Boards of Education was held to review the 1956 capital estimates of the boards in an effort to reduce the composite capital budget. The capital budget as amended at the meeting referred to was before the Board for consideration.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Hartley, moved that Report No. 5 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, be amended by adding the following as section 6:—

“6. That the revised capital estimates as shown in Appendix “A” be approved.”

The motion was carried.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 5 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated March 22, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 176.

#### **General Business.**

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council be requested



to include appropriate representation from the School Board if and when he submits a brief to the Premier of Ontario and cabinet ministers regarding capital financing in the Metropolitan area in order that the Government may be apprised of the position of the School Board in regard to its 1956 capital requirements.

The motion was carried.

**PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.**

**Communications.**

1. From the Executive Secretary submitting a request of the North York Board of Education for final approval of the sale of 4 acres of land on the south side of Steeles Avenue (Lot 15, Plan 2570) between Bathurst Street and Dufferin Street, purchased by the First Township School Area of North York in 1944 as a school site. The School Board approved the sale in principle on February 14, 1956, subject to the provisions of Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act and the offer to purchase being acceptable to the Metropolitan School Board.

The North York Board of Education advertised the sale and following receipt of tenders accepted the highest tender in the amount of \$23,700.00, being that of Irving Investments Limited.

On the motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Stinson, the Board gave final approval to the sale of the land to Irving Investments Limited subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor and to the North York Board paying to the School Board its appropriate share of the proceeds of the sale in accordance with Section 131(2) of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

2. From the Metropolitan Solicitor submitting an opinion as requested in connection with a recommendation of the School Accommodation Committee as shown in section 2 of Report No. 3 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II. The opinion of the Solicitor in-

licated that, in the event that the assessment of any property is transferred from public schools to separate schools or from separate schools to public schools, a school board would have the legal right to require the taxing authority to levy against such property the appropriate share of any debt liability existing against the school jurisdiction from which tax support was being withdrawn.

The communication was received.

#### **Consideration of Reports.**

Report No. 3 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated March 20, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 176.

Report No. 5 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated March 20, 1956. Appendix p. 179.

The Executive Secretary reported for information of the Board that, as requested by the Finance Committee, he communicated with the East York and Toronto Boards of Education regarding their respective requests contained in sections 3 and 4 of the Report to apprise them of possible delays in securing final approval of the revised amounts due to recent developments in connection with the Board's capital programme. He indicated that the East York Board of Education wishes to have its application for additional funds processed through Metropolitan Council but that the Toronto Board of Education has decided to withdraw its application for additional capital financing over and above the amount previously approved, viz. \$202,125.00.

Accordingly, Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that section 4 be deleted.

The motion was carried.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 5 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated March 22, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 181.

The Board adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, April 10, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on March 27, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

#### Communications

1. From Messrs Martin, Might and Stinson regretting their inability to be present.

Received.

2. From the Chairman of the Board presenting for information a copy of the preamble to the Board's 1956 capital estimates which was forwarded to the Metropolitan Council.

Received.

3. From the Executive Secretary reporting as requested by the Board regarding the establishment of a committee to consider a uniform building code for the Metropolitan area. The report indicates that the Committee was established at the request of the Toronto Chapter of the Ontario Association of Architects and that while the establishment of a building code does not come within the purview of the Metropolitan Corporation, the area municipality councils with the exception of the Town of Mimico have endorsed the work of the Committee and authorized representatives

to serve on the Committee. The report further indicates that the possibility of School Board representation on the Committee has been discussed with the Secretary of the Committee and it was indicated that if the Board requests representation such might be arranged and could be a useful complement to the work of the Committee.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that the Board request representation on the Committee and that the Advisory Council be requested to present recommendations to the Board with respect to such representation on the Committee.

The motion was carried.

4. From the Executive Secretary submitting an application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$60,000.00 for the purchase of an additional 10 acres to form part of the Northview Heights Secondary School site. Previously the North York Board submitted an application to the School Board for approval of 25 acres for the Northview Heights site at which time the School Board limited its approval to 15 acres. Accordingly, the North York Board made application to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval of the purchase of the balance of 10 acres from current revenues. At the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing the Chairman of the Board reserved judgment on the application to permit the North York Board to re-submit its application through the Metropolitan School Board and Metropolitan Council to secure debenture financing for the balance of the site.

Miss Perney, seconded by Dr. Long, moved that the application of the North York Board of Education be deferred until such time as the situation regarding the Board's 1956 capital programme has been clarified.

The motion was carried.

5. From the Advisory Council reporting as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee concern-

ing maximum size of intermediate school sites. The report indicates that the Council desires to give the matter further consideration but advises that the maximum site size which will be recommended to the Board will be greater than that proposed for the Gainsford Senior School site as referred to in Section 4 of Report No. 6 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

Received.

6. From the Executive Secretary submitting for approval of the Board a memorandum to area boards of education covering the following matters:—

1. Presentation of area board's capital programmes to area councils prior to submission to the Metropolitan School Board;

2. Preparation of a 10-year programme for new school construction;

3. Extension of the 10-year programme to 15 years;

4. Preparation of area boards' 1957 capital estimates to permit the first drafts thereof to be considered by the Metropolitan School Board by October 1st, 1956.

The Executive Secretary requested direction of the Board insofar as preparation of a preliminary 10-year capital programme is concerned.

The Board approved the memorandum to area boards of education prepared by the Executive Secretary.

Mr. Morton, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that the Board concur in the principle of establishing a 10-year estimated capital building programme as requested by the Metropolitan Executive Committee and that to assist in the preparation of the programme area boards of education be requested to submit the following information:—

1. An estimate of new development anticipated during the next 10-year period and school facilities required for same;

2. An estimate of any rehabilitation programme to be undertaken during the next 10-year period.

The motion was carried.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Peck, moved that the Metropolitan Council be advised that the School Board is in process of securing information from area boards of education on which to base an estimate of capital financing requirements over the next 10 years and that following receipt of such information an estimate of the needs of the Metropolitan area will be submitted for information of Council.

The motion was carried.

7. From the Chairman of the Advisory Council reporting that the Council concurs in the advisability of the School Board undertaking a study of school financing and the ability of the Metropolitan area to finance education and that the members of Council have expressed a willingness to assist the Board in planning such a study.

Mr. Morton seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the Advisory Council be authorized to proceed with the planning of a study as referred to above and to report thereon to the Board.

The motion was carried.

8. Disbursement List No. 43, dated April 5, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$1,696.95 was submitted for approval.

On motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the Board approved Disbursement List No. 43, Part I. For details of list see Appendix p. 200.

9. From the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council acknowledging receipt of the Board's capital building programme for 1956. The Chairman of Council

has requested a break-down of the budget figures as follows:—

1. (a) Balance of 1954 and 1955 approvals not yet debentured.  
(b) Actual amounts requiring debenturing in 1956.
2. (a) Approvals to be submitted in 1956.  
(b) Actual amounts to be debentured in 1956.
3. (a) Balance of 1954 and 1955 approvals and new approvals for 1956.  
(b) Total actual amounts requiring debenturing in 1956.

The Chairman of Council also indicated that representations which the Metropolitan Corporation has made and proposes to make to the provincial government are related to education, social welfare services and Metropolitan projects. He respectfully suggests that any representations which the Metropolitan Corporation thinks are appropriate to be made to the provincial government with respect to education should be made by a delegation from the School Board.

The Executive Secretary advised the Board that the information requested by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council has already been forwarded to the Metropolitan Commissioner of Finance for information and that an additional copy will be forwarded to the Chairman.

The communication was received.

The Executive Secretary reported for information of the Board that the Executive Committee of Metropolitan Council at its meeting held this day had before it for consideration the following applications:—

Etobicoke Board

Thistletown C.I., 12 standard classrooms, Art, Music,  
2 Science Labs, Library, 2 Home Economics, 2

Shops, Typing Room, Double Gymnasium, Cafeteria.

Metro Share .....	\$360,000.00
Local Share .....	558,000.00
Total .....	918,000.00
Ceiling .....	918,000.00

#### Toronto Board

Essex Senior School (replacement after extensive fire)  
16 standard classrooms, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Auditorium-Playroom, Gymnasium, Library.

Metro Share .....	\$140,000.00
Local Share .....	467,500.00
Total .....	607,500.00
Ceiling .....	632,100.00

The Executive Secretary indicated that the Executive Committee recommended to the Metropolitan Council that approval of the projects be limited insofar as debenture financing is concerned to the amounts approved by the Department of Education for legislative grant purposes.

Following a general discussion with respect to the implications of the recommendation of the Executive Committee, Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that further consideration of the matter be deferred until the Metropolitan Council has considered the recommendation of its Executive Committee.

The motion was carried.

It was understood, however, that if the Metropolitan Council approves the recommendation of the Executive Committee with respect to the foregoing applications, the Chairman of the Board and Executive Secretary would confer with the chairmen and officials of the area boards of education concerned to discuss action which should be taken insofar as an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board is concerned.



---

**Consideration of Reports**

Report No. 6 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated April 3, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 195.

Report No. 6 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated April 10, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 196.

**General Business**

On motion of Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Hartley, the Board decided to meet during the months of May and June as follows—Tuesday, May 8, Tuesday, May 29 and Tuesday, June 19, and that the meetings of the standing committees be adjusted accordingly.

**PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.**

**Communications**

10. Disbursement List No. 43, dated April 5, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$8,664.19 was submitted for approval. For details of list see Appendix p. 200.

On motion of Mrs. McBrien, seconded by Mr. Peck, Disbursement List No. 43, Part II, was approved.

11. From the Executive Secretary submitting an application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$209,400.00 for the purchase of properties required for the Palmerston Public School site extension.

Mr. Morton, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that the application be approved, subject to approval of the Toronto City Council.

The motion was carried.

**Consideration of Reports**

Report No. 6 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated April 3, 1956. Appendix p. 196.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Morton, moved that Report No. 6 of Buildings and Sites Committee be amended by adding the following as Section 5:—

“5. That approval be given to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of a public school site:

	Estimated Total Cost
Megan Road Site:	
6.8 acres .....	\$35,800.00
East of Manse Road, north of Lawrence Avenue and west of Megan, with 66 feet frontage on Lawrence, being part of Lot No. 8, Con. 1.	
Date school required—September, 1959.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—8.”	

The motion was carried.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 6 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated April 10, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 200.

The Board adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, April 24, 1956.

The Board met at 8.00 o'clock p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on April 10 were confirmed.

Upon reference being made to the dates for meetings of the Board during May, Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the first meeting of the Board in May be held on May 15 instead of May 8. The motion was carried.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications.

The following communications were read:

1. From Mr. G. Power regretting his inability to be present.

2. From the Metropolitan Conference of Rate-payers extending an invitation to the members of the Board to attend the conference of Metropolitan rate-payers to be held on Saturday, April 28, at the War Amputations of Canada Memorial Centre on Wellesley Street West, Toronto.

Received.

3. From the Metropolitan Clerk acknowledging receipt of a communication from the Chairman of the Board expressing opposition to elimination of any accommodation in school projects now provided in the

ceiling cost formula and urging that applications for school projects now before the Metropolitan Council be processed as soon as possible.

Received.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 7 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated April 17, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 201.

Report No. 7 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated April 19, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 202.

Report No. 1 of Chairmen's Committee, dated April 19, 1956. Appendix p. 203.

Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that section 1 be amended by deleting the word "endorse" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the word "receive".

The motion was carried.

Section 1, as amended, was adopted.

In regard to Section 3 of the Chairmen's Committee Report, Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Lang, moved that suggestion No. 3 contained in the appendix to the report regarding a local levy against new buildings for school purposes be referred to the Legislation and By-laws Committee for consideration and report.

The motion was carried.

Miss Perney, seconded by Mrs. Temple, moved that suggestion No. 5 contained in the appendix to the Chairmen's Committee Report, regarding capital costs from current funds, be referred to the Legislation and By-laws Committee for consideration and report to the next meeting of the Board.

The motion was carried.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The following communications were read.

4. From the Executive Secretary reporting for information that the York Township Council has indicated that it is prepared to approve the following application of the York Township Board of Education provided that the School Board will agree to bear an appropriate share of the cost of rehabilitation work (approximately \$76,000.00) required at the school:

Briar Hill Public School, addition of 4 standard classrooms, kindergarten, staff room, health room and rehabilitation.

Metro Share .....	\$100,000.00
Local Share .....	110,310.00
Total .....	210,310.00
Ceiling .....	210,310.00

(The foregoing application was given FINAL approval of the Metropolitan School Board on March 13, 1956.)

Mrs. Temple, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that the report be received and that the York Township Council be advised that as the cost of rehabilitation work in a school is not eligible for legislative grant the Metropolitan School Board under existing legislation cannot bear any portion of the cost of such work.

The motion was carried.

5. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for erection of new accommodation:

Memorial Public School, addition of 4 standard classrooms.

Metro Share .....	\$ 80,000.00
Local Share .....	22,900.00
Total .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00

Date addition required—September, 1956.

On motion of Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Hartley, the Board gave FINAL approval to the application of the York Township Board of Education.

6. From the Executive Secretary submitting for TENTATIVE approval the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of new accommodation:

Danforth Gardens Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated enrolment at opening—390.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.

Latcham Public School, 8 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, industrial arts, home economics, and auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$267,850.00
Ceiling .....	267,850.00

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

Anticipated enrolment at opening—270.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—340.

On motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Hartley, the Board gave TENTATIVE approval to the applications of the Scarborough Board of Education.

### **Consideration of Reports.**

Report No. 4 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated April 17, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 207.

Report No. 7 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated April 17, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 209.

---

Report No. 7 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated April 19, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 210.

The Board adjourned at 9.35 o'clock p.m.





## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, May 15, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, G. F. Ferguson, in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Campbell, Eve, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on April 24, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From Mrs. M. Temple regretting her inability to be present.

Received.

2. At its meeting on April 27, the Advisory Council appointed a committee to prepare a preliminary report, as requested by the Metropolitan School Board, on a plan for a "study of school financing and the ability of the Metropolitan area to finance education". The Committee met on May 2 and submitted an interim report, as shown in Appendix, p. 245, for consideration of the School Board.

The Executive Secretary reported that the Advisory Council had directed him to advise the Board that a study of this magnitude could not be undertaken by the Council without assistance. The Advisory Council, however, had indicated that it was prepared to review and collate the material contained within the report and generally supervise its compilation. The Secretary also reported that a substantial part of the report could be prepared during the summer months from material now available to the staff. It was proposed therefore that this preliminary work be undertaken by the staff and that after review the Advisory Council would indi-

cate to the Board the extent of additional assistance required to complete the study together with estimated costs.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Dr. Long, moved that the interim report be approved and that the staff be authorized to undertake the preliminary work referred to in the report of the Executive Secretary.

The motion was carried.

3. From the Advisory Council reporting as requested by the School Accommodation Committee that, in addition to the present Swansea secondary students in attendance at Humberside C.I., approximately 150 additional students could be accommodated on a long-term basis.

The report was referred to the School Accommodation Committee for information.

4. On September 28, 1954, the Board gave FINAL approval to an application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$1,000,000. for erection of York Mills High School. The Executive Secretary presented for consideration a request of the North York Board for revised final approval of the project based upon tender prices, as follows:

York Mills High School, 17 standard classrooms, 4 science laboratories, art room, music room, library-classroom, double gymnasium and cafeteria.

Metro Share .....	\$ 480,000.00
Local Share .....	532,500.00
Total .....	1,012,500.00
Ceiling .....	1,053,000.00

A breakdown of the total amount is as follows:—

Contract price .....	\$ 829,792.00
Architect's fee .....	78,919.00
Equipment .....	79,000.00
Contingency reserve .....	24,789.00
Total .....	<u>\$1,012,500.00</u>

The Executive Secretary noted that when the application was originally approved in the amount of \$1,000,000. the ceiling formula for academic secondary schools had not yet been adopted but that on the basis of the accommodation to be provided in the school the ceiling formula would be \$1,053,000.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Boland, moved that the application be given revised FINAL approval in the amount of \$1,012,500.

The motion was carried.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 5 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, dated May 8, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 213.

Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated May 8, 1956. Appendix p. 214.

Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that Section 7 be deferred pending receipt of a report with respect to action which might be taken by the Councils of Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough as a result of a recommendation included in Section 1 of Report No. 2 of Chairmen's Committee.

The motion was lost.

Section 7 was adopted, without amendment.

The report was adopted.

Report No. 8 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated May 10, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 226.

Report No. 2 of Chairmen's Committee, dated May 10, 1956. Appendix p. 238.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Lang, moved that Section 1 of Report No. 2 of Chairmen's Committee, be referred back to the Chairmen's Committee for further consideration.

The motion was lost.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Lang, further moved that Section 1 of Report No. 2 of Chairmen's Committee be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration.

The motion was lost.

Mr. Milgram, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that Section 1 be amended to read as follows:—

- "1. That consideration be given to seeking a per foot frontage levy in new subdivisions and a levy per acre for industrial lands, such revenue to be used for the purchase of necessary school sites and that arrangements be made to place this proposal before the Reeves and boards of education of the Townships of Etobicoke, North York and Scharborough."

The motion was carried.

Section 1, as amended, was adopted.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that Section 3 be deferred until such time as the Advisory Council submits its report with respect to representation to the Committee established to consider a uniform building code for the Metropolitan area.

The motion was lost.

Section 3 was adopted, without amendment.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

## PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

### Communications

5. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation for FINAL approval:—

Danforth Gdns. Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

---

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—Jan. 1, 1957

Anticipated opening enrolment—390

Anticipated maximum enrolment—410

Latham Public School, 8 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$180,000.00
Local Share .....	87,850.00
Total .....	267,850.00
Ceiling .....	267,850.00

Date school required—Sept. 1, 1956

Anticipated opening enrolment—270

Anticipated maximum enrolment—340

On motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, the Board gave FINAL approval to the applications of the Scarborough Board of Education.

6. The Board had before it for consideration a report of the Advisory Council, as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee, with respect to an application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$585,000. for erection of the Rockcliffe Handicraft School, having particular reference to the anticipated maximum enrolment of 500 pupils. For details of report, see Appendix p. 248.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that the report be deferred for consideration in conjunction with Section 3 of Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

The motion was carried.

7. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Edu-

cation for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation for TENTATIVE approval:—

Westway Public School, 12 standard classrooms, double kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$352,800.00
Ceiling .....	352,800.00

Date school required—Easter, 1957

Anticipated enrolment at school opening—480

Anticipated maximum enrolment—480

Mr. Milgram, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that TENTATIVE approval be given to the application for Westway Public School.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved in amendment that the application for Westway Public School be referred to the Buildings and Sites Committee for consideration and report thereon.

The amendment was carried.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 5 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated May 8, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 239.

Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated May 8, 1956. Appendix p. 240.

The Board had before it for consideration in conjunction with Section 3 of Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, a report of the Advisory Council with respect to the anticipated maximum enrolment at Rockcliffe Handicraft School of 500 pupils. For details of report, see Appendix p. 248.

The Board received the report and directed that a copy of same be forwarded to the York Township Board of Education for information.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that paragraph 3 of Section 3 of Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:—

---

"It is recommended that the Board re-affirm its original approval of the application in the amount of \$386,100.00 and that the York Township Board of Education be requested to revise its plans accordingly."

The motion was carried.

Section 3, as amended, was adopted.

In connection with Section 4 having regard to the sale of approximately 2.531 acres of the Lillian Street Public School site (North York), Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Eve, moved that the Executive Secretary be authorized to engage a competent real estate firm to appraise the land in question and report thereon to the Buildings and Sites Committee.

The motion was carried.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 8 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated May 10, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 245.

The Board adjourned at 9:40 p.m.





## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, May 29, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, G. F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman and Temple.

The minutes of the meeting held on May 15, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications.

1. From Miss M. Perney regretting her inability to be present.

Received.

2. From the Advisory Council reporting, as requested by the School Accommodation Committee, that in addition to the present Swansea secondary students in attendance at Humberside C.I. (Toronto), approximately 150 additional students could be accommodated on a long-term basis.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Eve, moved that since Humberside C.I. can accommodate all Swansea secondary school students, commencing September 1956 the Humberside C.I. attendance area be extended to include the entire Village of Swansea.

The motion was carried.

3. From the Advisory Council submitting as requested by the School Accommodation Committee the following recommendations with respect to secondary

school accommodation for students adjacent to the North York-Scarborough boundary:—

- (1) Southern Section: (South of the proposed Eglinton Avenue extension, east of the C.N.R. tracks, and south to the Township of North York boundaries.

That the North York academic and commercial students located in this small "pocket" be accommodated in the new Warden-St. Clair Collegiate to be erected by the Scarborough Board of Education in 1956-7. Technical students could attend the Danforth Technical School.

- (2) Central Section: (Eglinton to Highway 401)

On the Scarborough side, students south of Ellesmere Road attend the Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute; those north of Ellesmere and the C.P.R. railway are accommodated at Agincourt High School. At the present time, there are no pupils on the North York side. However, in the future when this large area develops, North York will require a secondary school to be located in the district. In the early stages of development, students could attend the York Mills Collegiate, and then the Don Mills Collegiate when it is built. Technical students could attend Northern Technical Commercial School or Danforth Technical School.

- (3) Northern Section: (North of Highway 401, East of Woodbine Avenue (Don Mills Extension).)

At present, Agincourt High School serves the area east of Victoria Park Avenue. It is estimated that in the district bounded by Victoria Park Avenue, Highway 401, Brimley Road and Steele's Avenue, there might be someday, a population of 117,000 people. In the area of North York, west of Don Mills Extension, there is room for another 18,000 residents. This would indicate that another secondary school would be needed, in addition to Agincourt High School, possibly in the Warden-Finch district. This school could accom-

moderate the North York pupils as well. The Committee suggests that until such a school becomes necessary, North York pupils attend Agincourt High School. Technical students could attend the Junior Vocational Classes (Grades 9 and 10) at Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute.

Dr. Long, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that the foregoing recommendations of the Advisory Council be referred to the North York and Scarborough Boards of Education for comment.

The motion was carried.

4. From the North York Board of Education requesting permission to sell to the Corporation of the Township of North York for park purposes property known as the Westminster Parkway site. The communication indicated that the predecessor Collegiate Institute Board acquired the 10-acre site in 1951 which is located on Westminster Parkway near Bathurst Street, north of Wilson Avenue, but due to its proximity to the Downsview Airport and its alignment with the east-west runway of the airport the site was never built upon. At the present time the North York Board operates a temporary public school located on property owned by the Township known as Gorman Park (8.5 acres) and the North York Board wishes to acquire the park lands as a permanent public school site. The high school site was financed by debentures in the amount of \$40,000 which were assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation in 1954.

The North York Board of Education suggested three possible arrangements to facilitate the foregoing request:—

(a) An exchange of title with the outstanding debentures transferred to the Gorman Park property.

(b) A valuation of each property to establish current worth, with the difference, if any, payable in cash and the outstanding debentures transferred to the Gorman Park property.

(c) A valuation of each property to establish current worth, sale of Westminster Parkway property to Council and proceeds applied as per Section 131 of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, purchase by Board of Gorman Park property and issuance of debentures to pay cost.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that the North York Board be advised that the Metropolitan School Board will approve the purchase of the Gorman Park lands for a school site and sale of the Westminster Parkway site to the Township of North York in accordance with suggestion (c) above and subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor.

The motion was carried.

5. From the Metropolitan Clerk submitting for information of the Board copy of a communication addressed to the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council advising him that in the opinion of the Executive Committee the per pupil ceiling formula of \$2,325. for provision of junior vocational units attached to academic secondary schools submitted for approval by the Metropolitan School Board, may be high in comparison with the formulae approved for other types of schools.

The Executive Secretary reported that in reply to a communication received from the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council he advised the Chairman of the reasons for the higher formula for this type of accommodation.

6. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for erection of secondary school accommodation for FINAL approval:—

Northern Technical-Commercial, revisions to shops to provide proper accommodation for Print, Weld, Tinsmith and Plumbing instruction, Music and Drama instruction adjacent to Assembly Hall.

---

Metro Share .....	Nil
Local Share .....	\$ 85,000.00
Total .....	85,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

Date addition required—December, 1956.

Present enrolment—1250.

Anticipated increase—450.

Mr. Morton, seconded by Mr. Peck, moved that the application for Northern Technical-Commercial School be given FINAL approval.

The motion was carried.

#### Consideration of Reports.

Report No. 9 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated May 22, 1956. Appendix p.

In connection with section 4 having reference to an application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of an additional 10 acres of land adjacent to the Northview Heights secondary school site, it was noted that the Finance Committee had recommended that section 4 be referred back since information had been received to the effect that the North York Board is considering the erection thereon of an intermediate school.

Accordingly, on motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, section 4 was referred back for further consideration.

Section 4, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 9 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated May 24, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 256 and 257.

#### General Business.

On behalf of the Etobicoke Board of Education, Mr. Milgram extended an invitation to the members of the

School Board to tour schools in the Township of Etobicoke and enquired of a date suitable to the members.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that the invitation of the Chairman of the Etobicoke Board be accepted and that if possible, arrangements be made to tour the Etobicoke schools on Saturday, September 15th.

The motion was carried.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that an expression of the Board's appreciation be conveyed to the Chairman and Members of the North York Board for the recent tour of North York schools.

The motion was carried.

## PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

### Communications.

7. From the Executive Secretary submitting as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for new school accommodation:

Sunny View School, addition of 6 classrooms, therapeutic tank.

Estimated Cost .....	\$184,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A
1956 Estimates .....	184,000.00

The Executive Secretary also presented for information of the Board data supporting the foregoing application.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Morton, moved that the foregoing application of the Toronto Board of Education be given TENTATIVE approval.

The motion was carried.

Dr. Long, seconded by Mrs. Temple, moved that the School Accommodation Committee and the Advis-

ory Council be requested to study the future of Sunny View School and the possible need for another school of this type in the Metropolitan area.

The motion was carried.

8. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation for FINAL approval:—

Rosedale Public School, 7 standard classrooms, Kindergarten, Auditorium-Playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$160,000.00
Local Share .....	42,125.00
Total .....	202,125.00
Ceiling .....	202,125.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—300.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—300.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Morton, moved that FINAL approval be given to the application for Rosedale Public School.

The motion was carried.

9. From the School Board's Treasurer indicating his approval of the application of the North York Board of Education for additional capital financing in the amount of \$86,915 in connection with excess costs of Anthony Road School, Almore Avenue School, Baycrest Avenue School and Roding Street School, as referred to in Section 7 of Report No. 9 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

The communication was received.

#### Consideration of Reports.

Report No. 9 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated May 22, 1956. Appendix p. 257.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that section 5 be deleted and the following substituted therefore:—

"5. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds:—

Sunny View School, addition of 6 classrooms, therapeutic tank.

Estimated Cost .....	\$184,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A
1956 Estimates .....	184,000.00"

The motion was carried.

Section 5, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 9 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated May 24, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 270.

#### General Business.

Mr. Milgram recalled that the Etobicoke Council on recommendation of the Etobicoke Board approved release of the Highbury Development Limited plan of subdivision of Lots 19 and 20, Concession I, Fronting on the Humber River, subject to completion of arrangements with the Etobicoke Board with respect to purchase of three school sites required in the development. The Etobicoke Board of Education has been endeavouring to secure the required sites since June 1955 but the owners of the development have indicated that the offer of the Etobicoke Board of Education is not acceptable. The Highbury Development Limited has indicated an appeal will be made to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval of the plan of subdivision.

On April 24 the Board adopted the following recommendation of the Buildings and Sites Committee:—

"that in the event that the Highbury Development Limited appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board in connection with approval of its plan of subdivision the Metropolitan School Board be rep-



---

resented at the Hearing to support the claim of the Etobicoke Board."

Accordingly, Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the Metropolitan Solicitor be requested to have an appearance made at the Hearing on behalf of the Metropolitan School Board and in assistance of the Board of Education for the Township of Etobicoke.

The motion was carried.

The Board adjourned at 9:15 p.m.



## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, June 19, 1956.

The Board met at 8.00 p.m.

The Chairman, G. F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on May 29, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

#### Communications

1. From Mr. J. H. Hartley regretting his inability to be present.

Received.

2. From the North York and Scarborough Boards of Education indicating that they approve the attendance areas for secondary school students adjacent to the North York-Scarborough boundary, recommended by the Metropolitan School Board at its meeting on May 29, as follows:—

- (1) Southern Section: (South of the proposed Eglinton Avenue extension, east of the C.N.R. tracks, and south to the Township of North York boundaries.)

That the North York academic and commercial students located in this small "pocket" be accommodated in the new Warden-St. Clair Collegiate to be erected by the Scarborough Board of Education in 1956-7. Technical students could attend the Danforth Technical School.

## (2) Central Section: (Eglinton to Highway 401)

On the Scarborough side, students south of Ellesmere Road attend the Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute; those north of Ellesmere and the C.P.R. railway are accommodated at Agincourt High School. At the present time, there are no pupils on the North York side. However, in the future when this large area develops, North York will require a secondary school to be located in the district. In the early stages of development, students could attend the York Mills Collegiate, and then the Don Mills Collegiate when it is built. Technical students could attend Northern Technical Commercial School or Danforth Technical School.

## (3) Northern Section: (North of Highway 401, East of Woodbine Avenue (Don Mills Extension).)

At present, Agincourt High School serves the area east of Victoria Park Avenue. It is estimated that in the district bounded by Victoria Park Avenue, Highway 401, Brimley Road and Steele's Avenue, there might be someday, a population of 117,000 people. In the area of North York, west of Don Mills Extension, there is room for another 18,000 residents. This would indicate that another secondary school would be needed, in addition to Agincourt High School, possibly in the Warden-Finch district. This school could accommodate the North York pupils as well. It is suggested that until such a school becomes necessary, North York pupils attend Agincourt High School. Technical students could attend the Junior Vocational Classes (Grades 9 and 10) at Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the attendance areas for secondary school students adjacent to the North York-Scarborough boundary be approved.

The motion was carried.

3. From Jacobson and Lipson Limited, owners of 10 Eglinton Avenue East, advising the Board that due

to expropriation of the building's parking lot on Holly Street which is required by the Parking Authority of Toronto, it will be necessary to procure other parking space after July 1, 1956.

Since the Metropolitan School Board parking arrangements are covered by a lease between the School Board and Jacobson and Lipson Limited, the Board, on motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Stinson, directed that the Metropolitan Solicitor submit an opinion regarding the Board's rights under the existing lease.

4. From the East York Board of Education reporting that it has under consideration at the present time a request of the School Board for inclusion of the Bennington Heights district (Township of East York) in the Leaside High School attendance area, and will report further at a later date.

Also from the Leaside Board of Education indicating that it is prepared to extend the Leaside High School attendance area to include secondary school students from the Bennington Heights district of the Township of East York on a year to year basis, provisional upon adequate space being available for all students within the Town of Leaside.

Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that the communications be referred to the Special Committee appointed to act for the Board during the summer adjournment.

The motion was carried.

5. From the Executive Secretary indicating that the decision of the School Board with respect to the attendance area for secondary school students residing in the Village of Swansea needs further examination insofar as commercial and technical school courses are concerned and recommending that the attendance area of Western Technical-Commercial School be extended to include the entire Village of Swansea and that the Swansea and Toronto Boards of Education be advised

of the further clarification. It is understood that academic secondary students who select the commercial option will enroll in grade 9 at Humberside Collegiate Institute.

On motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Eve, the recommendation of the Executive Secretary was adopted.

6. From the Scarborough Board of Education forwarding a resolution adopted by that board on June 11 expressing the opinion that the existing ceiling formula for construction of schools is not adequate due to increased construction costs and requesting that consideration be given to the establishment of a new ceiling formula.

On motion of Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mr. Morton, the communication was referred to the Special Committee appointed to act for the Board during the summer adjournment for study and report.

7. From the North York Board of Education requesting the Metropolitan School Board to approve the extension of the attendance area for York Memorial Collegiate Institute and George Harvey Vocational School (Township of York) to include the following secondary school students in the Township of North York:—

- (i) The attendance area to include the houses between George Anderson Drive and Lawrence Avenue West, but not include any students who reside on Lawrence Avenue.
- (ii) Grade IX students in the George Anderson Public School area must attend York Township schools without option.

It is understood that this change will result in an increase of approximately twenty Grade IX students divided between York Memorial Collegiate Institute and George Harvey Vocational School.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that attendance areas be established in accordance with the foregoing request.

The motion was carried.

8. From the Advisory Council recommending:

- (i) That the following boards of education be reimbursed the operating costs of the special education classes listed below, effective from the dates shown:—

North York Board of Education:

Special Vocational Class (Downsview C.I.)

No. of pupils—20 to 25

I.Q. Range—65 to 75

Age Range—14 to 16 years.

Department of Education approval—February 4, 1955.

Effective date of reimbursement—June 1, 1956.

Toronto Board of Education:

Academic Vocational Classes (5)—(To be located as follows:

Western Tech.-Comm. School—2 classes

Parkdale C.I.—1 class

Central H.S. of Commerce—1 class

Eastern H.S. of Commerce—1 class).

No. of pupils—22

I.Q. Range—80 to 85

Age Range—14 to 16 years.

Department of Education approval—1948.

Effective date of reimbursement—September 1, 1956.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that the special education classes listed above be approved for reimbursement of operating costs, effective from the dates shown.

The motion was carried.

- (ii) That, insofar as academic vocational classes in secondary schools are concerned, reimbursement of operating costs of such classes be on the basis of the per pupil cost for the regular classes in the schools in which the special classes are being operated.

The Board, on motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mr. Eve, concurred in the recommendation of the Advisory Council.

9. From the Advisory Council submitting a report as requested by the Board having reference to the effect of sections of the building code upon school construction. The report suggested that in lieu of requesting representation on the committee appointed to consider a uniform building code for the Metropolitan area, the School Board authorize the preparation of a brief by the Council embodying comments included in the report for presentation to the building code committee. (For details of report, see Appendix p. 296).

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the Board concur in the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Council.

The motion was carried.

10. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the Township of North York. The North York Board has indicated that it has no objection to the amendment.

Amendment No. 53—re-zoning of an area on the northwest corner of York Mills Road and Victoria Park Avenue from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area on the west side of Victoria Park Avenue, north of Eglinton Avenue from Residential to Commercial.



re-zoning of areas between the east branch of the Don River and the C.N.R., south of Finch Avenue East, from Open Space to Residential and Greenbelt to Residential.

re-zoning of an area on the west side of Dufferin Street, north of Lawrence Avenue from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of areas north of Sheppard Avenue West, between the C.P.R. and Main Street from Industrial to Residential, Industrial to Commercial, Industrial to Open Space, Residential to Industrial, and Residential to Commercial.

The Board, on motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Stinson, concurred in the comments of the North York Board of Education.

11. From the North York Board of Education advising that that Board has no objection to an application before the Ontario Municipal Board for subdivision of the lands now used as St. Andrew's Golf Course.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Grayson, moved that the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board.

The motion was carried.

12. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to subdivision plans:—

T-9803—42 lots

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Yorkview Drive Public School, eventually a school located to the north of the Hydro property. Block "B" should be re-located so as to give access to the north. Secondary students will attend Northview Heights Collegiate.

T-9831—21 lots

Public school pupils will attend Owen Boulevard Public School. Secondary students will attend York Mills Collegiate.

The Board, on motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Grayson, concurred in the comments of the North York Board.

13. On May 29, 1956, the School Board considered an application of the North York Board of Education for the sale of the Westminster Parkway Site to the Corporation of the Township of North York for park purposes. The School Board directed that should the sale be undertaken an appraisal be made of the property and the North York Board be apprised of the price at which the School Board would approve the sale.

The Secretary reported that the North York Board desires to proceed with the sale and is now in the process of having a previous valuation of the property brought up to date.

Mr. Grayson, seconded by Mr. Bonham, moved that the North York Board be advised that the Metropolitan School Board is prepared to consider the revised valuation of the North York Board in connection with the sale of the property and is making no arrangement at the present time to have a further valuation.

The motion was carried.

#### **Consideration of Reports**

Report No. 10 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated June 12, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 281.

Report No. 10 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated June 14, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 283.

#### **General Business**

The rules were suspended to admit the following:

Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the Metropolitan School Board request the Ad-

visory Council to study and report on accommodation needs for technical education in the Lakeshore District, Etobicoke Township and Township of South Peel over the next 10 years.

The motion was carried.

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Communications

14. From the Toronto Board of Education submitting the following resolution adopted by that Board on May 24, 1956:—

“That the following attendance area, approved by the York Township Board, be included in the attendance area for Hughes Public School, effective September 1, 1956:

- “(a) The north side of Rogers Road (from the east side of Kane Avenue to the C.N.R. tracks).
- (b) The east side of Kane Avenue between Rogers Road and Kersdale Avenue.
- (c) Both sides of Kersdale Avenue between the east side of Kane Avenue and where it joins Silverthorn Avenue.
- (d) Silverthorn Avenue to the north side of Aileen Avenue from Kersdale Avenue northerly to No. 405.
- (e) Both sides of Aileen Avenue between Silverthorn Avenue and Blackthorn Avenue.
- (f) Blackthorn Avenue North (almost to Dunraven Drive) No. 432.
- (g) The area on the south side of Rogers Road Road and south to the city limits, east from the C.N.R. tracks to No. 189 Rogers Road.”

The communication was received on motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Martin.

15. From the Advisory Council recommending that, subject to receipt of Department of Education approval, the North York Board of Education be re-

imbursed the operating costs of the following special education classes, effective September 1, 1956:—

Opportunity Class (Saranac Public School)

No. of pupils—15

I.Q. Range—65-75

Age Range—7 to 12 years.

Opportunity Class (Maple Leaf Public School)

No. of pupils—15

I.Q. Range—65-75

Age Range—7 to 12 years.

Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that the recommendation of the Advisory Council be adopted.

The motion was carried.

16. From the East York Board of Education advising of accommodation problems existing in the western section of the Township and requesting the School Board to join with the East York Board in a study of the problem including the possible acquisition of the Teachers' College on Pape Avenue as a means of relieving over-crowding in schools in the western section of the Township.

Mr. Martin, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that the delegation previously appointed to wait upon the Minister of Education to bring specific requests of the Board to his attention be requested to enquire of the Minister regarding the possible use of the Teachers' College on Pape Avenue by the East York Board of Education.

The motion was carried.

17. From the Advisory Council reporting, as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee, with respect to provision of junior kindergarten facilities in schools in the Metropolitan area. The report indicated that the Council does not recommend establishment of junior kindergarten facilities in the Metropolitan area at the present time in view of the following considerations:—

- (i) shortage of accommodation for pupils above kindergarten level;
- (ii) difficulties being experienced in financing new buildings and additions;
- (iii) scarcity of qualified kindergarten teachers;
- (iv) hazards of travel for young children to and from school.

The Advisory Council further points out that in many municipalities the practice is to admit to kindergarten at the beginning of September children who will be 5 years of age by the following December 1st with the result that many children are in fact admitted to kindergarten prior to 5 years of age.

Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that the Report of the Advisory Council be received.

The motion was carried.

18. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for public school purposes:—

Excess Cost of Anthony Road School—	\$7,746.00—
Almore Avenue School—	\$36,186.00—
Baycrest Avenue	—\$28,098.00—
Roding Street School—	\$14,885.00.
Metro Share .....	\$ 86,915.00
Local Share .....	Nil
Total .....	86,915.00
Ceiling .....	n/a

Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that FINAL approval be given to the application of the North York Board.

The motion was carried.

19. On February 22, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board gave FINAL approval to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Vradenburgh Public School 12 standard classrooms, double kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

---

Metro Share .....	\$272,000.00
Local Share .....	80,800.00
Total .....	352,800.00
Ceiling .....	352,800.00

The Scarborough Board of Education has indicated that following careful consideration of the tenders submitted the board awarded the contract for the school to the second lowest tenderer, i.e. Dell Construction Company.

For the information of the Board, the Chairman of the Scarborough Board of Education briefly outlined reasons for the Scarborough Board's action in awarding the contract to the second lowest tenderer.

Following consideration of the foregoing, Dr. Long, seconded by Mr. Martin, moved that having heard a confidential report outlining reasons why the second lowest tender was accepted by the Scarborough Board the Metropolitan School Board advise the Metropolitan Council that it approves acceptance of the second lowest tender, namely The Dell Construction Company.

The motion was carried.

20. From the North York Board of Education advising that since the Department of National Defence has not seen fit to complete the proposed agreement for the education of pupils on Crown lands (R.C.A.F. Station, Downsview Airport) whereby the North York Board of Education would erect suitable accommodation for same and be reimbursed the capital charges for such accommodation plus a per pupil fee, the North York Board has revised its plans for the proposed Keele-Sheppard Public School. Originally the North York Board proposed a school consisting of 20 grade classrooms, 2 kindergartens, playroom-auditorium and ancillary space at an estimated cost of \$558,600.00. This accommodation was proposed for both North York resident pupils and children of R.C.A.F. personnel Downsview Airport. The North York Board in view of the foregoing now proposes to provide accommodation for North York resident pupils only in a school

consisting of 12 grade classrooms, 2 kindergartens and playroom-auditorium and accordingly requests tentative approval of same. Estimated cost for this project is \$352,800.00. (Ceiling formula—\$352,800.00).

Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Lang, moved that tentative approval be given to the revised application for Keele-Sheppard Public School.

The motion was carried.

21. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of public school sites:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Dorcot Public School Site:	
6.72 acres .....	\$ 48,600.00
North of Lawrence Avenue and east of Midland Avenue, Part of Lot 26, Con. 1.	
Date school required—September 1957	
No. of classrooms proposed—12.	
Morrish Road Public School Site:	
6.677 acres, plus 20 foot entrance to Morrish Road .....	24,575.00
West of Morrish Road, north of Elles- mere Road, Part of Lot 7, Con. II.	
Date school required—September 1957.	
No. of classrooms proposed—8.	

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that the applications be approved.

The motion was carried.

	Estimated Total Cost
Hunter's Glen Public School Site:	
Site Proper .....	8.2 ac. \$ 61,900.00
Right of way from Midland Avenue .....	.3 "

Right of way from Hailey- bury Drive .....	.3 "
---	------

Total	8.8 ac.
-------	---------

East of Midland Avenue, south of  
Lawrence, Part of Lot 26, Conces-  
sion D

Date school required—September 1956.

No. of classrooms proposed—12.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that since the Metropolitan School Board has established 8 acres as the maximum size for a public school site under normal conditions, the Board approve for debenturing purposes from the bulk site fund the purchase of 8 acres only for the Hunter's Glen Public School Site in the amount of \$56,300.00, being 8/8.8 of the estimated total cost of \$61,900.00.

The motion was carried.

22. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following replies of area boards of education with respect to a request of the School Board for adoption of a uniform procedure for assessment revision:—

**EAST YORK:**

The Board has not yet considered the matter but will receive a recommendation from its Business Administrator at its next meeting favouring the adoption of the procedure.

**ETOBICOKE:**

The Board has not yet considered the matter nor is its Business Administrator ready to indicate what recommendation he will make.

**FOREST HILL:**

The Board has not yet considered the matter but will receive a recommendation from its Secretary-Treasurer at its next meeting favouring the adoption of the procedure.

**LAKESHORE:**

The Board has agreed to follow the procedure.



LEASIDE:

The Board has agreed to follow the procedure (for 1 year only).

NORTH YORK:

The Board has agreed to follow the procedure.

SCARBOROUGH:

The Board has not yet formally considered the request but is at present following the procedure as laid down.

SWANSEA:

The Board has agreed to follow the procedure.

TORONTO:

The Finance Committee has agreed to the procedure which is essentially the one being followed at present.

WESTON:

The Board has agreed to follow the procedure.

YORK:

The Board has agreed to follow the procedure.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mrs. Norman, moved:—

- (i) That the area boards of education be advised that the procedure recommended for consideration by the boards on May 29 has been considered generally acceptable by a majority of area boards and that implementation of the uniform plan be undertaken as of September 1st, 1956, and further that in the event that any individual board declines to follow the procedure the Metropolitan School Board make the necessary arrangements to see that the work is done in the manner described in the recommended procedure.
- (ii) That the Metropolitan Assessment Revision Committee be requested to recommend the form of reports to be sent to the Metropolitan School Board by area boards in regard to assessment revision.

The motion was carried.

23. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for public school site extension:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Givins Public School Site Extension:	
.14 acres .....	\$124,000.00
Shaw Street—Nos. 150, 152, 154.	
Bruce Street—Nos. 2, 4, 6.	

The Board, on motion of Mr. Morton, seconded by Mr. Grayson, approved the application for Givins Public School Site Extension.

#### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 10 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated June 12, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 290.

Report No. 10 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated June 14, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 295.

The Board adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, July 24, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

Present: Messrs. Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Power, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman Mr. J. C. Van Esterik, occupied the Chair.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

#### Communications

From the Executive Secretary submitting for consideration the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of properties required for parking facilities adjacent to the Toronto Board's administration building:

	Estimated Total Cost
New Administration Building (Parking Lot) .....	\$300,000.00
1.05 acres.	
McCaul Street—7 lots.	
Henry Street—10 lots.	
Date required—1956.	

Miss Perney, seconded by Dr. Long, moved that the Board resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider the application and that the Vice-Chairman be Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was carried.

The Committee of the Whole rose.

The Secretary reported on behalf of the Committee of the Whole that the Committee recommends as follows:

“That the application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$300,000.00 for purchase of 1.05 acres to be used as parking lot for the new administration building be approved.”

On motion of Mr. Morton, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole was adopted.

The Board adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, September 18, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Hartley, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

Owing to the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. J. C. Van Esterick, occupied the Chair.

The minutes of the meetings held on June 19 and July 24, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From Mrs. McBrien, Messrs. Ferguson, Lang and Milgram regretting their inability to be present.

Received.

2. From Miss Joyce Burne expressing appreciation on behalf of herself and Russell Pickering for the wedding gift presented to them by members of the Board.

Received.

3. From Mrs. M. Temple expressing appreciation to the members of the Board for their recent expression of sympathy.

Received.

4. From the Executive Secretary suggesting that the October School Board meetings be held on October 16 and 30 with Committee meetings during the respective weeks previous in view of the Convention programme during the first week in October.

On motion of Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Hartley, the Board decided that Board meetings during October would be held on the 16th and 30th with Committee meetings held during the respective weeks previous.

5. From the Royal Ontario Museum reporting on the increase in the number of pupils from Metropolitan Toronto visiting the Museum and suggesting that Superintendents of the various boards be urged to have their classes visit the Musuem during the autumn and winter to leave the spring months free for out-of-town classes. The communication was referred to the Board by the Finance Committee with the suggestion that area board chairmen urge their respective boards to support the Royal Ontario Museum.

Received, on motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Dr. Lockhart.

6. From the Executive Secretary submitting as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee further information regarding development in the area around subdivision plan T-10010, Township of North York.

On motion of Mr. Peck, the Committee deferred consideration of the communication in order that it might be considered with section 1 of Report No. 11 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, regarding sub-division plans.

7. From the Executive Secretary advising that arrangements have been made for parking accommodation for Board and Buildings and Sites Committee meetings under the building at 20 Eglinton Avenue East until such time as other accommodation can be secured.

Received.

8. From the North York Board of Education forwarding a copy of a letter to the Department of National Defence advising them that the North York Board has approved assumption of normal responsibility for the education of children residing on Downsview Airport following dissolution of the R.C.A.F.

Downsview School Board and with the understanding that school taxes are being paid by or on behalf of parents of these children.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mr. Martin, moved that the matter be referred to the Finance Committee for further study and recommendation.

The motion was carried.

9. From the Municipality of New Toronto submitting the following resolution adopted by the Council on September 12, 1956:—

“THAT this Council does hereby endorse the resolution of the Metropolitan School Board passed on May 15th, 1956, whereby a per foot frontage levy in new sub-divisions and a levy per acre for industrial lands can be charged, such revenue to be used for the purchase of necessary school sites:

“AND THAT a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Metropolitan School Board and to the Lakeshore District Board of Education.”

Received, on motion of Mr. Morton, seconded by Miss Perney.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 6 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, dated September 11, 1956. Appendix p. 301.

Miss Perney, seconded by Dr. Long, moved that subsection (2) of section 3 of the Report having reference to a report of existing attendance areas in Metropolitan Toronto be amended to read as follows:—

“(2) That the areas listed under (a), with the exception of Item 10, Public Schools, and Item 4, Secondary Schools, be confirmed.”

The motion was carried.

Section 3, as amended, was adopted.

The Report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 11 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated September 11, 1956. Appendix p. 311.

The Board had before it for consideration in conjunction with Section 1 of Report No. 11 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, a communication from the Executive Secretary indicating proposed development in the area surrounding T-10010 and pointing out the vast building programme to which the School Board's comments with respect to subdivision plans seem to have committed it.

Following discussion, Section 1 was adopted without amendment.

The Report was adopted, without amendment.

Report No. 11 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated September 13, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 316.

Report of Special Summer Committee, Part I, dated September 7, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 330.

### **General Business**

Mrs. Norman, seconded by Mr. Martin, moved that an expression of the Board's appreciation be conveyed to the Chairman and members of the Etobicoke Board of Education for the recent tour of Etobicoke schools.

The motion was carried.

## **PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.**

### **Consideration of Reports**

Report No. 6 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated September 11, 1956. Appendix p. 321.

With respect to Section 1 of the Report regarding extension of the Hughes Public School attendance area to include York Township pupils, Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Peck, moved that sub-section (a) of Section 1 be deleted.

The motion was carried.



---

Section 1, as amended, was adopted.

The Report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 11 of Buildings and Sites Committee Part II, dated September 11, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 323.

Report No. 11 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated September 13, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 328.

Report of Special Summer Committee, Part II, dated September 7, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 340.

The Board adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

---



## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, October 16, 1956.

The Board met at 8.00 p.m.

The Chairman, G. F. Ferguson, in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Hartley, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on September 18, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From the Toronto Board of Education submitting the following resolution adopted by the Toronto Board at its meeting on September 20, 1956:—

“That, at the request of the Metropolitan School Board, the area of East York known as the Bennington Heights district be included as an optional attendance area for Jarvis and Oakwood Collegiates for academic pupils, and in the attendance area of Northern Technical-Commercial School for commercial and technical pupils, until further notice, viz., from the Belt Line east along Moore Avenue to the C.P.R. right-of-way south along the C.P.R. right-of-way to the Don River and West to the city limits.”

The communication was received.

2. From the Toronto Board of Education advising that the enrolment at Boulton Avenue Junior Vocational School has now reached the point where the Toronto Board is unable to accept additional pupils until further notice.

The communication was referred to the School Accommodation Committee for consideration.

3. From the Executive Secretary submitting as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee at its last meeting a clarification of the classification of areas designated as Open Space and Greenbelt in connection with proposed Amendment No. 48 to the Official Plan of the North York Township Planning Area.

The Board deferred the communication for consideration with Section 1 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

4. From Gordon S. Adamson & Associates, Architects, submitting further information as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee regarding site conditions at Thistletown Collegiate Institute Site.

The Board deferred the communication for consideration with Section 8 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

#### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated October 9, 1956. Appendix p. 357.

The Board had before it for consideration in conjunction with Section 1 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, a communication from the Executive Secretary indicating use of areas classified as Open Space and Greenbelt in connection with the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the North York Township Planning Area:—

Amendment No. 48—

re-zoning of an area east of the proposed extension of Highway 400 immediately north of the northern boundary of the Township of York from Greenbelt to Open Space.

re-zoning of an area east of the proposed Highway 400 extension immediately south of Flamborough Road from Greenbelt to Residential.

The North York Board has indicated that it has no objection to proposed Amendment No. 48. However, the Board feels that Greenbelt areas should be preserved rather than developed as residential areas.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that Section 1 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, be amended by the addition of the following as sub-section (b) :—

“That the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the North York Township Planning Area with the exception of the comment regarding preservation of Greenbelt areas:—

Amendment No. 48—

re-zoning of an area east of the proposed extension of Highway 400 immediately north of the northern boundry of the Township of York from Greenbelt to Open Space.

re-zoning of an area east of the proposed Highway 400 extension immediately south of Flamborough Road from Greenbelt to Residential.

The North York Board has indicated that it has no objection to proposed Amendment No. 48. However, the Board feels that Greenbelt areas should be preserved rather than developed as residential areas.”

The motion was carried.

Section 1, as amended, was adopted.

The Board had before it for consideration in conjunction with Section 8 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, a communication from Gordon S. Adamson & Associates, Architects, submitting additional information regarding site conditions at Thistletown Collegiate Institute Site. The communication explained the necessity of earth moving on the site to facilitate the building of the school at a cost of \$19,240.00.

The Executive Secretary reported for information of the Board:—

- (a) that due to an error, the Etobicoke Board's application for capital funds for Thistletown C.I. as shown in Section 8 should read as follows:—

Metro Share .....	\$ 360,000.00
Local Share .....	710,550.00
Total .....	1,070,550.00
Ceiling .....	918,000.00

- (b) that with respect to the special allowance requested by the Etobicoke Board of Education to be added to the ceiling formula for site conditions, i.e. \$27,294.00, only \$8,054.00 appeared to be justified in view of action taken by the Board previously in regard to site conditions. The amount of \$8,054.00 is made up as follows:—

Grade beams and re-inforced concrete ...	\$5,500.00
Retaining wall and cantilever .....	2,554.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,054.00

- (c) that if the application for Thistletown C.I. is approved in the amount of \$1,070,550.00, the Etobicoke Board will exceed by approximately \$65,000.00 the balance remaining to its credit in the 1956 composite capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that section 8 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:—

“8.(a) That revised FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education:—

Thistletown C.I., 12 standard classrooms, Art, Music, 2 Science Labs, Library, 2 Home Economics, 2 Shops, Typing Room, double gymnasium, cafeteria.

---

Metro Share .....	\$ 360,000.00
Local Share .....	710,550.00
Total .....	1,070,550.00
Ceiling .....	918,000.00
	144,496.00*
	8,054.00**
	<hr/> \$1,070,550.00

\*Portion of 30% allowance against future addition

\*\*Special allowance for site conditions.

(b) that since the Chairman of the Etobicoke Board of Education has indicated that Hilltop Senior Public School will not likely be proceeded with before 1957, the Etobicoke Board be requested to withdraw their application for Hilltop Senior Public School should such withdrawal be necessary in order that the Etobicoke Board stay within the amount included in the Metropolitan School Board's 1956 capital estimates."

The motion was carried.

Section 8, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 12 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated October 11, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 364.

Report of Joint Meeting of Chairmen's Committee and Finance Committee, dated October 11, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 370.

### General Business

With respect to preparation of the 1957 capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board, the Executive Secretary submitted the following recommendations for consideration:—

- (a) that area boards of education be requested to submit at the earliest possible date their tentative 1957 capital programme,

- (b) that area boards of education be requested to submit an indication of their capital programmes for the next five years in connection with a request made by the Metropolitan Council for an estimate of capital projects required in the Metropolitan area during the next ten years.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Power, the Board authorized the Executive Secretary to communicate with the area boards of education as recommended in (a) and (b) above.

The rules were suspended to admit the following:—

Mr. Morton, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that the Buildings and Sites Committee be requested to establish a policy with respect to the granting of allowances in excess of the ceiling formula for reasons of abnormal site conditions.

The motion was carried.

## PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

### Communications

5. The Buildings and Sites Committee, at its meeting held on October 9, had before it for consideration the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for new public school accommodation:—

Thompson Farm Public School, 10 classrooms, double kindergarten, auditorium-playroom, and ancillary space.

Estimated Cost .....	\$ 301,350.00
Ceiling .....	301,350.00
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
Anticipated enrolment at school opening—400.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—470.	

From the supporting data presented by the Scarborough Board it appeared difficult to justify the erection of a double kindergarten even for the future.



Accordingly, the Committee referred the application back to the Scarborough Board for further consideration. Under date of October 10, the Scarborough Board indicated that it had agreed to amend the application to provide for erection of 10 standard classrooms and a single kindergarten, as follows:—

Thompson Farm Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, auditorium-playroom and ancillary space.

Estimated Cost .....	\$ 279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

On motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Eve, the Board gave TENTATIVE approval to the revised application of the Scarborough Board of Education.

6. From the North York Board of Education requesting clarification of the attendance area for public school pupils residing in the vicinity of Park Lane Circle and Lawrence Avenue, east of Bayview Avenue, since the North York Board is considering the possible erection of a public school in the immediate vicinity.

On motion of Miss Perney, seconded by Dr. Long, the Board referred the communication to the School Accommodation Committee for consideration.

7. From the North York Board of Education requesting that consideration be given to the provision of school dental service for North York pupils in attendance at Toronto schools. The communication expressed the opinion that since the North York pupils are under the jurisdiction of the Toronto Board of Education such pupils should receive the same dental services as provided for Toronto pupils. However, as the cost of the dental service in Toronto schools is borne solely by the City of Toronto, the Toronto Board of Health has ruled that the North York pupils are not eligible to receive dental treatment at the Toronto school clinics.

Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mr. Hartley, moved that the Executive Secretary be requested to secure from

the appropriate medical officers of health details of existing arrangements with respect to dental service for North York pupils enrolled in Toronto schools and to report thereon to the School Accommodation Committee.

The motion was carried.

8. From the Executive Secretary submitting as requested by the Buildings and Sites Committee a report of a special committee appointed to review the plans and facilities of Rockcliffe Handicraft School with particular reference to the following:— (a) capacity of the proposed school and (b) general suitability of the proposed plant as a junior vocational school (handicraft unit). (For details of report see Appendix "A", page 381.)

The Board deferred the report for consideration with section 4 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated October 9, 1956. Appendix p. 371.

In connection with section 4 the Board had before it for consideration a report of a special committee appointed to review the plans and facilities of Rockcliffe Handicraft School, for details of which see Appendix "A", page 381.

Following consideration of the report, Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that section 4 be amended by deleting the last paragraph and substituting the following therefor:—

"It is recommended that the application for Rockcliffe Handicraft School be approved, as follows:—Metro Share—\$120,000.00; Local Share—\$340,000.00; Total—\$460,000.00, and further that since the amount included in the York Township

---

Board's capital estimates for public school accommodation has been exhausted, the necessary additional funds for Rockcliffe Handicraft School in excess of the amount previously approved be transferred from the secondary school capital estimates of the York Township Board of Education."

The motion was carried.

Section 4, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 12 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated October 11, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 377.

The Board adjourned at 9.35 p.m.



## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, October 30, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, G. F. Ferguson, Esq., in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Grayson, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on October 16 were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications.

1. From Messrs. Eve, Hartley and Martin regretting their inability to be present.

Received.

2. From the Executive Secretary reporting for information of the Board that final approval of the Ontario Municipal Board has been received for the following projects:—

Etobicoke Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
Albion Gardens P.S. ..\$	227,850.00	May 30
Castlebar P.S. ....	227,850.00	April 18
Eatonville P.S. ....	81,155.00	March 8
Elmlea P.S. ....	83,077.00	September 14
Etienne Brule P.S. ....	244,185.00	October 12
Royal York C.I. ....	514,000.00	March 27
Royal York C.I. (cafeteria) .....	22,647.00	September 17
Westway P.S. ....	330,750.00	September 25

## Lakeshore District Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
John English P.S. ....	\$ 483,770.00	October 12
Mimico High School ...	202,500.00	April 10

## North York Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
Excess Costs: Anthony Rd., Almore Ave., Baycrest Ave., and Roding St. P.S. ....	\$ 86,915.00	August 29
Champlain P.S. ....	176,400.00	February 7
Highview Ave. P.S. ....	176,400.00	March 29
Mallow Road P.S. ....	227,850.00	February 29
Northview Heights C.I. ....	1,535,000.00	March 28
Victoria Park P.S. ....	260,000.00	February 17
Wilkie Blvd. P.S. ....	240,000.00	March 16
Wilmington St. P.S. (addition) ....	170,000.00	June 11
York Mills C.I. ....	1,012,500.00	June 20
Yorkview Dr. P.S. ....	123,000.00	October 12
Downsview P.S. (addition) ....	154,000.00	August 21
Downsview C.I. (extra cost) ....	285,000.00	February 28

## Scarborough Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
Birch Cliff P.S. ....	\$ 126,150.00	March 28
Chine Dr. P.S. ....	168,710.00	September 12
Cliffside P.S. ....	37,200.00	March 21
Golf Road P.S. ....	217,120.00	March 27
West Hill P.S. ....	40,000.00	September 25
George B. Little P.S. ...	352,800.00	July 11
Lynwood Heights P.S. ...	227,850.00	July 24
Manhattan Park P.S. ...	301,350.00	August 9
Vradenburgh P.S. ....	352,800.00	July 23

## Toronto Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
Essex Street P.S. ....	\$ 607,500.00	July 11
Givins Sr. P.S. ....	624,750.00	July 27
Ogden P.S. ....	433,650.00	September 7
Old Orchard P.S. ....	202,125.00	April 9

## York Township Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
Briar Hill P.S. ....	\$ 210,310.00	June 7
Lambton Park P.S. ....	70,000.00	July 11

## East York Board of Education.

	Amount	Date of Approval
Plains Road P.S. ....	\$ 176,400.00	April 26

Received.

3. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the Scarborough Board of Education with respect to the following subdivision plan:—

Township of Scarborough.

T-9834—13 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ionview Public School.

Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Morton, moved that the Board concur in the comments of the Scarborough Board of Education.

The motion was carried.

4. From the Executive Secretary submitting for approval the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of secondary school sites:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Cedar Brae Secondary School Site 6.935 plus 5.34 = 12.275 acres .....	\$127,000.00

435-foot frontage on Markham  
Road, south of Lawrence Avenue  
(west side).

Date school required—January 1, 1958.

No. of Classrooms Proposed—25.

W. A. Porter Memorial C.I. Site 15 acres plus .88 acres plus 2.048 acres for road and entrance .....	\$192,000.00
--	--------------

Warden and St. Clair Avenues.

Date school required—September 1, 1957.

No. of Classrooms proposed—25, cafeteria,  
Double Gym.

The .88 acres was the residue of the property  
owned by the Sisters of St. Joseph at that  
location and necessary to obtain the site.

The 2.048 acres are necessary to extend Fairfax  
Crescent to Warden Avenue and to provide  
access to the school property.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that

- (a) the application for Cedar Brae Secondary  
School Site be approved; and
- (b) the application for W. A. Porter Memorial C.I.  
Site be approved on the understanding that not  
less than 2.048 acres will in due course be con-  
veyed to the Scarborough Township Council  
for road purposes.

The motion was carried.



5. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds:—

Maintenance Shop and Warehouse. Purchase of properties known as 180 and 182 Norseman Street.

Metro Share .....	Nil
Local Share .....	\$ 66,795.00
Total .....	66,795.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

(20 per cent. of this project is chargeable to the secondary school account and 80 per cent. to the public school account.)

On motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board gave FINAL approval to the application.

6. From the Etobicoke Board of Education enquiring whether or not an amount of \$19,240.00 required due to site conditions at Thistletown Collegiate Institute might not be more properly a charge against the bulk site fund rather than a charge against the cost of construction of the school.

At the meeting of the School Board held on October 16, the Etobicoke Board of Education requested that consideration be given to increasing the ceiling formula for construction of Thistletown Collegiate Institute by an amount of \$19,240.00 required due to site conditions. The School Board, however, could not see its way clear to approve the amount as a special allowance in excess of the ceiling and directed that the required funds be charged against the allowance for a future addition to the school.

On motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mrs. Norman, the communication was referred to the Buildings and Sites Committee for study and recommendation.

7. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

(Comments of the Executive Secretary are indicated with an asterisk.)

Township of North York.

T-10047—38 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Churchill Avenue Public School.

Intermediate students will eventually attend Senlac Junior High School.

Secondary students will attend Northview Heights Collegiate.

\*5 portable classroom units are being used at the present time at this school. However, when the Yorkview Drive School is completed, a transfer of pupils will be effected.

T-10156—224 lots.

Public school pupils will eventually attend a school in the vicinity. The North York Board will require approximately 5 acres as part of a junior high school site within the easterly part of the proposed subdivision. Secondary students will eventually attend a collegiate in the northeast of the Township.

T-10290—45 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Blythwood Public School in Toronto.

Secondary students will attend a Toronto secondary school (academic)—North Toronto C.I.; vocational—Northern Technical-Commercial School)

T-10291—12 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Blythwood Public School in Toronto.

Secondary students will attend a Toronto secondary school (academic—North Toronto C.I.; vocational—Northern Technical-Commercial School)

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education.

Mr. Grayson, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, moved that the motion be amended to read as follows:—

“that the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to subdivision plans T-10047 and T-10156, but that subdivision plans T-10290 and T-10291 be referred to the School Accommodation Committee for study.”

The amendment was lost.

The motion was carried.

8. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds:—

Alderwood C.I.. Additional funds required to complete project.

Metro Share .....	Nil
Local Share .....	\$ 22,000.00
Total .....	22,000.00

The original approval for Alderwood C.I. was \$850,000.00. The actual cost of the school to September 27, 1956, is \$872,000.00. The ceiling formula for the Alderwood C.I. is \$918,000.00.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the Board gave FINAL approval to the application.

9. From the Executive Secretary submitting communications from the Deputy Minister of Education, the Metropolitan Solicitor and the North York Board of Education having reference to

(a) dissolution of the Downsview R.C.A.F. School Board;

- (b) status of pupils resident on Downsview R.C.A.F. Station insofar as maintenance assistance payments are concerned;
- (c) legislative grants payable on behalf of pupils resident on Downsview R.C.A.F. Station;
- (d) amount of grant to be paid by the Federal Government to the North York Board of Education for provision of school accommodation for pupils of R.C.A.F. personnel at Downsview Airport;
- (e) breakdown of pupils resident on R.C.A.F. Station Downsview in schools throughout the Metropolitan area.

On motion of Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the communications were referred to the Finance Committee for study and recommendation.

#### **General Business.**

The rules were suspended to admit the following:

Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that during the month of December only one meeting of the School Board be held, namely Tuesday, December 18, and that the Committee meetings be held during the preceding week.

The motion was carried.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that the congratulations and best wishes of the School Board be extended to Dr. C. F. Cannon, former Deputy Minister of Education, upon his appointment as Chief Director of Education, and to Mr. F. S. Rivers and Mr. C. W. Booth upon their recent appointments as Deputy Ministers of Education.

The motion was carried.

---

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING  
PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

**Communications.**

10. From the Executive Secretary submitting for approval the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of a public school site extension:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Park Public School Site Extension.	
18,000 square feet or .41 acres .....	\$138,000.00
On Shuter Street, Nos. 466, 466½A, 466½B, 472, 472½A, 472½B and 474.	

(Present site approximately 3 acres)

In order that the foregoing application may be approved the Toronto Board of Education indicated that it was agreeable to a reduction in an approval granted earlier this year (July 24) in an amount of \$300,000.00 for purchase of properties required for a parking lot adjacent to the Board's administration building. Under such an arrangement, the Toronto Board of Education would proceed with the purchase of properties required for the Park Public School site extension and in addition the purchase of properties required for the parking lot up to an amount of \$150,000.00.

On motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Lang, the Board approved the application for Park Public School site extension subject to the conditions outlined above.

11. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation.

Three Valley Drive P.S. 4 standard classrooms, kindergarten.

---

Metro Share .....	\$100,000.00
Local Share .....	24,950.00
Total .....	124,950.00
Ceiling .....	124,950.00

Date school required—September 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—97.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—194.

On motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Morton, the Board gave FINAL approval to the application.

12. On March 23, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education:—

Garden Avenue Public School. 6 standard classrooms, kindergarten, playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$140,000.00
Local Share .....	34,000.00
Total .....	174,000.00
Ceiling .....	176,400.00

The Board had before it an application from the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for the project in the amount of \$262,730.00 together with a request that the amount to be debentured be increased to \$176,400.00, i.e. the ceiling allowance. The Toronto Board of Education proposes to provide the balance of funds required, namely \$86,330.00, from current funds.

On motion of Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, the Board approved the revised application for Garden Avenue Public School.

13. From the Etobicoke Board of Education requesting permission to sell to the South Peel Board of Education one portable classroom unit at a price of \$4,000.00.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board approved the sale of one portable by the Etobicoke Board of Education at a price of

\$4,000.00 subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor and in accordance with the provisions of Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

14. From the North York Board of Education requesting permission to sell the property known as the Yonge Street School since the property is no longer used or required for public school purposes. As of January 1st, 1954, no debentures were outstanding against the land or building.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board approved the sale of the property subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor and in accordance with the provisions of Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

15. From the North York Board of Education submitting as requested a valuation in the amount of \$52,700.00 of the property known as Gorman Park owned by the Corporation of the Township of North York required by the North York Board of Education for a public school site. The communication indicated that the North York Board will withdraw its previous application for purchase of the Gorman Park site in the amount of \$108,000.00 and substitute therefor an application in the amount of \$53,500.00.

On motion of Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mrs. Norman, the Board approved the valuation prepared by H. W. Cooke & Son.

16. On September 18, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board gave FINAL approval to an application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for erection of John G. Althouse Public School (formerly known as Gainsford Public School) in an amount of \$279,300.00.

The Etobicoke Board has now submitted an application for capital funds for erection of John G. Alt-

house Public School in the amount of \$315,840.00 made up as follows:—

General Contractor's Tender .....	\$301,294.00
LESS deletions and modifications to specifications ...	16,907.63
	<hr/> \$284,386.37
Architects' Fee—6% .....	17,063.63
Furniture and Equipment .....	16,500.00
Contingencies .....	8,550.00
	<hr/> \$326,500.00

The Etobicoke Board of Education requests that the ceiling allowance for the school be raised from \$279,300.00 to \$315,840.00 by the addition of a 15 per cent. allowance against a future addition to the school. The difference between the estimated cost of the project (\$326,500.00) and the debenture requested (\$315,840.00) would be borne out of current funds.

On motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mrs. Temple, the Board approved the application on the understanding that if necessary, the Etobicoke Board be requested to withdraw their application for Hilltop Senior Public School should such withdrawal be necessary in order that the Etobicoke Board stay within the amount included in the Metropolitan School Board's 1956 capital estimates.

17. From the Executive Secretary submitting for TENTATIVE approval the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Courcelette Public School:

Addition of 9 standard classrooms and general purpose room to a recent addition to the school; demolish original school in due course and provide area with new school.



---

Estimated Cost .....	\$231,525.00
Special demolition charge .....	6,800.00
	<hr/>
	\$238,325.00
Ceiling .....	231,525.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Present enrolment—358.

Anticipated increase—32.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board gave TENTATIVE approval to the application.

The Board adjourned at 9:50 p.m.



## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, November 13, 1956.

The Board met at 8.00 p.m.

The Chairman, Mr. G. F. Ferguson, in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Lang, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on October 30 were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From Mr. J. H. Hartley regretting his inability to be present. Received.

2. From Messrs. F. S. Rivers and C. W. Booth thanking the Board for congratulations extended to them upon their recent promotions to the position of Deputy Ministers of Education.

Received.

3. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the area boards of education concerned regarding the following proposed amendments to Official Plans:—

Township of North York:

Amendment No. 61—

re-zoning of an area on the west side of Mills Road, south of Eglinton Avenue, from Greenbelt to Industrial

re-zoning of an area west of Yonge Street, south of Lorraine Drive, from Commercial to Residential

The North York Board has indicated that it has no objection to the proposed amendment.

Township of Etobicoke:

Amendment No. 111—

re-zoning of an area on the west side of Royal York Road, south of Dixon Side Road, from Residential to Commercial

The Etobicoke Board of Education has indicated that it has no objection to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mr. Peck, moved that the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke and North York Boards of Education.

The motion was carried.

4. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following subdivision plan:—

Township of North York

T-10310—22 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Owen Boulevard Public School, eventually a public school to the east. No lands are required within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision for the purposes of a public, junior high or secondary school site, but an access must be provided to the southeast as an extension of York Road so that children will eventually be able to attend a school to the east of Wilkets Creek. Intermediate pupils will eventually attend St. Andrews Junior High School. Secondary students will attend York Mills Collegiate.

On motion of Dr. Lockhart, seconded by Mr. Eve, the Board concurred in the comments of the North York Board.

5. From the Chairman of the Board submitting for consideration a report and recommendations of a meeting held between representatives of the Board and the Metropolitan Council regarding apportion-

ment of capital costs of school projects and other matters. (For details of report, see Appendix "A", p. 395.)

Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that recommendations (ii) to (vi) inclusive be approved but that since a recommendation with respect to payment of maintenance assistance payments on the basis of the current year's average daily attendance is included in Report No. 13 of Finance Committee, Part I, no action be taken in regard to section (i).

The motion was carried.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 7 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, dated November 6, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 385.

Report No. 13 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated November 6, 1956. Appendix p. 387.

In regard to section 4 having reference to Ledbury Park and Highland Hill Junior High Schools Mrs. Temple, seconded by Mr. Lang, moved that, at the time of the Hearing before the Ontario Municipal Board, the Metropolitan Solicitor be requested to make a statement on behalf of the Metropolitan School Board embracing the following points:—

- (a) that through its endorsation of the report entitled, "Report on The Organization of The Intermediate Grades", the School Board has indicated its approval in principle of a three level system of education;
- (b) that, after careful examination, the School Board has approved the applications for conversion of the Ledbury Park Public School to a senior public school (grades 7, 8 and 9) and the erection of Highland Hill Senior Public School (grades 7, 8 and 9);

- (c) that in its examination of all building applications the School Board satisfies itself that construction of new building will not result in any long term surplus of classrooms and that an application for a third senior public school unit (grades 7, 8 and 9) was referred back to the North York Board of Education because it appeared that its construction would result in vacant classrooms in existing schools.

The motion was carried.

The report was adopted, without amendment.

Report No. 13 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated November 8, 1956. Appendix p. 390.

In connection with Section 3, the Board, on motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Martin, directed the Executive Secretary to forward the Board's request to the Minister of Education forthwith.

The report was adopted.

### **General Business**

With respect to the Committee meetings during the month of December, the Board decided as follows:—

Buildings and Sites Committee to be held on Tuesday, December 4.

Finance Committee to be held on Thursday, December 6.

(The Board previously decided to hold only one Board meeting during the month of December, i.e. Tuesday, December 18.)

### **PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.**

#### **Communications**

6. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Maryvale Public School (Addition No. 1)—6 standard classrooms and auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$120,000.00
Local Share .....	34,350.00
Total .....	154,350.00
Ceiling .....	154,350.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1957.

Thompson Farm School—10 standard classrooms, kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—September 1, 1957

Anticipated opening enrolment—400

Anticipated maximum enrolment—470.

On motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the Board gave FINAL approval to the applications of the Scarborough Board.

7. From the East York Board of Education enquiring as to whether the Metropolitan School Board will pay the transportation costs to and from school each day for pupils with legge perthes in attendance at regular schools.

Mr. Eve, seconded by Mr. Van Esterik, moved that the Board pay the transportation costs to and from school for pupils with legge perthes.

The motion was carried.

### Consideration of Reports

Report No. 7 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, dated November 6, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 392.

Report No. 13 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated November 8, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 393.

The Board adjourned at 8.50 p.m.





## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, November 27, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, in the Chair.

Present:—Messrs. Boland, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Lockhart, Long, Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on November 13, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications.

1. From Messrs. F. J. Boland, J. H. Hartley and W. Lang regretting their inability to be present.

Received.

2. From the Executive Secretary submitting for FINAL approval the following application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for erection of secondary school accommodation:—

Runnymede C.I.—Addition of 3 standard classrooms, Industrial Arts and Home Economics to be located in present auditorium space, Auditorium, Cafeteria, Staff rooms, Health room and Guidance rooms, rehabilitation work in basement.

Metro Share .....	\$ 60,000.00
Local Share .....	356,020.00
Total .....	416,020.00
Ceiling .....	416,020.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Present enrolment—677 (March, 1956).

Anticipated increase—794.

On motion of Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board gave FINAL approval to the application for Runnymede Collegiate Institute.

3. From the East York Board of Education reporting as requested on availability of accommodation for pupils from proposed subdivision Plan T-5644 (72 lots) in the Township of North York as follows:—

- (i) that at present none of the pupils from North York could be accommodated in junior elementary, intermediate or secondary schools, and
- (ii) that pupils from subdivision T-5644 could be accommodated in East York schools providing authority was given for additions to elementary, junior high and secondary schools.

On motion of Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Eve, the Board referred the communication to the Advisory Council for study and recommendation.

4. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

Township of North York.

T-10324—63 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Elkhorn Drive Public School, eventually Page Avenue Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend Bunty Lane Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-10352—498 lots.

The North York Board will require approximately 3.5 acres as part of a public school site. The proposed site of 3.55 acres (Block F) is geographically acceptable. Intermediate pupils will eventually attend Pleasantview Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Scarborough Secondary School.

T-10354—16 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Maple Leaf Public School. Intermediate pupils will eventually attend Gracefield Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate.

On motion of Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board concurred in the comments of the North York Board of Education.

#### Consideration of Reports.

Report No. 14 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated November 20, 1956. Appendix p. 399.

Mr. Peck, seconded by Mr. Campbell, moved that the first sentence of section 5 be amended to read as follows in order to conform with section 1 of Report No. 14 of Finance Committee, Part I, viz.:

“That the following applications of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of school sites be aproved on the understanding that the cost of same will not be applied against the bulk site appropriation but that separate application will be made to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval of the purchase of lands since the applications were not approved by the Council of the Corporation of the Township of North York:—”

The motion was carried.

Section 5, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report No. 14 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated November 22, 1956. Appendix p. 403.

Mrs. Temple, seconded by Mr. Morton, moved that section 5 having reference to a visit to the Ontario School for the Deaf at Belleville be amended by adding the name of Mr. Z. S. Phimister, Chairman of the Public School Committee of the Advisory Council.

The motion was carried.

Section 5, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

Report of Joint Meeting of Legislation and By-laws and Chairmen's Committees, dated November 22, 1956. Appendix p. 406.

With respect to section 2 of the report regarding an evaluation of the operation of the Metropolitan School Board with a view to the possibility of making the operations more effective, Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Milgram, moved that sub-section (i) of section 2 be deleted.

The motion was lost.

Dr. Long, seconded by Miss Perney, moved that sub-section (i) of section 2 be amended to read:

"That whereas the members of the Metropolitan School Board have over the past few years demonstrated an ability to undertake the duties assigned to it by the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act without significant bias to local loyalty, there seems therefore to be no need for change in the composition and method of selection of the members of the Metropolitan School Board and that this viewpoint be communicated to the Metropolitan Council and the provincial government in order that they may be aware of the Board's point of view."

The motion was carried.

Sub-section (i), as amended, was adopted.

Section 2, as amended, was adopted.

The report, as amended, was adopted.

## PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

### Communications.

5. From the Executive Secretary submitting for approval the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of public school sites:—

	Total Estimated Cost
Bendale Park Public School Site, 6.019 acres. Benshire Drive, north of Hydro Line ..... Date school required—September, 1957. No. of Classrooms proposed—10 plus single kindergarten, General Pur- pose Room.	\$47,400.00
Chancellor Drive Public School Site, 6.98 acres ..... Frontage on Chancellor Drive, south of Hydro Line, between Markham and Golf Road. Date School required—September, 1957. No. of Classrooms proposed—10.	51,150.00
Inglewood Heights Public School Site, 3.776 acres ..... Frontage on Dempster Street, east side of Lot 30, Con. 2. Date School required—September, 1957. No. of Classrooms proposed—10 plus Home Economics, Industrial Arts and Crafts.	34,200.00
Watford Heights Public School Site, 6.477 acres ..... Frontage on Moran Road, south boundary Plan 4382, to west limit of Lot 25, Con. 3. Date School required—September, 1957. No. of Classrooms proposed—9.	46,650.00
Warden Hydro Line Site, 6.198 acres ..... Frontage on Warden Avenue (west side), approximately half way	33,025.00

between Sheppard Avenue and Finch Avenue.

Date School required—December, 1957.

No. of Classrooms proposed—8.

On motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Mr. Grayson, the Board gave approval to the applications of the Scarborough Board of Education.

6. From the Scarborough Board of Education submitting an application for capital funds in the amount of \$283,285.00 for erection of Inglewood Public School (formerly known as Latcham Public School) consisting of 8 standard classrooms, kindergarten, industrial arts, home economics and auditorium-playroom.

Tentative approval of the Ontario Municipal Board for this project was given on July 26, 1956, in the amount of \$267,850.00, being the ceiling formula. The Scarborough Board of Education has indicated that the cost of construction and equipping the school will be \$296,024.20, and that an amount of \$12,739.20 will be provided from current funds. The application of the Scarborough Board requested that the ceiling formula for the school be increased by an amount of \$15,435.00 as an allowance against a future 4-room addition.

On motion of Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board approved the application for capital funds in the revised amount of \$283,285.00.

#### **Consideration of Reports.**

Report No. 14 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated November 20, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 409.

Report No. 14 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated November 22, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 412.

The Board adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

## Metropolitan School Board

Tuesday, December 18, 1956.

The Board met at 8:00 p.m.

The Chairman, G. F. Ferguson, in the Chair.

Present: Messrs. Boland, Bonham, Campbell, Eve, Grayson, Lockhart, Long Martin, Might, Milgram, Morton, Peck, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien, Norman, Temple and Miss Perney.

The minutes of the meeting held on November 27, 1956, were confirmed.

### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

#### Communications

1. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendments to the Official Plan of the Etobicoke Planning Area:—

#### Amendment No. 112—

Re-zoning of an area south of Richview Side Road, west of Highway No. 27 from Residential to Commercial.

The Etobicoke Board of Education has noted that the proposed amendment would serve to locate a regional shopping centre adjacent to the proposed Briarcrest Public School. The Board does not favour the location of shopping centres in such proximity to a school site from the point of view of increased traffic, and would therefore ask that the intention to re-zone this particular area for commercial use be re-considered.

#### Amendment No. 113—

Re-zoning of an area on the east side of Weston Road north of Barker Avenue from Commercial to Residential.

The Etobicoke Board of Education has no objection to the proposed amendment.

On motion of Mrs. McBrien, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the Board concurred in the comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education.

2. On November 13, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board withheld approval of subdivision plan T-10274 (Regent Park South) until the Toronto Board of Education made satisfactory arrangements for purchase of land required for the extension of the Park Public School site.

The Toronto Board of Education has advised that the City of Toronto has agreed to sell to the Toronto Board the land necessary for Park Public School site extension for an amount of \$23,000.00.

On motion of Mr. Morton, seconded by Mr. Might, the Board approved release of subdivision plan T-10274 and directed that the Department of Planning and Development be advised that the Toronto Board of Education has completed satisfactory arrangements with regard to acquisition of the necessary land.

3. From the President of the Bennington Heights Home and School Association forwarding a copy of a communication sent to the Commissioner of Works for East York Township expressing concern that proper provision be made for the safety of children in the planning of the Bayview extension of the Don Valley Expressway.

On motion of Mr. Martin, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, the Executive Secretary was directed to secure such information as may be available from the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board with respect to the proposed Bayview extension of the Don Valley Parkway and further that upon receipt of the information the School Accommodation Committee consider the necessity of revising existing attendance areas for pupils residing in the Bennington Heights district of East York Township.



4. From the Weston Board of Education submitting the following resolution adopted by that Board on December 5, 1956, having reference to enrolment at Weston Collegiate and Vocational School:—

“IN view of the projected enrolment by areas, and the graphs supplied, plus the report of the Fire Department objecting to use of the third floor,

“BE IT RESOLVED, THAT this Committee recommend to the Board of Education that a copy of the graphs, etc., be forwarded to the Metropolitan School Board, requesting that the School Accommodation Committee make a new survey early in 1957 with a view of reducing the attendance for 1957-58.”

On motion of Mrs. Norman, seconded by Miss Perney, the Board referred the resolution to the Advisory Council for study and report to the School Accommodation Committee early in the new year.

5. From the Advisory Council submitting a report dated November 30th having reference to establishment of attendance areas and payment of operating costs of special education classes and recommending as follows:—

- (i) that the attendance areas as shown in Appendix “A”, page 449 for which no formal approval has been given previously be approved effective January 1, 1956;
- (ii) that area boards of education be reimbursed the operating costs of special education classes as shown in Appendix “B”, page 452 effective September 1, 1956.

On motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Miss Perney, section (i) of the Report of the Advisory Council was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mr. Martin, section (ii) of the Report of the Advisory Council was adopted.

6. From the Executive Secretary reporting for information of the Board that final approval of the Ontario Municipal Board has been received for the following projects:—

	Amount	Approval Date
Etobicoke Board of Education:		
Thistletown C.I. ....	\$1,051,310.	November 28
Scarborough Board of Education:		
General Brock P.S. ....	157,146.	November 22
Gooderham P.S. ....	227,850.	November 16
Hunters Glen P.S. ....	346,185.	December 5
Toronto Board of Education:		
King Edward .....	1,095,150.	October 26
Regent Park .....	610,050.	December 5
Wellesley .....	433,650.	November 7
York Township Board of Education:		
Rockcliffe .....	460,000.	November 16
Received, on motion of Mr. Van Esterik, seconded by Dr. Lockhart.		

7. From the Deputy Minister of Education forwarding a suggested draft amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act to permit maintenance assistance payments to be paid on the basis of the current year's average daily attendance rather than on the preceding year's average daily attendance as at present provided.

"Section 125 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, is amended by striking out the words "during the preceding year" in clauses (a), (b) and (c) and adding clause (d) as follows:

- (d) The monthly instalments for January to September, inclusive in any year shall be based on the average daily attendance for the preceding term of September to December inclusive and the monthly instalments for October to December in-

clusive shall be based on the average daily attendance of September of the current year."

Explanatory Note:

The maintenance assistance payments are based on the average daily attendance of the preceding year. Since the enrolment is increasing rapidly each September, the Metropolitan School Board wishes to base its payment on the average attendance of the current year. To do this, it would be necessary to make payments on an estimate which would be revised twice during the year and adjusted finally in the next year. The proposed legislation will make allowance for the increasing average attendance and will use data which are available prior to the date of payment.

Requested to comment, the Executive Secretary noted that the School Board's petition to the Minister of Education with respect to maintenance assistance payments requested that payments be made on the basis of the current year's average daily attendance rather than the preceding year's average daily attendance and at that time it was suggested that section 125 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act could be amended by substituting the word "current" for the word "preceding" in all sections of section 125. Such an amendment would permit the School Board to make payments to area boards during the year as is the case at present with a final adjustment early in January of the following year when the average daily attendance for the month of December has been received from the area boards of education.

Mrs. Temple, seconded by Mrs. Norman, moved that the communication from the Deputy Minister of Education be acknowledged and that in reply the Department of Education be requested to give consideration to amending section 125 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act as originally requested by the School Board.

The motion was carried.

8. From the Executive Secretary recommending that area boards of education be reimbursed the operating costs of special education classes for the period June to November, 1956, as follows:—

	Public	Secondary
East York .....	\$ 10,745.83	\$
Etobicoke .....	19,927.35	
Forest Hill .....	2,061.78	
Lakeshore .....	5,230.84	
Leaside .....	2,479.60	
North York .....	36,433.75	1,414.20
Scarborough .....	24,245.31	
Toronto .....	326,858.18	95,691.43
Weston .....	1,227.48	
York .....	30,837.33	
	<hr/> \$460,047.45	<hr/> \$ 97,105.63

On motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the recommendation of the Executive Secretary was approved.

9. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of area boards of education concerned with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

#### Township of Etobicoke

##### T-9953—355 lots

Public school pupils will attend Eatonville Public School (kindergarten—grade 6) and Bloorlea Public School (grades 7 and 8). Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I.

##### T-10396—4 lots

Public school pupils will attend Humber Valley Village Public School. Secondary students will attend Etobicoke C.I.

##### T-10408—15 lots

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School. (Eventually a school will be constructed on Chapman Avenue site to serve children

from this area.) Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until Richview Collegiate is opened.

City of Toronto

T-10444—4 lots

Public school pupils will attend Rosedale Public School. Secondary students will attend Jarvis C.I., Central Technical School or Northern Technical-Commercial School.

Township of York

T-10348—113 lots

The York Township Board is not prepared to approve of subdivision plan T-10348 unless a public school site is provided in the subdivision plan. Secondary students will attend Runnymede C.I.

Comment of Executive Secretary:

The foregoing plan of subdivision is approximately one-half mile from Roselands Public School. The optimum capacity of the school is 800 pupils while the October, 1956, enrolment was 684.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Grayson, moved:—

- (i) that the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke and Toronto Boards of Education;
- (ii) that subdivision plan T-10348 (Township of York) be referred back to the York Township Board of Education together with the comments of the Executive Secretary for further consideration.

The motion was carried.

10. On October 16, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board referred the following application for capital funds for erection of intermediate school accommodation back to the North York Board of Education for further review with particular reference to the matter of surplus junior school accommodation:—

	Estimated Cost	Ceiling
Bunty Lane Junior High School		
27 standard classrooms, 2 industrial arts, 2 home economics, and double gymnasium .....	\$1,139,250.	\$1,139,250.
Date school required—September, 1958		
Anticipated opening enrolment—822		
Total pupil spaces provided—1,085		

In October it was noted that by 1959 approximately 17 surplus rooms would result in the five existing schools in the Bunty Lane Junior High School attendance area when the grades 7 and 8 had been removed. Further data submitted by the North York Board indicated that the 17 surplus rooms would be utilized in two ways:

1. Establishment of 10 additional special education classes.
2. The balance of the 17 rooms which the North York Board indicates to be  $3\frac{1}{2}$  rooms would be used either to serve sparsely populated areas in the east from which pupils could be transported or for enrichment activities and projects, for audio-visual education, and for testing purposes.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mrs. Norman, moved that TENTATIVE approval be given to the application for Bunty Lane Junior High School.

Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Grayson, moved in amendment that the application be referred to the Advisory Council for study and report to the Buildings and Sites Committee at the earliest possible date.

The amendment was carried.

The motion was lost.

11. From the Executive Secretary submitting comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

## Township of North York

## T-9876 Revised—1,347 lots

The North York Board will require three school sites, one completely within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision, the other two partially within the boundaries. The proposed public school site of 4.5 acres (Block J) is geographically acceptable, as is part of a Junior High School site of 3.5 acres (Block G). Approximately 3 acres should be located along Broadgreen Road in the vicinity of Oasis Place as part of a secondary school site.

## Comment of Executive Secretary:

The North York Board office has indicated that the secondary school site will serve the area bounded by the Don Valley Parkway (Woodbine Avenue) on the east, Highway 401 on the south, the Don River on the west, and Steeles Avenue on the north.

## T-10399—300 dwelling units

Public school pupils will attend Sheppard Avenue Public School. Intermediate pupils will eventually attend Finch Avenue Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Downsview Collegiate.

On motion of Mr. Martin, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the Board concurred in the comments of the North York Board.

12. From the Property and Parks Committee of the Township of North York requesting that a meeting be arranged with representatives of the Metropolitan School Board, the North York Board of Education and Property and Parks Committee to discuss the valuations submitted for the Gorman Park property (\$53,500.00) and the Clanton Park school site (\$106,000.00).

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mr. Peck, moved that such a meeting be arranged by the Executive Secretary and that the members of the Finance Committee represent the School Board at such meeting.

The motion was carried.

13. From the Chairman reporting that as requested by the School Board, a delegation consisting of Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Ferguson and Van Esterik and the Executive Secretary, together with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council, the Metropolitan Solicitor and the Commissioner of Finance, waited upon the Minister of Education on Monday, December 17, to present petitions including requests for increased legislative grants. (Details of the petitions are shown in the School Board minutes dated November 13, Appendix pages 396 and 397, and November 27, Appendix page 404.)

The Metropolitan Council considered the School Board's petitions at its meeting held on December 11 and amended the petition by the inclusion in section (iv) of the Board's petition of the following:

“(iv) that the Province of Ontario be requested to pay a realistic percentage of the capital expenditures involved in the purchase of school sites or extensions thereof in the Metropolitan area.”

The Board received the report for information.

14. On November 20, 1956, the Building and Sites Committee referred back to the Etobicoke Board of Education for further consideration the following application for capital funds for purchase of a secondary school site since the data submitted did not seem to substantiate the need for a secondary school in the area proposed:

	Estimated Total Cost
Stock Farms Collegiate Institute Site—	
9.04 acres. Located on the west side	
of Royal York Road .....	\$ 56,000.00
Date school required—Indefinite.	

The Etobicoke Board has now resubmitted the application for approval stating that while the Board



admits there is some doubt regarding the necessity of providing a secondary school on the site, it is possible that development in the area which at present contains two golf courses will necessitate the erection of a secondary school. The Etobicoke Board pointed out that if the land is not acquired at this time, it may not be available in the future and even if the land is available, the price would increase substantially.

On motion of Mr. Milgram, seconded by Mrs. McBrien, the Board approved the purchase of the Stock Farms Collegiate Institute site to be applied against the bulk site appropriation.

#### **Consideration of Reports.**

Report No. 15 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated December 4, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 423.

Report No. 15 of Finance Committee, Part I, dated December 6, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 445.

#### **General Business.**

The rules were suspended to admit the following:

Miss Perney, seconded by Mr. Martin, moved that the Chairman of the Board be authorized to name a Committee to meet with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council in regard to the manner in which the 1957 per pupil ceiling formula is to be presented to the Executive Committee and to make such arrangements as may be required to support the Board's request for increases in the per pupil ceiling formula.

#### **PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.**

##### **Communications.**

15. From the Executive Secretary submitting the following applications of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds in connection with school sites:

	Amount
Essex Senior Public School Site .....	\$ 6,000.00
Additional funds required for demolition of houses and preparation of site.	
Garden Avenue Public School Site .....	17,000.00
(formerly Fern Avenue)	
Additional funds required for securing property, demolition of houses, preparation of site, closing lanes, etc.	
Estimated Cost for above properties .....	57,000.00
Less unexpended funds from former application .....	46,923.00
This application .....	<u>\$10,000.00</u>
King Edward Composite School Site 5,376 square feet. Lippincott Street—Nos. 160, 162, 164, 166. Required for play area. Additional funds required for demolition of houses on site and preparation of site for building purposes .....	\$26,000.00
Ogden Public School Site .....	9,000.00
Additional funds required for demolition of houses and preparation of site.	
Palmerston Public School Site .....	14,000.00
Additional funds required for demolition of houses and preparation of site, and closing lanes.	
Queen Alexandra Public School Site .....	7,000.00
Additional funds required for demolition of houses.	

Regent Park Public School Site .....	50,000.00
Additional funds required for demolition of houses on site and site preparation, for building purposes.	
Wellesley Public School Site .....	11,000.00
(now Church Street Public School). Additional funds required for demolition of houses and preparation of site, closing lanes, etc.	

Mr. Grayson, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, moved that the applications be approved.

The motion was carried.

16. From the Executive Secretary submitting for TENTATIVE approval the following application of the East York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Parkside Junior Public School—Addition of 6 standard classrooms.	
Metro share .....	\$120,000.00
Local share .....	nil
Total .....	120,000.00
Ceiling .....	154,350.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Present enrolment—585.

Anticipated increase—23.

Present school—10 classrooms and kindergarten.

On motion of Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Eve, the Board gave TENTATIVE approval to the application for an addition to Parkside Junior Public School.

17. From the Executive Secretary submitting for TENTATIVE approval the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Sheppard Avenue Public School—16 standard classrooms, 2 kindergartens, office, library, staff rooms, health room.

---

Estimated cost .....	\$455,700.00
Ceiling .....	\$455,700.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—600.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—713.

Mr. Stinson, seconded by Mrs. Norman, moved that the application be TENTATIVELY approved.

The motion was carried.

18. On Wednesday, September 19, the Public School Committee of the Advisory Council, as authorized by the Board, had a meeting with Dr. and Mrs. A. W. G. Ewing of Manchester University, England. The Ewings are considered to be world authorities on the education of the deaf and from this meeting a wealth of material has been compiled as part of the current study of the future of Sunny View School.

Dr. and Mrs. Ewing were the guests for a three-day period of the local chapter of the International Council for Exceptional Children. The half day afforded the Public School Committee was therefore time taken from their own leisure to give us the benefit of their experience. This service was freely given.

The Committee feels, however, that a professional service of this nature should not go unrecognized and recommends therefore that an honorarium in the amount of \$100.00 be authorized to be forwarded to Dr. and Mrs. Ewing.

On motion of Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Milgram, the Board authorized an honorarium of \$100.00 to be forwarded to Dr. and Mrs. A. W. G. Ewing.

19. Early in the fall the School Board had before it for consideration a list of attendance areas previously approved by the Metropolitan School Board together with a list of attendance areas having no specific approval. The following attendance area which is now submitted for approval is in the latter category:—

<u>Sending Board</u>	<u>Receiving Board</u>	<u>Boundaries</u>	<u>Grades to be Served</u>	<u>School</u>
North York	Toronto	North Melrose Ave. West Avenue Road South & East City of Toronto	K-8	John Wanless

The foregoing attendance area has been in operation for some time now and the officials of the North York and Toronto Boards are agreeable to continuance of the attendance area.

On motion of Miss Perney, seconded by Dr. Lockhart, the Board approved the above attendance area, effective January 1, 1956.

#### **Consideration of Reports.**

Report No. 15 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated December 4, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 447.

Report No. 15 of Finance Committee, Part II, dated December 6, 1956, was adopted. Appendix p. 448.

#### **General Business.**

At the request of the Board, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. J. C. Van Esterik, took the Chair.

On behalf of the Board, Mr. Power presented to the Chairman, Gordon F. Ferguson, the gavel used by him during his term as Chairman of the Board and expressed the hope that the gavel would be a constant reminder to Mr. Ferguson of the many worthwhile and happy hours as Chairman of the Board. Mr. Power referred to Mr. Ferguson's services on the School Board and on the Toronto Board of Education, expressed appreciation of the members for the manner in which he had conducted the meetings of the Board

and of his consideration and respect for the opinions of others.

Mr. Stinson, on behalf of the members of the Board presented a piece of luggage to Mr. Ferguson.

The Chairman acknowledged the gifts with thanks and paid tribute to the members for their co-operation and consideration which had made his duties so pleasant and his term as Chairman a most rewarding experience. Mr. Ferguson also expressed appreciation to the staff for their help and assistance over the past year.

The Chairman again took the Chair.

The Chairman spoke to the members regarding the advisability of arranging a semi-social evening early in the new year to which would be invited the Minister of Education, senior officials from his Department, and members of the Legislative Assembly representing the Metropolitan area for the purposes of enabling members of the Board to become acquainted with members who might support requests of the School Board in the Legislature. He suggested that an hour might be spent during the evening discussing problems currently before the Board.

The Chairman expressed the hope that the 1957 Board would give the suggestion consideration early in the new year.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

**APPENDIX**  
**to the**  
**MINUTES**  
**of the**  
**METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD**  
**1956**







# APPENDIX

---

## Metropolitan School Board

### INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF 1956 CHAIRMAN OF THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. Gordon F. Ferguson

I feel that first I must express to you, my colleagues, appreciation in your electing me Chairman of the Metropolitan School Board for 1956.

I shall do my utmost to vindicate your judgment as well as your kindness, and I do sincerely hope that 1956 will be a fruitful and satisfying year both in our own experiences and the opinion of our area Boards.

I covet both your co-operation and assistance as together we face each succeeding task or problem with which we may be entrusted or challenged. I feel confident that in harmonious understanding we shall not face any difficulty beyond our capacity to successfully solve.

Most of the members of the Metropolitan School Board are also trustees in the municipalities which they represent. As local trustees we have become accustomed in our local areas to the nature of the problems that concern an area board of education. The role of the Metropolitan School Board, however, is quite different from the role of the area boards. Locally we are concerned with a multitude of important decisions, but fortunately for us many of these may be made quickly against an established background of policy and tradition. In contrast, the Metropolitan School Board, a mere fledgling in comparison with the area boards, faces fewer problems; but these must be undertaken without the benefit of long experience or established policy.

The success or failure of the Metropolitan School Board therefore rests, not on the volume of its legislative pro-

gramme, but rather on its quality. This type of operation can be done most successfully by a body of trustees who are willing to question, to reflect, and debate at every stage in the evolution of a new idea. Intelligent participation in this type of activity assumes consistent and careful study of the various agendas and reports forwarded to trustees.

For many trustees with heavy local responsibilities and probably a subconscious first loyalty to the local area this poses a real problem. May I urge that all trustees attach much significance to the responsibilities we share in this room. Let us grant the same priority to the meetings and affairs of this Board as we already do to our local responsibilities.

Those who were present last Friday afternoon and evening were privileged to listen to a statement from Dr. John Long, which in my opinion clearly and sincerely represented the attitude which has brought success to this Board, when he told us what he believed to be our duty as Metropolitan trustees.

This Board has been fortunate in many of its efforts, but I believe one of its greatest strokes of good fortune as well as good judgment was the election of Dr. John Long as its first Chairman in 1953.

We who have served with Dr. Long have come to recognize the magnitude of that good fortune.

His statement made last Friday represented the inner convictions of a trustee keenly loyal to his own area board, but with an even deeper and stronger sense of responsibility to the combined problems of all area boards represented in this room.

His expressed opinion was a living challenge to each one of us and my personal wish is that Dr. John Long shall remain a member of this Board for many years and that each of us may emulate his loyalty of purpose in our attitudes and service.

I feel certain that I speak for those of my colleagues who have served this Board in 1953 and later that without

exception we recognize Dr. John Long as the "Dean of the Metropolitan School Board" and to which honour he alone is entitled.

At this Inaugural Meeting it is my privilege to summarize some of the major problems which shall be our mutual concern during the coming year.

#### I. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 1955 BOARD

Four major reports suggesting changes in or confirming previous policy await your consideration. The various committees will have an opportunity to consider these reports in detail, so it will suffice at the present time to list them for you:

1. The establishment of maintenance assistance payments becomes a responsibility of this Board for the first time in 1956. This important decision must be made prior to the consideration of our annual budget.
2. A comprehensive proposal with respect to non-resident fees affecting pupil exchanges within the Metropolitan area has been studied and endorsed by the Board of last year and will require early consideration.
3. Certain problems have developed in connection with the financial support by the Metropolitan School Board of Auxiliary Classes and a major report dealing with this problem is now complete.
4. The ceiling cost formula for school construction established in 1954 and administered through 1955 will require restudy in keeping with our obligation to the Metropolitan Council to keep this formula up to date.

#### II. CHANGES IN LEGISLATION

The 1955 Board submitted three requests for amendment to the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. Specifically, requests were made for:

- (a) Permission for local boards to substitute a member on the Metropolitan School Board in the event that the chairman declined to serve;

(b) Permission for the Metropolitan School Board to pay that portion of the non-resident fee above the per pupil cost of the sending board;

(c) Revision of the Act to provide that maintenance assistance payments be based on the average daily attendance of the current year.

The decision of the government on these three matters will affect the operation of this Board and therefore it is important that we understand fully the implications of the proposed changes.

### III. MATTERS REFERRED TO AREA BOARDS OF EDUCATION

It became apparent during 1955 that if the Metropolitan School Board was to fulfill its planning role that it should become as fully informed as possible regarding the long range plans of the area boards. As an aid to planning a very significant report "The Organization of the Intermediate Grades" was completed and forwarded to all trustees. The report, of course, was intended only as a guide but any trend toward the three-level system of education would certainly involve this Board. To an even greater extent the complementary report on the expansion of technical school facilities will immediately have Metropolitan implications. It is anticipated that area boards will, in due course, comment upon this latter report and indicate future plans with respect to technical education. The development of a composite proposal consistent with local aspirations will be a task of major proportions.

For those trustees dealing with matters exclusively affecting public schools, the reaction of the area boards to the proposal that the Metropolitan School Board become involved in assessment revision, perhaps even to the point of appointing additional staff for the purpose, will require careful study.

### IV. ADVISORY COUNCIL

During the past two years the Board has had the benefit of the advice of the Advisory Council. Many of the

reports previously referred to have been prepared as the result of study by this group. In addition to a wide range of reports which have recently been completed, Council is currently engaged in a comprehensive study of the swimming pool as a feature of school programme.

Thus far I have reviewed briefly the major areas of study which concerned us at the beginning of a new year of work. To these must be added the routine responsibilities of the Board.

### I. BUDGET

Preparation of the annual budget of the Metropolitan School Board is an integral part of the financial planning for the area as a whole and will affect the budget of each local area. For instance, it is necessary to complete the current estimates of this Board before the area boards may confidently include Metropolitan revenues in their own current budget. Yet conversely, the capital budget or composite proposal for the Metropolitan area of school building cannot be completed in this office until complete information has been submitted from the area boards.

### II. BUILDING PROGRAMME

Approval of the composite proposal carries with it, of course, the assurance to area boards that the projects so listed may be expected to be undertaken during the current year. The Buildings and Sites Committee however will be required to review the individual applications and fulfill the obligation of this Board to ensure that the need is entirely justified and that the proposed building is consistent with sound planning for the area as a whole.

The 1955 budget contained proposals anticipated to cost \$25,000,000.00. When the budget was presented to the Metropolitan Council, this Board's representatives were asked to reduce the total appropriation to approximately \$21,000,000.00. In the judgment of these representatives this latter figure represented a maximum amount of building which would be serviced during the year and it is interesting to note that Metropolitan Council approvals proved their judgment correct.

The rate of growth in certain of the suburbs however has exceeded our expectations. It is likely, therefore, that this Board will be required to support an even higher capital programme than was considered necessary last year. If we are to keep faith with our obligation, it will be necessary to review the composite proposal most diligently.

### III. SITE PURCHASE FUND

Late in 1954 the Metropolitan School Board was instrumental in securing from the Metropolitan Corporation and the Ontario Municipal Board a bulk appropriation for the purchase of sites. This achievement testifies to the prestige of our Board and the confidence which these allied agencies have in us. As a result of the establishment of this fund, site purchases have been made more readily and under more favourable terms for the area boards. The arrangement, however provides that each year a composite site proposal shall be prepared and its administration shall be a function of this Board. In view of the tremendous gain to the areas as a result of the fund, we have an obvious obligation to administer it wisely.

### IV. ATTENDANCE AREAS

Each year through the efforts of the Accommodation Committee the establishment of attendance areas whereby students of one municipality attend the schools of an adjacent municipality has resulted in a substantial reduction in school construction. This task is incidentally referred to as the Board's balance sheet. It has been estimated that exchanges of this kind have resulted in construction savings in excess of a million dollars. Against this can be matched the \$100,000.00 a year which it costs to operate the Board. We should expect therefore to continue our critical examination of school facilities along boundary lines with the object of seizing upon every opportunity to make the most effective use of our existing classrooms.

### V. AUXILIARY CLASSES

As the school systems of the area expand the need for additional special services to meet the needs of children with a wide range of handicaps is obvious but these facilities are costly, and it is important therefore that the ex-

pansion of special classes be done in an orderly economical fashion.

I am sure that you may be somewhat awed by this imposing list of responsibilities. In actual practice we have found that it is not necessary to carry on the full scale of meetings in order to keep pace with our legislative programme. During January, February and March undoubtedly the regular schedule of Committee meetings will be required. Indeed, as long as applications for new school construction are being reviewed the Building and Sites Committee and the Finance Committee will need to meet regularly. Much of this work however is seasonal in character and in order that members might not be called together more frequently than is necessary the By-laws were amended to provide that Committee meetings might be withdrawn in favour of consideration of items from a short agenda at the regular Board meeting. With this assurance that every effort will be made to use the time and energies of the members of this Board as effectively as possible may I urge that together we pledge ourselves to perform our task here to the best of our ability.

In conclusion, it would seem reasonable to observe that the Metropolitan form of government has sufficient advantages and has won enough good will during the past three years to ensure that it will be part of our municipal organization for the foreseeable future. As a Board it can be an agency standing in the way of local boards as they seek to unroll the red tape which makes the achievement of urgent goals most difficult. Such should not and must not be the case for the Metropolitan School Board is not another board; it is merely ourselves gathering together to consider matters of mutual interest. On this basis I feel confident that the Board deserves admission into the full partnership of planning and it is towards this objective that I believe we as trustees should set our sights.

Let each of us in our thinking and effort in planning and co-operation, not only see the need of the present but may we project our vision forward into the future, so that those who take up our unfinished tasks will in sincerity say of us, "They did not lag—They did their work well."

## Metropolitan School Board

DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 38  
January 10, 1956

## PART I

## 1. Employees Pension, G. D. Spry

Past Service Contributions Jan. 1/54 to Dec. 2/55 .....	\$ 788.69	
Board's Portion of Future Ser- vice for Dec./55 .....	7.53	\$ 796.22

## 2. Maintenance Assistance Payments

due January/56 Secondary (Est.) .....	814,017.25
---------------------------------------	------------

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 25, 1955

## 3. Advisory Council—Nov. &amp; Dec./55

Honorariums .....	\$1,920.00	
Travelling Expenses .....	480.00	\$2,400.00

## 4. Air Comfort Engineering Company

Supplies .....	12.36
----------------	-------

## 5. Bell Telephone Company

December .....	82.50
----------------	-------

## 6. Casselman Company Limited

Cleaning Supplies .....	6.89
-------------------------	------

## 7. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited

Meeting Expense .....	25.00
-----------------------	-------

## 8. Gestetner (Canada) Limited

Paper .....	\$58.08	
Ink .....	97.20	
Supplies .....	11.26	166.54

9. Henry Birks & Sons (Ont.)  
Limited

General Expense .....	17.74
-----------------------	-------

## 10. Instruments (1951) Limited

Map .....	6.93
-----------	------

## 11. Jacobson, Lipson and Richmond

Parking Lot Dec. ....	\$ 50.00	
Bldg. Rental Dec. 15-Jan. 14 .....	1,087.50	1,137.50



## Appendix

9

12. Kendall Printing Company Limited		
Supplies .....	\$	18.15
13. New York Window Cleaning Company		
November .....		12.00
14. Ontario Towel Service Limited		
November .....		10.00
15. Ofrex (Canada) Limited		
Supplies .....		64.00
16. Petty Cash (2)		
Supplies .....	\$	13.37
Meeting Expense .....		36.19
Postage .....		95.24
Miscellaneous .....		9.38
		\$ 154.18
Supplies .....	\$	8.39
Meeting Expense .....		26.83
Miscellaneous .....		7.12
		\$ 42.34
		196.52
17. Receiver General of Canada		
Postage .....		10.00
18. T. Sanderson & Sons Limited		
Supplies .....		39.60
19. School Progress Magazine		
Subscription .....		2.00
20. Stainton & Evis Limited		
Supplies .....		75.25
21. Staff Salaries		
Nov. 18—Dec. 1/55 .....	\$1,343.47	
Dec. 2—Dec. 15/55 .....	1,343.47	
Dec. 16—Dec. 29/55 .....	1,343.47	4,030.41
22. Staff Expense Allowances		
December .....		70.00
23. Toronto Hydro-Electric System		
November .....		19.53

24. Trustees' Allowances—Sept.  
to Dec.

Expense .....	\$2,131.97	
Travelling .....	174.16	\$2,306.13

25. Walter Stewart, Insurance  
Renewal Prem., Burglary & Robbery ..... 131.25

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION DECEMBER 13, 1955

26. Auxiliary Class Payments  
June to November, 1955 and  
1954 Adjustments—Socondary ..... 128,533.5227. Municipality of Metropolitan  
Toronto  
Treasurer ..... \$5,000.00  
Solicitor ..... 5,000.00  
Audit Dept. .... 8,500.00 18,500.00

---

\$ 972,687.29

## PART II

1. Maintenance Assistance  
Payments  
due January/56 Public (Est.) ..... \$1,841,072.55

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION DECEMBER 13, 1955

2. Auxiliary Class Payments  
June to November, 1955 and  
1954 Adjustments—Public ..... 463,012.84

---

\$2,304,085.39

## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 1 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, January 17, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Bonham, Eve, Ferguson, Hartley and Morton, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. (a) That the Report of the Advisory Council, dated December 29, 1955, having reference to reimbursement of the operating costs of special education classes by the Metropolitan School Board, be adopted. (For details of Report see Appendix "A", page 12).

(b) With regard to the section of the Advisory Council's report concerning education of the gifted child, your Committee recommends that in September, 1956, the Etobicoke Board of Education be invited to arrange for the presentation by an appropriate member of its staff of a report on the special education classes operated in that Township for gifted children. It is also recommended that the Executive Secretary secure from area boards of education a brief summary of special activities on behalf of gifted children for study in conjunction with the report from Etobicoke Township.

(c) The Committee further recommends that a complete review of the report on reimbursement of the operating costs of special education classes be undertaken early in 1957.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, January 31, 1956.

December 29, 1955.

To the Chairman and Members of the School Accommodation Committee:

The following extract from the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act 1953 governs the Metropolitan School Board's powers with respect to classes under the Auxiliary Classes Act:

"Section 126(1) It shall be the duty of the School Board and it shall have power,

(g) notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, to make provisions, if deemed expedient, for the payment to any board of education of any part or the whole of the cost of the education of pupils attending classes established under The Auxiliary Classes Act and other special classes authorized by the Minister, to the extent that such cost or part thereof exceeds the maintenance assistance payments paid in respect of such pupils;"

On March 23, 1954, the Metropolitan School Board approved a procedure by which it undertook to re-imburse area boards of education for the full cost of operation of classes operated under The Auxiliary Classes Act.

The basis of this re-imbursement was established as the average daily attendance in each type of class multiplied by the annual per pupil cost for each type of class. The arrangement was confirmed for all classes in operation on January 1, 1954, of the types listed in regulations 38 of Consolidated Regulations of Ontario, 1950. Re-imbursement on behalf of new classes was to be subject to the approval of the Metropolitan School Board.

There can be little doubt that the principal motive behind the action of the Metropolitan School Board was the elimination of a complicated schedule of non-resident fees; one fee for each type of class in each municipality. Implementation of the plan, however, gave emphasis to a second objective, i.e., that the boards collectively through representation on the Metropolitan School Board could avoid duplication of services and ensure an orderly growth and expansion of the auxiliary class programme.

Auxiliary education has been constantly changing. Thirty or more years ago classes existed mainly to give special aid

to children with marked physical handicaps and a special programme of instruction to children with very obvious learning limitations. Admissions to the latter type class were confined mainly to children with an I.Q. of 80 or less and return to the regular grade was a most infrequent outcome.

As school personnel became more competent in the identification and instruction of pupils with limited learning ability, they learned that factors other than low I.Q. caused retardation in school, i.e., emotional instability, unsatisfactory home environment, too frequent school transfers, etc. The techniques they had found so successful with the limited learner were applied to other forms of retardation. For most of these, reinstatement in the regular stream was the goal and hence to these classes and related activities the term 'remedial' was frequently applied.

Auxiliary class education became special education and the distinction between the regular school programme and the work done in special classes became less clearly defined. Each year school systems became increasingly versatile in their methods of meeting special needs of pupils under their care. Class types varied from school district to school district and their establishment was influenced by the economic status of the area, geography of the district, density of population and a whole range of related factors.

In its resolution authorizing re-imbursement to area boards the Metropolitan School Board accepted the range of classes as defined in "regulations 38". Review of the applications for new classes over the past two years has demonstrated the variety in type and emphasized the possibility of the Metropolitan School Board becoming involved in re-imbursement for classes which properly belong under general rather than special education. It has become obvious that a clearer definition was required of the types of classes for which the Metropolitan School Board should undertake full financial responsibility.

This need was given further emphasis when The Auxiliary Classes Act was repealed and incorporated as Section 5 in The Schools Administration Act. There has been no change in "regulations 38" but it has been intimated that these too will be re-written in the near future.

In its review of the types of classes listed under "Regulations 38", the Committee recognizes three main categories of classes, i.e., (i) classes for pupils whose physical handicaps affect school progress; (ii) classes for pupils who are educationally retarded; and (iii) classes for gifted pupils.

Separate recommendations are given below for each category.

#### I. Classes for physically handicapped.

It is recommended:

That the policy of reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board of the full cost of operation be continued for the following classes, admission to which is based on a physical handicap of some kind:

Aphasic Classes	Orthopaedic Classes
Braille Classes for Blind	Sanatorium Classes
Hard-of-Hearing Classes	Sight-Saving Classes
Hospital Classes	Speech Correction
Institutional Classes	Home Instruction
Oral Classes for Deaf	

The number of pupils in each class will be as provided in the Department of Education regulations for these classes.

#### II. Classes for pupils who are retarded.

As has already been pointed out, area boards of education have shown initiative and ingenuity in the type of classes established for pupils who are retarded educationally. No policy of the Metropolitan School Board should discourage this trend. It is important that area boards continue to recognize and to exercise their complete freedom within The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act in the development from local resources of special classes and services required to meet local needs.

The recommendations below propose that the present plan of reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board be continued for classes where a substantial majority of pupils have been admitted on the basis of low learning capacity. A three-level programme for such pupils is envisaged and accordingly three specific class types are defined. The report

assumes that this minimum service should be available to all school districts within the Metropolitan area and therefore should be a charge against the Metropolitan rate. In view of the present confusion of class names it is further proposed that the names shown be reserved exclusively for classes and schools which meet the conditions contained in the definitions.

It is recommended:

(a) TYPES

That for the purpose of the Metropolitan School Board the following three types of classes and special schools noted below be recognized:

(i) Opportunity Classes—For children of limited learning capacity between the ages of 7 and 16.

(ii) Academic Vocational Classes—Senior Classes of the "opportunity" types operated in the public elementary schools for pupils 12 years of age and over.

(iii) Special Vocational Classes—Classes operated under the secondary school panel for pupils ages 14 and over who have been in regular attendance in opportunity and/or academic vocational classes who would benefit from attendance in a secondary school. Exceptions may be made for the admission of eligible pupils who come from other than public schools in the Metropolitan area.

(iv) Special Vocational Schools—(Such as York Handicraft, Boulton Avenue Junior Vocational, Edith L. Groves Junior Vocational and Jarvis Junior Vocational Schools.)

(b) REIMBURSEMENT

(i) That area boards of education be reimbursed the full cost of operation of opportunity, academic vocational and special vocational classes provided that 75% of the pupils admitted shall have I.Q.'s of not more than 80. It is understood that the normal tolerance of 5 points shall be accepted in calculation of I.Q. The Committee believes that the provision for 25% of the class on other than mental ability will give the classes sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of all schools in the Metropolitan area.

(ii) That area boards of education be reimbursed the full cost of operating special vocational schools as outlined in sub-section (iv) of section (a) above and such other special vocational schools as may be approved by the Metropolitan School Board in the future, provided that the admission requirements outlined in sub-section (i) of section (b) Reimbursements are adhered to.

(c) ENROLMENT

That reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board shall also be conditional upon an area board's willingness to conform to the enrolment standard set forth below:

- (i) Opportunity classes, *16* plus or minus 4 pupils
- (ii) Academic Vocational classes, *20* plus or minus 4 pupils.
- (iii) Special Vocational classes, *20* plus or minus 4 pupils.

The enrolment of less than the number italicized above will be approved where there is a concentration of special problem cases or where the geography of the area makes it impossible to support the larger class.

STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT

It is recommended that the appropriate education officer be required annually to submit a statement verifying the eligibility of the classes under his jurisdiction in sections I and II above for reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board.

III. Classes for gifted pupils.

Existing regulations pertaining to the auxiliary class section (Part V) of The Schools Administration Act, 1954, make provision for *Advancement Classes* for children of superior ability. A few classes have been established, i.e., London, St. Catharines and Etobicoke, but there has been no significant trend toward the segregation of gifted children in special classes within the Act.

In response to an application of the Etobicoke Board of Education the Metropolitan School Board on September 13, 1955, on the advice of its Advisory Council decided that the reimbursement policy applicable to classes under the Auxili-



ary Classes Act should not apply to Advancement Classes. It is recommended that this policy be continued in 1956 and that Advancement Classes be not included in the list of special classes for the operation of which the Metropolitan School Board undertakes to reimburse area boards of education.

It has already been observed that the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act was deliberately contrived to leave area boards free to meet special problems in their own way. The view was taken that not all boards would decide to meet the needs of superior children through the establishment of special classes. A wide variety of practices can be observed in the classes of this area which favourably affect the progress of gifted children, i.e.:—

1. Identification of gifted children through standardized tests.
2. Check of effort and drive by matching achievement against ability.
3. Counsel of specialists in meeting the needs of gifted children.
4. Provision of flexible programmes particularly in the field of reading and mathematics.
5. Integration of library activities and regular school programme.
6. Acceleration up to one year of superior children.
7. Enrichment activities in the elementary grades and additional options in secondary school.
8. Provision for a wide range of co-curricular opportunities.
9. Mutual counselling between parent and teacher re gifted children.

However, although experiments in the field of Advancement Classes will be watched with interest, it has been concluded that such activities should be regarded along with

other efforts on behalf of the gifted, to be within the regular programme and therefore a legitimate charge against local rates.

Respectfully submitted,

C. C. GOLDRING,  
Chairman of Council.

---

REPORT No. 1 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
PART I.

Tuesday, January 17, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Lockhart, Milgram, Van Esterick and Mrs. Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That final approval of the Ontario Municipal Board has been received for the following projects:—

	Amount
East York Board of Education:—	
Selwyn Elementary .....	\$218,150.00
Selwyn Portables .....	18,000.00
George Webster Public School .....	6,000.00
Etobicoke Board of Education:—	
Douglas Park Public School .....	\$218,231.00
Kingsview Village Public School .....	227,850.00
Queensway Public School .....	45,000.00
Sir Adam Beck Memorial Public School .....	172,770.00
Lakeshore District Board of Education:—	
Seventh Street Public School .....	\$ 53,800.00
North York Board of Education:—	
Maple Leaf Public School .....	\$236,000.00

## Scarborough Board of Education:—

Administration Building .....	\$436,720.00
General Brock Public School .....	309,372.00
Regent Heights Public School .....	154,347.00
Terraview Public School .....	157,550.00
Portables No. 80-103 .....	164,520.00
Portables No. 65-79 .....	105,400.00
Agincourt High School .....	826,200.00
Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute .....	795,900.00
R. H. King Collegiate Institute .....	324,000.00

## Toronto Board of Education:—

Cottingham Public School .....	\$176,400.00
Palmerston Public School .....	573,171.00
North Toronto Collegiate Institute .....	847,273.00

## York Township Board of Education:—

Roseland Public School .....	\$142,000.00
------------------------------	--------------

2. Your Committee had before it for information a communication from the North York Board of Education giving notice that the Ontario Municipal Board has granted an Appointment of Hearing for Friday, January 27, 1956, at 10:00 a.m. with respect to the proposed capital outlay of \$60,000.00 from current revenue by the North York Board for purchase of ten acres of land immediately northwest of the intersection of and having frontage on Finch Avenue West and Bathurst Street.

Originally the North York Board of Education submitted an application for approval of capital funds in the amount of \$149,000.00 for the purchase of the Bathurst-Finch High School Site (Northview Heights C.I.). The North York Board proposed to buy 25 acres. However, the Metropolitan School Board decided to limit the size of secondary school sites which are purchased from capital funds to 15 acres. Accordingly the Board approved capital funds in the amount of \$89,400.00. As a consequence, the North York Board has decided to purchase the additional 10 acres for the Northview Heights C.I. from current revenues.

Your Committee instructed the Executive Secretary to attend the aforementioned Hearing and to advise the Ontario Municipal Board that the Metropolitan School Board

had established the principle that the bulk site appropriation (Ontario Municipal Board Order No. 2785) be restricted in its use to the acquisition of essential school property. For this purpose it was decided that approval would not be given for purchase within the bulk order of sites in excess of 8 acres for public school purposes and 15 acres for secondary school purposes. The Secretary was further instructed to state that consistent with this principle the Board had approved a proportionate amount of the total cost of the 25-acre site for the Northview Heights Secondary School from the bulk site appropriation and had suggested to the North York Board of Education that other means of financing be arranged for the balance of the cost.

3. That the Board concur in the comments of area boards of education with respect to the following subdivision plans and so advise the Department of Planning and Development and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board:—

Township of Etobicoke.

T-9171—6 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Eatonville Public School. Secondary students will attend Etobicoke C.I. pending completion of the Burnhamthorpe C.I. for September, 1956.

T-9202—7 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Wedgewood Public School. Secondary students will attend Etobicoke C.I. pending completion of the Burnhamthorpe C.I. for September, 1956.

T-9315—586 lots.

A public school site will be required in this subdivision. The Etobicoke Board requests that release of the plan be withheld until a signed Offer to Purchase has been obtained. Secondary students will be accommodated at Etobicoke C.I. until Burnhamthorpe C.I. is opened in September, 1956.

Township of North York.

T-8302 Revised—20 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Churchill Avenue Public School and eventually Yorkview Public School.

Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-8771 Revised—41 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Lillian St. Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9164—8 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Gorman Park Public School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-9180—9 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Churchill Avenue Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9183—7 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Rippleton Road Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I., later York Mills C.I. and eventually Don Mills C.I.

#### Township of Scarborough.

T-8848 Revised—444 lots.

T-8907 Revised—590 lots.

The Scarborough Board has indicated that it will require two public school sites from these adjacent subdivisions. In each instance one-half of the site will be required from each subdivision. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

The two school sites are required because of the fact that the southerly site will serve the Bendale Subdivision immediately south from the Hydro Line to Lawrence Avenue East between McCowans Road and Bellamy Road. The southerly site will also serve a small area immediately north of the Hydro Line.

T-9056—9 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Regent Heights Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9161—14 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Centennial Road Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

4. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following motion adopted by the 1955 Metropolitan School Board on December 13, 1955:—

“That it be recommended to the 1956 Board that the recommendations of the Advisory Council with respect to the per pupil ceiling formulae be adopted.” For details of recommendations, see Appendix, pages 23 to 42.

Your Committee recommends that the recommendations of the Advisory Council with respect to the per pupil ceiling formulae be adopted.

5. On December 13, 1955, the Board approved additional debenture financing for Downsview Collegiate Institute in the amount of \$246,506.00. The additional debenture financing covers the following items:—

Difference between existing debenture issue and ceiling formula for this school .....	\$219,675.82
Costs arising from re-location of the school (i.e. from the Westminster Parkview Site to the site at Keele Street and Wilson Avenue) .....	26,830.18
	<hr/> \$246,506.00 <hr/>

The application of the North York Board of Education was for an amount of \$285,000.00 and with the application was submitted a statement showing extra costs which in the opinion of the North York Board of Education were a direct result of the change of location. On the basis of an analysis of these costs the Metropolitan School Board at its meeting December 13, 1955, approved the amount set forth above, i.e. \$26,830.18, in excess of the ceiling formula, due to the change of location. This action was taken on the assumption that changes made by the North York Board during 1954 had the effect of bringing the project within the period of operation of the ceiling cost formula.

Subsequently, the North York Board of Education indicated its intention of appealing this decision to the Ontario

Municipal Board. This fact was conveyed to the Executive of the Metropolitan Council. The Chairman of the Board, the Business Administrator of the North York Board of Education, and the Executive Secretary were present at the Executive meeting for a discussion on this problem. There was general agreement at this discussion that there was some reasonable doubt that the formula should be applied to this school since its construction on the original site had been approved prior to the establishment of the Metropolitan School Board. The Executive Committee intimated that if the Metropolitan School Board was willing to certify that this project was approved prior to the establishment of the ceiling formula it would be recommended to the Metropolitan Council that the total application of the North York Board of Education, i.e. \$285,000.00, be approved.

Your Committee recommends that the Board now approve the application for additional capital funds in the full amount, i.e. \$285,000.00, and that the application be supported by a certificate, as requested, that in the opinion of the Board the approval of the Downsview C.I. was given prior to the establishment of the ceiling cost formula.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, January 31, 1956.

---

A. A CEILING COST FORMULA FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO AREA.

1956.

The History of the Formula:—

One of the priority tasks undertaken by the Metropolitan organization in January, 1954, was the review and approval of the applications for new school construction. From the outset representatives of the Metropolitan School Board were present at each Executive meeting with an imposing list of proposed school buildings. School applications were debated at length and it became increasingly evident that there was

need for a common understanding between the two bodies if the important work of building schools was to continue without interruption.

A variety of proposals were entertained but after a series of conferences held in the summer of 1954, it was decided that a formula should be established setting forth a ceiling cost within which the Metropolitan Council could be expected to give approval. Accordingly, the Advisory Council of the Metropolitan School Board was given the task of preparing and making recommendations with respect to this formula. The Advisory Council compiled school costs in the Metropolitan Area over the previous five years; studied school cost data from other urban centres in the province and from cities in the United States. On the basis of these studies costs of \$735.00 per pupil for public elementary school accommodation and \$1,350.00 per pupil for academic secondary school accommodation were established. Later in the year the formula was expanded to include a ceiling cost of \$1,050.00 per pupil for intermediate school accommodation, comprising any combination of grades 7-10. The Advisory Council has continued its study of this problem, and in this report suggests revisions to ceiling costs already approved and recommends a ceiling cost for public elementary schools, kindergarten to grade six (junior schools). A ceiling cost for vocational secondary schools is under study but will not be ready for presentation with the 1956 capital budget.

Most of the school projects processed during 1955 were within the ceiling formula. This, of course, was to be expected. School boards and their advisors can, from their wide experience, estimate building costs accurately. 1955 projects, therefore, were planned with the ceiling cost in mind and it is satisfying to note that most boards were able to adapt their school plans to the formula limitations. The cost of some projects, however, did exceed the formula. This confirms the effectiveness of the formula since in every case the excess could be interpreted in terms of some special feature or special problem not provided for in the ceiling cost formula.

It was agreed when the formula was first conceived that it should be reviewed on an annual basis and together with



such revisions as might be required incorporated in the annual capital budget of the Metropolitan School Board. While it is likely that this annual review will suffice to keep the formula consistent with fluctuations in building costs, it is possible that a rapid increase within a single year would impose an unreasonable limitation upon boards in their building activities. It is therefore recommended that, in the event of an increase in building costs in excess of 10% as of October 1, 1955, measured by the building cost index published in McLean's Building Guide, the Metropolitan School Board shall be expected to review and suggest any upward revision of the formula made necessary through the increased cost.

#### FORMULA—1956.

##### 1. Junior Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-6.

A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of junior public elementary school accommodation, grades kindergarten to 6, up to an amount calculated on the basis of \$735.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: single kindergarten classrooms—30; standard classrooms—35.

B. That in the case of applications for units of 6 classrooms or more where the board indicates that an addition will be required, that an additional amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 15 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated future addition. In such instances the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

(Note:—It might have been expected that Junior Schools could be constructed at a lower cost than a kindergarten to grade 8 school. The formula for these schools, however, is based upon a smaller unit, i.e., 12 rooms and kindergarten. Any significant reduction in the formula would have required the elimination of ancillary space completely. It was the

considered opinion of the committee that the inclusion of one general purpose area of approximately 2,000 square feet represents the minimum facility for this type of school.)

2. Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-8.

A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of public elementary school accommodation, grades kindergarten to 8, up to an amount calculated on the basis of \$735.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: single kindergarten classrooms—30; standard classrooms—35.

B. That in the case of applications for units of 8 classrooms or more where the board indicates that an addition will be required, that an additional amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 15 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated future addition. In such instances the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

3. General Shop and Home Economics.

That area boards of education be permitted to include in their requisition for capital funds one shop and one home economics unit for each 480 students of total enrolment in grades 7 and 8 at the rate of \$20,000.00 per unit.

4. Intermediate Schools—Any Combination of Grades 7-10.

A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of intermediate schools embracing any combination of grades 7 to 10 an amount calculated on the basis of up to \$1,050.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: standard classrooms—35; general shop and home economics units—20; single gymnasium unit—30.

B. That in the case of application for schools to accommodate 420 pupils or more, where a board indicates than an

addition will be required, that a further amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 20 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated addition. In such instances, the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

5. Academic Secondary Schools—Grades 9-13.

A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of academic secondary school accommodation, grades 9 to 13, up to an amount calculated on the basis of \$1,350.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: standard classrooms—30; general shop and home economics units—20; single gymnasium unit—30.

B. That in the case of applications for schools to accommodate 600 pupils or more where the board indicates that an addition will be required that a further amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 30 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated addition. In such instances the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

6. Special Cases.

A. That in the rehabilitation of existing accommodation, if the estimated cost exceeds 50 per cent. of the allowance under the formula for a new building to accommodate the same number of pupils, the area board concerned should consider demolition of the existing accommodation and erection of a new school unit;

(i) Where it is possible to determine the cost separately for rehabilitation features of any construction project, it is recommended that boards be permitted to request an increase in the ceiling formula with respect to any project involving rehabilitation up to the amount separately provided for in the contract for the rehabilitation. Each board's application for such increase would then be considered by the Metropolitan School Board on its merits.

(ii) Where such facilities as heating, plumbing, wiring, etc., are being replaced during a rehabilitation and construction programme, these facilities being installed to serve both the old school and the new unit, the proportion of the cost of replacement that the number of pupil spaces in the old school bears to the total pupil spaces in the old school and the new addition may be treated as rehabilitation cost.

It is understood, of course, that the Board would not likely approve a rehabilitation expense which exceeds 50 per cent. of the allowance under the formula for a new building to accommodate the same number of pupils.

B. That additions to existing facilities shall be within the formula already approved for new school accommodation.

C. That the Metropolitan School Board shall retain the right to approve the necessary capital financing for ancillary accommodation which an area board proposes to erect to bring the accommodation of any school in line with the minimum standards on which the formula is based.

In the event that a board gives evidence that in an addition or separate building to be part of a school unit where there is existing accommodation, it is recommended that the area board be permitted to increase the ceiling cost by the amount shown in the appropriate table for any ancillary features which the board proposes to erect to serve existing classroom accommodation.

ALLOWANCE FOR NON-INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS NOT PROVIDED  
FOR IN AN EXISTING BUILDING.

A. Junior Public Elementary Schools Grades K-6.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Spec. Space Construction Cost on a per classroom basis	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
Playroom, Library, etc. ....	2,000	970	\$2,740.00	\$ 600.00	\$3,340.00
Staff Room .....	400	190	540.00	120.00	660.00
Health Room .....	300	150	420.00	90.00	510.00
Principal's Office .....	250	120	340.00	70.00	410.00
	<u>2,950</u>	<u>1,430</u>	<u>\$4,040.00</u>	<u>\$ 880.00</u>	<u>\$4,920.00</u>

Costs based on \$12.00 per square foot.

## Metropolitan School Board.

## B. Public Elementary Schools Grades K-8.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Spec. Space Construction Cost on a per classroom basis	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
Playroom .....	2,000	1,000	\$2,120.00	\$ 470.00	\$2,590.00
Library .....	750	370	790.00	170.00	960.00
Special Purpose					
Room .....	350	180	370.00	80.00	450.00
Health Room .....	300	150	320.00	70.00	390.00
Staff Room .....	400	200	420.00	90.00	510.00
Principal's Office .....	250	130	270.00	60.00	330.00
	<u>4,050</u>	<u>2,030</u>	<u>\$4,290.00</u>	<u>\$ 940.00</u>	<u>\$5,230.00</u>

Costs based on \$12.00 per square foot.

## C. Intermediate Schools Any Combination Grades 7-10.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Spec. Space Construction Cost on a per classroom basis	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
Lunchroom and Kitchen .....	2,700	1,070	\$1,890.00	\$ 450.00	\$2,340.00
Dressing Rooms .....	1,000	400	700.00	160.00	860.00
Special Purpose Room .....	750	300	520.00	130.00	650.00
Staff Rooms .....	700	280	490.00	120.00	610.00
Guidance Offices .....	500	200	350.00	80.00	430.00
Health Room .....	450	180	310.00	70.00	380.00
Extra-Curricular Area .....	350	140	250.00	60.00	310.00
Principal's Office .....	500	200	350.00	80.00	430.00
	<u>6,950</u>	<u>2,770</u>	<u>\$4,860.00</u>	<u>\$1,150.00</u>	<u>\$6,010.00</u>

Cost based on \$13.00 per square foot and 26 instructional areas.

Double Gymnasium	Area	7,000	
	Applicable share of Walls and Corridors	2,780	9,780 square feet
	Contract Cost 9,780 at \$13.00		\$127,140.00
	Portion of Architect's Fees, etc., 9,780/54,790 of \$168,736.00		30,120.00
			<u>\$157,260.00</u>
	Less Cost allowed on per pupil basis 60 x \$1,050.00		<u>63,000.00</u>
			<u>\$ 94,260.00</u>
	Excess Cost per Classroom or Shop \$94,260/24 = \$3,930.00.		



## D. Academic Secondary Schools Grades 9-13.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Spec. Space Construction Cost on a per classroom basis	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
Auditorium .....	9,000	3,550	\$4,340.00	\$1,030.00	\$5,370.00
Cafeteria .....	6,000	2,370	2,900.00	690.00	3,590.00
Dressing Rooms, etc. Extra Curricular	1,500	590	720.00	170.00	890.00
Area .....	1,000	390	480.00	110.00	590.00
Guidance Offices .....	700	280	340.00	80.00	420.00
Staff Rooms .....	700	280	340.00	80.00	420.00
Health Room .....	300	120	140.00	40.00	180.00
Committee Room .....	200	80	100.00	20.00	120.00
Principal Office .....	850	340	420.00	100.00	520.00
	<u>20,250</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>\$9,780.00</u>	<u>\$2,320.00</u>	<u>\$12,100.00</u>

Cost based on \$13.50 per square foot and 39 instructional areas.

Double Gymnasium	Area	8,000	
	Applicable share of Walls and Corridors	3,160	11,160 square feet
	Contract Cost 11,160 at \$13.50		\$150,660.00
	Portion of Architect's Fees, etc., 11,160/92,150 of \$295,000.00		35,730.00
			<u>\$186,390.00</u>
	Less Cost allowed on a per pupil basis 60 x \$1,350.00		<u>81,000.00</u>
			<u>\$105,390.00</u>
	Excess Cost per Classroom or Shop \$105,390/37 = \$2,850.		

---

ADDITIONAL PRINCIPLES.

1. In calculating the formula allowance for an addition to an existing school the cost of the school or the cost of previous additions thereto shall be taken into account if school or additions were subject to the approval of the Metropolitan School Board.

2. Where a special feature has been incorporated in a school prior to the formula is found to be less than optimum from a size standpoint, an allowance may be made for bringing it up to the optimum size on a proportionate basis.

## EXAMPLE 1.

Assume a playroom in a public elementary school which was built prior to January 1, 1954 contains 1,200 square feet. The school is to be increased in size from 12 rooms plus kindergarten to 14 rooms plus kindergarten and it is desired to increase the size of the playroom to 2,000 square feet.

Solution.

A school of 12 plus K would normally provide sufficient funds for a playroom of  $13/17 \times 2,000 = 1,530$  square feet. Since the playroom that was built was only 1,200 square feet an additional allowance may be made of  $330/1530 \times \$2,590 \times 13 = \$7,260$ . The two additional rooms should provide sufficient funds to bring the playroom from 1,530 to 1,760 square feet. The other 240 square feet to bring the size up to 2,000 square feet would have to be financed out of current funds.

## EXAMPLE 2.

Assume a playroom in a public elementary school contains 1,000 square feet. The school as it existed at January 1, 1954 contained 10 standard classrooms and a kindergarten and has had an addition of 4 standard classrooms since that time at a cost of \$661.00 per pupil. It is now desired to bring the playroom up to 2,000 square feet and to add two more standard classrooms.

Solution.

A school of 10 plus K would normally provide sufficient funds for a playroom of  $11/17 \times 2,000 = 1,290$  square feet. Since the playroom that was built was only 1,000 square feet

an additional allowance may be made of 290/1,290 x 2,590 x	
11 = .....	\$ 6,400.00
The four room addition added since January 1/54	
at \$661.00 per pupil will provide 140 x (735. —	
661) = .....	10,360.00
	<u>\$16,760.00</u>

The proposed two room addition should provide sufficient funds to allow the increase in the playroom to be made without expenditure out of current funds.

\*No. of classrooms in optimum size elementary school (K—Grade 8).

#### DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS.

1956.

##### A. JUNIOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—Grades K-6.

1. Optimum Capacity of School—	pupil spaces
12 standard classrooms	420
kindergarten	30
	<u>450</u>
2. Optimum Area of School:	
(a) Instructional Space	
	Square Footage
12 standard classrooms at 750 .....	9,000
1 kindergarten (incl. wash-	
rooms, etc.) .....	1,100
	<u>10,100</u>
(b) Ancillary Space	
Special purpose area (Playroom,	
library, half classroom) .....	2,000
Staff room and staff washroom	
facilities .....	400
	<u>2,400</u>
(c) Administrative Areas	
Principal's office (including wash-	
room) .....	250

## Appendix.

37

Health room .....	300	
		550
(d) Service Areas		
Caretakers' and general storage	500	
Boiler room and coal storage .....	700	
Corridors .....	5,200	
Pupils' washrooms .....	1,000	
		7,400
		20,450
Inside and Outside Walls .....		2,200
		22,650
3. Calculation of Contract Price		
22,650 square feet at \$12.00 .....		\$271,800.00
4. Total Cost		
Contract .....		\$271,800.00
Architects Fees .....		16,300.00
Equipment .....		19,500.00
Site Improvement .....		15,000.00
Contingencies .....		8,150.00
		\$330,750.00
5. Per Pupil Cost		
\$330,750.00 divided by 450 .....		\$ 735.00
B. PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—Grades K-8		
1. Optimum Capacity of School—	pupil spaces	
16 standard classrooms	560	
kindergarten	30	
	590	
2. Optimum Area of School:		
(a) Instructional Space	Square Footage	
16 standard classrooms at 750 .....	12,000	
1 kindergarten (Incl. wash-		
rooms, etc.) .....	1,100	
	13,100	
(b) Ancillary Space		
Playroom .....	2,000	

## Metropolitan School Board.

Library .....	750	
Special Purpose room .....	350	
Staff room and staff washroom facilities .....	400	
		3,500
(c) Administrative Areas		
Principal's office (Incl. wash-room, etc.) .....	250	
Health room .....	300	
		550
(d) Service Areas		
Caretakers' and general storage .....	600	
Boiler room and coal storage .....	800	
Corridors .....	6,800	
Pupils' washrooms .....	1,200	
		9,400
		26,550
Inside and Outside Walls .....		3,090
		29,640
3. Calculation of Contract Price		
29,640 square feet at \$12.00 .....	\$355,680.00	
4. Total Cost		
Contract .....	\$355,680.00	
Architects Fees .....	21,340.00	
Equipment .....	25,500.00	
Site Improvement .....	20,460.00	
Contingencies .....	10,670.00	
		\$433,650.00
5. Per Pupil Cost		
\$433,650.00 divided by 590 .....	\$	735.00
C. INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS—Grades 7 & 8; 7, 8 & 9 or 7, 8, 9 & 10		
1. Optimum Capacity of School—	pupil spaces	
20 classroom areas .....	700	
2 general shops .....	40	
2 home economics .....	40	
1 double gymnasium .....	60	
		840

## 2. Optimum Area of School:

	Square Footage	
(a) Instructional Space		
15 standard classrooms at 750 .....	11,250	
1 library classroom .....	1,000	
1 music classroom .....	1,000	
1 art classroom .....	1,000	
2 science classrooms at 750 .....	1,500	
2 general shops at 1,200 .....	2,400	
2 home economics at 1,000 .....	2,000	
1 double gymnasium (and stage) .....	7,000	
	<hr/>	27,150
(b) Ancillary Space		
Lunch room .....	2,200	
Special purposes room .....	750	
Extra-curricular space .....	350	
Staff room or rooms .....	700	
Dressing rooms .....	1,000	
Kitchen (Pupil, Public, Staff) .....	500	
	<hr/>	5,500
(c) Administrative Areas		
Offices — Principal and Gen. Office .....	500	
Guidance and counselling .....	500	
Health room .....	450	
	<hr/>	1,450
(d) Service Areas		
Pupil washrooms .....	2,000	
Storage—		
caretaker .....	500	
athletic .....	400	
general .....	200	
	<hr/>	1,100
Boiler room and coal storage .....	2,000	
Corridors and entranceways .....	9,500	
	<hr/>	14,600
		48,700
Inside and Outside Walls, 12½%		6,090
		<hr/>
		54,790

3. Calculation of Contract Price		
54,790 square feet at \$13.00 .....		\$712,270.00
4. Total Cost		
Contract .....	\$712,270.00	
Architects Fees .....	42,736.00	
Equipment .....	81,000.00	
Site Improvement .....	25,000.00	
Contingencies .....	20,000.00	
		<hr/>
		\$881,006.00
5. Per Pupil Cost		
\$881,006.00 divided by 840 .....	\$	1,050.00

D. ACADEMIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS—Grades 9 to 13,  
10 to 13 or 11 to 13

1. Optimum Capacity of School—	pupil spaces
34 Classroom Teaching Areas	1020
2 Shops	40
1 Home Economics	20
1 Double Gymnasium	60
	<hr/>
	1140

2. Optimum Area of School:  
(a) Instructional Space

	Square Footage
25 Standard Classrooms at 700	17,500
2 Music Rooms —(1 Vocal, 1 Instrumental) 700 plus 1,000	1,700
1 Arts and Crafts .....	1,000
5 Science Laboratories (2 Chem., 2 Phys., 1 Gen.) at 1,000 .....	5,000
1 Library-Classroom .....	1,200
2 General Shops at 1,400 plus Storage 230 each .....	3,260
1 Home Economics .....	1,400
1 Double Gymnasium (Incl. Office and Bleacher Space)	8,000
	<hr/>
	39,060



---

**Appendix.****41**

(b) Ancillary Space		
Auditorium, (Incl. dressing rooms, stage, etc., for 600 pupils) .....	9,000	
Staff rooms .....	700	
Dressing rooms, showers, team rooms .....	1,500	
Cafeteria and Kitchen for 400 pupils .....	6,000	
Extra Curricular Activities .....	1,000	
	<hr/>	18,200
(c) Administrative Areas		
Principal, Vice Principal and General Office .....	850	
Guidance Offices .....	700	
Committee Room .....	200	
Health Room .....	300	
	<hr/>	2,050
(d) Service Areas		
Pupils' Washrooms .....	3,000	
Storage Space—		
caretaker .....	800	
athletic .....	600	
general .....	250	
	<hr/>	1,650
Boiler Room, Coal Storage		
Electrical and Mechanical		
Equipment .....	3,600	
Corridors and Entranceways .....	15,590	
	<hr/>	23,840
		<hr/>
		83,150
Inside and Outside Walls .....		9,000
		<hr/>
		92,150
3. Calculation of Contract Price		
92,150 square feet at \$13.50 .....		\$1,244,000.00
4. Total Cost		
Contract .....		\$1,244,000.00
Architects Fees .....		75,000.00

---

Equipment .....	150,000.00
Site Improvement .....	35,000.00
Contingencies .....	35,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,539,000.00

5. Per Pupil Cost  
     \$1,539,000.00 divided by 1,140 .....\$   1,350.00

---

REPORT No. 1 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, January 26, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Stinson (Chairman), Ferguson, Long, Might, Power, Van Esterik, and Mrs. Temple, it was decided to report and recommended as follows:—

1. In favour of the financial sections of Report No. 1 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, and Report No. 1 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. Your Committee recommends that the Executive Secretary be authorized to call a meeting of business administrators of area boards of education in the near future to consider the following matters and submit recommendations to the Committee thereon:

(a) The method of calculating payments to area boards for pupils enrolled in classes operated under the Auxiliary Classes Section of the Schools Administration Act.

(b) The method of calculating the per pupil cost of regular class pupils for use as a basis for the establishment of non-resident fees by the Metropolitan School Board.

3. That the Executive Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries be authorized to attend the mid-winter conference of the Ontario Association of School Business Officials to be held on January 27 and 28 in Toronto, and that their expenses be paid.

4. That By-law 25 be amended by adding the following as section (c) thereof:

1. That the Executive Secretary be authorized to requisition from the Metropolitan Council such funds as may be required for the regular payments to be made by the Board

(a) up to the total of the amounts shown in the current estimates of the Board when such estimates have been approved, and

(b) up to the amount of the interim appropriation for school purposes as approved by the Metropolitan Council prior to the adoption of the estimates.

2. That the Treasurer be authorized:

(a) to transfer to the Metropolitan Corporation such funds received by the Board at any time as are not immediately required for the Board's operations.

(b) to pay for rent and salaries whenever they arise.

(c) to pay all accounts up to a limit of \$500.00.

3. That the Treasurer's name be stamped on Board cheques for use in payment of accounts up to \$500.00.

5. That an amount of \$8,500.00 be included in the 1956 estimates of the Board for audit services of the Metropolitan Audit Department during the year 1956.

6. Your Committee had before it for comment a motion forwarded by the Metropolitan Council containing a proposal that the Provincial Government amend existing regulations to permit the Department of Education to pay legislative grant on capital expenditures for renovation of school accommodation when, in the opinion of the area municipality, the Metropolitan School Board and the Department of Education, structural renovation is justified.

The Committee is of the opinion that it is unlikely that the Department of Education would consider paying legislative grant on capital expenditures for renovation of accommodation as heretofore the Department has been adamant

on this matter. Under the provisions of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, capital expenditures not approved for Legislative grants become a responsibility of the area municipality. However, your Committee feels that there is no reason why the Metropolitan School Board should not decide on the apportionment of capital expenditures for re-payment by the Metropolitan Corporation and the area municipality. Insofar as the erection of secondary school accommodation is concerned, it has been noted that during the past two years the share of the capital cost borne by the area municipality has usually been slightly more than 50% of the total expenditure. The Committee does not consider this to be a realistic apportionment of costs and is of the opinion that a more equitable distribution of costs is desirable.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends that the Chairman of the Board and Chairman of the Finance Committee, together with the Executive Secretary be authorized to confer with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council, the Commissioner of Finance and the Metropolitan Solicitor to discuss the possibility of devising a plan whereby the Metropolitan School Board would decide upon the apportionment of capital costs rather than basing such apportionment on the present method, i.e., the amount approved for legislative grant purposes become a Metropolitan responsibility.

The Committee specifically proposes that the aforementioned representatives present for consideration the following two proposals:—

That the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended:

- (i) to provide that the Metropolitan School Board shall determine in connection with each application for capital funds the proportion of debt which shall be borne by the Metropolitan School Board and that proportion which shall be borne by the area board of education;

OR

- (ii) to provide that the Department of Education shall, in addition to indicating an amount approved for

legislative grant purposes, indicate a second amount for all municipalities in the Metropolitan area which shall be the amount of debt to be borne by the Metropolitan School Board.

It is further proposed that the results of this conference be reported to the Board at which time any change in legislation recommended might be considered by the Legislation and By-laws Committee.

7. Your Committee recommends adoption of the recommendations contained in the report having reference to non-resident fee payments by the Metropolitan School Board. (For details of report, see Appendix "A", pages 45 to 50.) (Amended.)

8. Your Committee recommends adoption of the recommendations contained in the report having reference to maintenance assistance payments for 1956. (For details of report, see Appendix "B", pages 51 to 56.)

9. Your Committee recommends adoption of the recommendations contained in the report having reference to losses in legislative grants resulting from the establishment of the Metropolitan School Board. (For details of report, see Appendix "C", pages 57 to 64.)

10. Your Committee recommends adoption of the attached cumulative sick leave plan for employees of the Metropolitan School Board. (For details of plan, see Appendix "D", pages 64 and 67.)

FRED C. STINSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

#### APPENDIX "A"—PART I.

January 23, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members of the Finance Committee:—

During the Fall of 1955 the Metropolitan School Board and the Advisory Council reviewed the method by which the non-resident fees were established during the first two years of operation of the Board. These two bodies regarded as a defect in the free structure the fact that an area board

of education might be required to send its students to an adjacent municipality at a per pupil cost in excess of its own. The 1955 Board endorsed in principle the recommendation of the Advisory Council as set forth in the attached report. (See Appendix "A".) A study of the proposed plan by area boards of education led to a complication in its application to non-residents who qualify for full or partial exemption of fees from the receiving board. To overcome this problem the 1955 Board recommended the inclusion of an additional recommendation.

It is noted that the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act will require amendment to permit the School Board to pay any portion of the non-resident fee and to this end the Government has been requested to consider such an amendment, subject to confirmation by the 1956 Board of the plan proposed by the Advisory Council.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. McCORDIC,  
Executive Secretary.

---

October 24, 1955.

To the Chairman and Members of the  
Metropolitan School Board:

On September 14, the Advisory Council requested the Sub-Committee consisting of Messrs. Fuller (Chairman), Brownlee, Emond and Muir to consider the question of maintenance assistance payments for 1956 together with non-resident fee schedules. The Sub-Committee's report was presented to the last meeting of the Advisory Council and was referred back to the Sub-Committee for further consideration.

Following review of its original report your Committee begs to submit the following for consideration of the Council:

A. Non-Resident Fees.

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, defines the duties and powers of the Metropolitan School Board with respect to non-resident fees as follows:

Section 126(1) It shall be the duty of the School Board and it shall have power,

- (e) notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, to determine the basis upon which and the conditions under which fees, if any, on behalf of resident pupils of one public school division or high school district in the Metropolitan Area shall be paid by the sending board to the receiving board, and the net amount of such fees after allowance has been made for the maintenance assistance payments paid to the receiving board in respect of such pupils;

In the years 1954 and 1955 non-resident fees were established on the following basis:

1. A per pupil cost for each of the four types of service provided, namely, public elementary, academic secondary, commercial secondary, technical secondary, was established by each board in accordance with the formula devised for this purpose by the Metropolitan School Board.

2. The non-resident fee was determined to be the excess (if any) of the per pupil cost over the appropriate maintenance assistance payment.

Although the logic of this method of calculation of non-resident fees appears sound, any re-study should recognize the fact that a growing proportion of non-residents are from attendance areas established by the Metropolitan School Board. The Board has already established attendance areas which require the sending board to pay to the receiving board fees based on a per pupil cost higher than the per pupil cost of the sending area, e.g. York Township—Oakwood C.I.; East York—Gledhill, Earl Beatty.

Such developments are inevitable in various parts of the Metropolitan area if the Metropolitan School Board meets its obligation of making optimum use of existing school accommodation. It does not seem fair, however, to penalize the board of a municipality because geography dictates that from the Metropolitan viewpoint it should be a buyer of education at cost greater than its own. Indeed such an anomalous situation as the following could arise. A board

might find itself required to accept in one of its attendance areas pupils from a neighbouring municipality at a rate which must not be greater than the per pupil cost within the municipality but be required to send some of its own pupils to an attendance area of another municipality at an increased fee.

One method of easing this problem would be through the raising of maintenance assistance payments. Obviously the closer the maintenance assistance payment is to the gross per pupil cost the lower the non-resident fee will be. However, up to the present time the Metropolitan School Board has appeared to agree that maintenance assistance payments should not be raised above the lowest per pupil cost in any municipality. In fact in a report recently submitted, it was suggested that the authors of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act had considered it desirable that a portion of the cost should be raised at the local level. If the Metropolitan School Board continues to recognize the soundness of this principle in its establishment of future maintenance assistance payments, no significant reduction would be possible in non-resident fees.

The Advisory Council has endorsed and desires to place before the Metropolitan School Board a plan which seems to resolve the problem of the sending board being required to pay for its non-resident students at a higher rate than its resident pupils, viz.:

*It is recommended that the sending board shall pay a non-resident fee which together with the maintenance assistance payment is not greater than its own cost and the Metropolitan School Board shall pay any excess up to the per pupil cost of the receiving board and that this arrangement shall apply to all non-resident pupils residing within an attendance area approved by the Metropolitan School Board and to all other non-resident pupils whose attendance in another municipality is approved by the sending board.*  
(Amended)

#### Special Cases

I. If an area board of education does not provide public elementary or academic secondary or commercial secondary



---

or technical secondary education and therefore must buy one or more of these services for its pupils, it is recommended that for such service the local per pupil cost shall be considered to be the weighted average of all such services in the Metropolitan area.

II. It is further recommended that (a) the share (if any) of non-resident fees to be paid by the Metropolitan School Board be calculated without regard for exemptions as described in the covering letter, (b) the exemption required by statute and any extension thereof approved by a receiving board be applied against that portion of the non-resident fee to be paid by the sending board.

Attached to this report is an estimate of the immediate net gain or loss under this plan for each of the area boards of education. It should be pointed out, however, that where an exchange of pupils eliminates the necessity of new school construction there is a general savings proportionate to assessment by each of the area boards. This factor is not reflected in the table referred to above.

POSSIBLE PLAN FOR CALCULATION OF NON-RESIDENT FEES.  
Based on the lower of the Receiving or the Sending Board's Fees (Min.=0).

	Costs to area boards under new plan		Apparent	
	Costs to area boards under existing arrangements	Paid by sending board to receiving board	Paid through Metro Levy	Decrease in Cost
			Total	In Cost
East York	\$ 60,138.00	\$ 40,668.00	\$ 6,239.00	\$ 13,231.00
Etobicoke	64,568.00	49,953.00	12,562.00	2,053.00
Forest Hill	4,480.00	3,472.00	3,466.00	6,938.00
Lakeshore	3,037.00	1,033.00	4,295.00	5,328.00
Leaside	15,910.00	12,685.00	3,749.00	16,434.00
North York	135,740.00	67,358.00	16,705.00	84,063.00
Scarborough	57,764.00	32,940.00	11,125.00	44,065.00
Swansea	50,305.00	41,340.00	1,169.00	42,509.00
Toronto	1,924.00	1,924.00	97,745.00	99,669.00
Weston	1,165.00	90.00	1,169.00	1,259.00
York	47,242.00	21,940.00	10,646.00	32,586.00
	<u>\$442,273.00</u>	<u>\$273,403.00</u>	<u>\$168,870.00</u>	<u>\$103,112.00</u>
			\$442,273.00	\$103,112.00

## NOTES:

- (1) The Metropolitan School Board pays to the receiving board the difference between its per pupil cost and the amount paid by the sending board.
- (2) All boards receive their full per pupil cost less maintenance payments of \$150, \$250, \$300, and \$400 (assuming technical payment is set at \$400 per pupil).
- (3) Calculations are based on 1954 per pupil costs and enrolments in May, 1955.
- (4) When an area buying education has no comparable service of its own, it will pay the lower of the weighted average cost of all boards offering the service or the receiving board's cost less the appropriate maintenance assistance payment.

## APPENDIX "B".

Extract from Advisory Council report dated October 24, 1955, approved by the 1955 Board and recommended to the 1956 Board for consideration:—

## Maintenance Assistance Payments.

Two functions of the Metropolitan School Board, i.e., establishment of non-resident fees and establishment of maintenance assistance payments are inter-related. The problem of the non-resident fee might have been eased by raising the maintenance assistance payments. If the Board adopts the proposal contained in the report dealing with non-resident fees there seems to be no need for drastic alteration in the maintenance assistance payments. However, some adjustment in and clarification of the academic commercial secondary payment of \$250.00 and the vocational payment of \$300.00 per pupil is still required.

Under present regulations of the Board maintenance assistance payments for commercial students depend upon the type of school in which the commercial course is offered. In the academic secondary schools of Etobicoke, Forest Hill, Leaside and East York, maintenance assistance payments for commercial students are paid at the academic rate, namely \$250.00 per pupil. In vocational secondary schools claims are honoured at the vocational pupil rate, namely \$300.00 per pupil. Boards which operate commercial courses in both types of schools may claim the larger grant for all commercial pupils. This unusual ruling seems to rest on whether the commercial courses are operated within the purview of an Advisory Vocational Committee. The four municipalities previously referred to do not offer technical courses and therefore cannot appoint Advisory Vocational Committees. It does not seem fair that on this technicality they should be deprived of receiving maintenance assistance payments on the same scale as other municipalities for their commercial students. Since the cost of technical education is considerably in excess of the cost of commercial education the Advisory Council is of the opinion that the maintenance assistance payments for technical pupils should be increased to \$400.00

The Advisory Council therefore recommends the following schedule of maintenance assistance payments, beginning 1956, should the plan for non-resident fees recommended in Part A be approved:—

Public Elementary Schools—

\$150 per pupil of A.D.A. (average daily attendance)

Academic Secondary Schools—

academic pupils \$250 per pupil of A.D.A.

commercial pupils \$250 plus \$50 per pupil of A.D.A.

Vocational Secondary Schools—

commercial pupils \$300 per pupil of A.D.A.

technical pupils \$300 plus \$100 per pupil of A.D.A.

---

To the Chairman and Members of the Finance Committee—

On November 22, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board received and endorsed for recommendation to the 1956 Board recommendations relating to the scale of maintenance assistance payments. Payments during 1954 and 1955 were fixed by statute and varied according to the following categories of students—public elementary, academic secondary, and vocational secondary. The recommendations for 1956 propose that for maintenance assistance purposes secondary pupils be divided into three categories instead of two, i.e., academic, commercial and technical.

The decision to establish different maintenance assistance payments on behalf of commercial and technical students was due to two factors. First, there is a wide difference in the cost of these two services in all municipalities providing them. Second, comparable commercial courses may be offered in both academic secondary schools and in vocational secondary schools.

The main problem in the operation of the scale contained in the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act during the past two years has been the decision as to which students shall be academic secondary and which students shall be vocational secondary. Introduction of a commercial category does not solve the problem but merely emphasizes the need for some method by which the categories of all

---

secondary school students can be attested that will be fair to all area municipalities.

During 1954 and 1955 the same conditions have been applied to maintenance assistance payments with respect to qualification as vocational secondary students as are used for legislative grant purposes. Vocational grants are paid when the courses in which the pupils are enrolled come under the purview of an Advisory Vocational Committee (as do all courses in vocational and technical schools) and when instruction is given in the vocational subjects by teachers who hold vocational certificates.

An Advisory Vocational Committee will only exist if the board in question operates a vocational school or a vocational department approved by the Department of Education. Several municipalities, i.e., East York, Leaside, Forest Hill, Etobicoke, provide no technical course. For maintenance assistance payment purposes, students in the commercial course in these communities are classed as academic secondary pupils whereas similar students in an area where there is an Advisory Vocational Committee may be placed under the jurisdiction of that committee and for maintenance assistance payment purposes be recognized as vocational secondary pupils.

Similarly, some areas provide a general course in grade 9 and do not formally designate pupils as academic, commercial or technical until the beginning of grade 10. They may, however, through the selection of options provide for some grade 9 students courses equivalent to the first year of the commercial course and for others courses equivalent to the first year of the technical course.

Recent studies, i.e., Report on the Organization of the Intermediate Grades and Expansion of Technical School Facilities in the Metropolitan Area, have emphasized the need for flexibility in school planning if the best service is to be provided at the least cost.

The present basis, however, for recognition of secondary school pupils for maintenance assistance payment purposes is neither fair to the boards of the area nor can it be expected to contribute to the present desirable variation in

secondary school organization. It would indeed be difficult to promote the kind of flexibility suggested in the above reports when areas receive differing payments for pupils taking essentially the same course on the purely arbitrary condition that one board has an Advisory Vocational Committee and the other has not.

Since the Metropolitan School Board is concerned both about what maintenance assistance payments it shall pay on behalf of secondary school students and what legislative grants shall be received on behalf of these pupils, a brief report on each of these problems follows:

(a) *Maintenance Assistance Payments.*

A major change in the administration of secondary schools has recently been inaugurated by the Department of Education. The Department has proposed to the Boards of Education of Toronto, Hamilton, London, Windsor and Ottawa that their officials assume full responsibilities of administration including the inspection of teachers with Departmental officials giving their assistance once in every four years. This is in line with the de-centralization policy of the Department in other areas and underlines the growing autonomy of school boards. Toronto has already implemented the Department's proposal.

It is the opinion therefore of the Advisory Council that the Metropolitan School Board is under no obligation to base its maintenance assistance payments on the pattern of the Departmental grants described in section (b) of this report. Instead payments should be made on the basis of the course in which pupils are enrolled, namely, academic, commercial or technical, and not be governed by the particular location in which the instruction is given.

For practical purposes classification might best be done by the Department of Education or the appropriate board officials.

In view of the larger autonomy which the Department has delegated to boards of education in the larger centres of population the heavier responsibilities thus falling upon officials of the board, and the fact that these matters are under

constant study within the Metropolitan area, the Advisory Council is of the opinion that decisions as to the category into which pupils should be divided should rest with the area boards and their officials.

It is proposed therefore that the appropriate officer in each area shall be requested to indicate to the Metropolitan School Board the status for maintenance assistance payments for each of the pupils under his jurisdiction. In this connection it is assumed that each school official will be guided in his decision by the courses as defined in Circular H.S.I.

(b) *Department of Education grants.*

One of the prime objectives of the creation of the Metropolitan School Board was to ensure the maximum use of existing school accommodation and facilities insofar as circumstances would permit. In this manner building costs would be reduced and both the Metropolitan area and the Department of Education would benefit financially. This procedure has been consistently followed. If a board of education of one municipality of Metropolitan Toronto with an excess of accommodation could accommodate pupils who are under the jurisdiction of another board which is without adequate accommodation school boundary lines were redrawn with the co-operation of both boards and new building costs have thus been avoided.

To illustrate. During this school year a number of pupils are in attendance at Oakwood C.I. who would normally attend Vaughan Road C.I. This lightening of the pupil load at Vaughan Road C.I. has made it possible to accommodate a number of first year pupils who, under less crowded conditions, would attend the George Harvey Vocational School, in which they will enroll as second year students in September, 1956. In this way provision of additional classrooms for these pupils at the George Harvey Vocational School became unnecessary.

It has been the contention of the Advisory Council that these pupils should be regarded as bona fide technical school pupils, subject to the Departmental technical school grant.

The Department of Education has been approached on this point on two occasions but it has adhered to the position

that unless pupils are enrolled in courses that come under the purview of an Advisory Vocational Committee (as do all courses in vocational and technical schools) and unless instruction is given in the vocational subjects by teachers who hold vocational certificates they shall not be eligible for technical school grants. This position is taken in spite of the fact that these pupils are recognized by the technical schools as having completed a course wholly acceptable to the technical school and are freely admitted to the second year of the technical school course.

Not only does the Advisory Council consider this to be an unrealistic approach but it believes that this interpretation by the Department disregards the special circumstances that exist in Metropolitan Toronto and the efforts that the Metropolitan School Board has made to co-operate with the Department in reducing building costs.

However, the Advisory Council recognizes that the regulations governing legislative grants are provincial. Resolution of the special problems of the Metropolitan area will therefore require lengthy study.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS.

It is recommended:—

(i) That the appropriate officer in each area shall be requested to indicate to the Metropolitan School Board the status for maintenance assistance payments for each of the pupils under his jurisdiction. In this connection it is assumed that each school official will be guided in his decision by the courses as defined in Circular H.S.I.

(ii) That the Board arrange a conference with representatives of the Department of Education in an effort to have the Regulations of the Department amended to provide for payment of vocational grants on behalf of pre-technical students who may be enrolled in other than a technical school for the first or second year of the technical course.

Respectfully submitted,

C. C. GOLDRING,  
Chairman of Council.



## APPENDIX "C".

## PART I.

January 24, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the Finance Committee:—

On October 24, the Advisory Council submitted a comprehensive report to the 1955 Board which is substantially the report contained in this agenda regarding non-resident fees. In its study of the problem of non-resident fees the Advisory Council noted the apparent losses in legislative grants that have resulted from the Metropolitan operation and also noted that the proposal that the Board pay a portion of non-resident fees would cause a further decrease in legislative grants. In addition, a review of the existing grant structure as it affects the Metropolitan area revealed other areas of potential grant loss.

The Advisory Council respectfully submits its observations with respect to grants on non-resident fees as a part of its total study of the financing of the school programme for non-resident pupils from within the Metropolitan area. Its observations relative to other potential grant losses are submitted with the comment that, although reports on these matters have not been specifically requested it was deemed that this information should be in possession of the Board.

As a basis for study the Advisory Council had for its information the attached report prepared by the Executive Secretary. (See pages 59 to 64.)

The Advisory Council recommends:—

(i) *Re Change in status of municipality.*

That no action be taken in view of the fact that no municipality is currently taking steps to achieve a change in status.

(ii) *Re re-assessment.*

The Advisory Council recommends no action in view of the fact that the grant regulations as applied to the Metro-

politan area are the same as apply to all other sections of the Province.

(iii) *Re debenture debt.*

Although the amount of money is not large, the Advisory Council recommends that every effort be made to obviate the losses incurred in this instance.

(iv) *Tuition fees paid to other boards.*

Since the loss is large and will increase if the proposals with respect to non-resident fees are implemented the Advisory Council recommends that the Government be approached with the request that legislative grant be paid on the gross per pupil cost including maintenance assistance payments paid to the receiving board.

In summary as a result of its various studies relating to the financial operation of the Metropolitan School Board, the Advisory Council observes that there are a number of major problems which may only be resolved through consultation and negotiation with the Department of Education.

It is recommended, therefore, that the Board consider convening conferences with the Minister of Education and representatives of his Department for a discussion of the following requests:—

(i) that maintenance assistance payments be based on the current year's average daily attendance;

(ii) that vocational grants be paid on behalf of pre-technical students who may be enrolled in other than a vocational school; and

(iii) that the Departmental regulations be revised to eliminate the grant losses as outlined in the report referred to above particularly insofar as Item 4—grants on non-resident fees and Item 3—grants on approved operating costs, are concerned.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. McCORDIC,  
Executive Secretary.

November 28, 1955.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the Advisory Council:—

On October 7, 1955, the Advisory Council requested the Executive Secretary to "prepare a report listing instances where provincial legislative grants have been reduced due to the establishment of the Metropolitan School Board".

With the continued rapid increase in growth in several of the area municipalities comes an increase in assessment and an increase in school costs. It becomes, therefore, very difficult to say what grant losses have been suffered by Metropolitan Toronto by reason of the formation of the Metropolitan School Board. However, the attached information and the following comments may be helpful.

1. *Change in status*—No rural municipality has been given urban status in this area since the formation of Metropolitan Toronto; therefore there has been no grant loss suffered in this regard.
2. *Re-Assessment*—Assessment increases for purposes of grant calculations are limited to 20% in each year. There seems to be considerable new assessment even in relatively stable communities each year and there is, of course, a great deal in the growing municipalities. Thus, it might be said that re-assessment probably has not had any great effect on school grants as yet because of the 20% limitation, the amount of new assessment, and the fact that the Department of Education was already applying an equalization factor to the assessment of a number of areas.
3. *Debenture Debt*—Since the non-resident fees as now established include very little for debt charges and since boards with non-resident pupils are allowed only the "resident portion" of their debt charges in approved cost, a definite loss in grants is being suffered here  
e.g. Weston is allowed a 45% grant on 16.4% of its vocational debt charges and 37.2% of its academic debt charges. Most of the balance of the debt charges would have been charged to North York and Etobicoke in non-resident fees (grant percentage 30). Since there are some pupils from outside

Metropolitan Toronto, a conservative estimate of the grant loss in 1955 in this regard would be:

Vocational .....	75% of \$26,306.67 x 30% =	\$5,919.00
Academic		
Secondary ...	55% of \$17,105.79 x 30% =	2,822.00
		<hr/>
		\$8,741.00

There are, of course, other instances where this loss is evident as well.

4. *Tuition Fees Paid to other Boards*—The 1955 grants on non-resident fees have been based on the *net* non-resident fee after the deduction of maintenance assistance payments. No grant was paid on the maintenance assistance payment portion of the cost of educating non-resident pupils. The following sheets present a conservative estimate of the grant loss to the Metropolitan area because of this position taken by the Department of Education. Under the non-resident fee plan adopted for 1956 subject to the necessary change in legislation being granted, a further loss of grant on the additional amount of approximately \$169,000.00 to be paid by the Metropolitan School Board for non-resident pupils will be suffered. The exact amount of this loss is difficult to determine but a conservative estimate would be  $\frac{1}{3}$  of \$169,000.00 = \$56,000.00.

The comments submitted to the Hon. W. J. Dunlop, Minister of Education in a report made in the early fall of 1954 are still valid. A copy of this report is appended. To date the only specific item dealt with to the satisfaction of the Metropolitan School Board has been the permission to area boards to claim for grant purposes debenture debt charges paid on their behalf by the Metropolitan School Board.

It is hoped that the above information will serve as a starting point for the Council's deliberations on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. McCORDIC,  
Executive Secretary.

## 1955 GRANT LOSSES RE NON-RESIDENT FEES.

Based on the Average of May and October, 1954 Enrolments  
and 1954 Costs.

Public School grant allowed on

Tuition fees paid to another board less tuition fees received from another board.

Secondary School grant allowed on

Tuition fees paid to another board.

Public.

	Grant Gain	Grant Loss
East York sends 130 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is \$150.00 $(40-16)\% \times 130 =$	\$.....	\$ 4,680.00
North York sends 330 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is \$150.00 $(50-16)\% \times 330 =$	.....	16,830.00
North York sends 5 pupils to York.		
Loss is \$150.00 $(50-40)\% \times 5 =$	.....	75.00
Scarborough sends 40 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is \$150.00 $(62-16)\% \times 40 =$	.....	2,760.00
Toronto sends 35 pupils to East York.		
Gain is \$150.00 $(40-16)\% \times 35 =$	1,260.00	.....
York sends 125 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is \$150.00 $(40-16)\% \times 125 =$	.....	4,500.00
York sends 7 pupils to Forest Hill.		
Loss is \$150.00 $(40-24)\% \times 7 =$	.....	168.00
	<u>\$ 1,260.00</u>	<u>\$ 29,013.00</u>

## Academic Secondary.

	Grant Gain	Grant Loss
East York sends 50 pupils to Leaside and Toronto.		
Loss is $\$250.00 \times 30\% \times 50 =$	\$.....	\$ 3,750.00
Etobicoke sends 200 pupils to Lakeshore, Toronto & Weston.		
Loss is $\$250.00 \times 30\% \times 200 =$	.....	15,000.00
North York sends 425 pupils to East York, Toronto, Weston & York.		
Loss is $\$250.00 \times 30\% \times 425 =$	.....	31,875.00
Scarborough sends 30 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$250.00 \times 30\% \times 30 =$	.....	2,250.00
Swansea sends 175 pupils to Toronto & York.		
Loss is $\$250.00 \times 45\% \times 175 =$	.....	19,688.00
York sends 16 pupils to Toronto & Weston.		
Loss is $\$250.00 \times 30\% \times 16 =$	.....	1,200.00
	<u>\$.....</u>	<u>\$ 73,763.00</u>

## Vocational.

	Grant Gain	Grant Loss
East York sends 150 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 30\% \times 150 =$	\$.....	\$ 13,500.00
Etobicoke sends 300 pupils to Lakeshore, Toronto & Weston.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 30\% \times 300 =$	.....	27,000.00
Forest Hill sends 12 pupils to Toronto & York.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 35\% \times 12 =$	.....	1,260.00

Lakeshore sends 12 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 50\% \times 12 =$	.....	1,800.00
Leaside sends 60 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 35\% \times 60 =$	.....	6,300.00
North York sends 300 pupils to Toronto, Weston & York.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 30\% \times 300 =$	.....	27,000.00
Scarborough sends 110 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 30\% \times 110 =$	.....	9,900.00
Swansea sends 75 pupils to Toronto		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 45\% \times 75 =$	.....	10,125.00
Weston sends 5 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 45\% \times 5 =$	.....	675.00
York sends 60 pupils to Toronto.		
Loss is $\$300.00 \times 30\% \times 60 =$	.....	5,400.00
	<u>\$.....</u>	<u>\$102,960.00</u>
1954 Net Total=		\$204,476.00
To reduce enrolment to attendance 90%=		\$184,028.00
In 1955 this amount will be increased by approximately 50% $\therefore$ 1955=		\$250,000.00

1955 Rate of Grant on Approved Cost (Non-Res. Fees).

	Public Academic Secondary & Vocational	
East York	40	30
Etobicoke	50	30
Forest Hill	24	35
Lakeshore	24	50 (same rate as township)
Leaside	24	35
North York	50	30

---

Scarborough	62	30
Swansea	26	45
Toronto	16	15
Weston	26	45
York	40	30

---

## APPENDIX "D".

CUMULATIVE SICK LEAVE PLAN FOR EMPLOYEES OF  
THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD.

## General.

1. This plan shall apply to all employees on the permanent full-time staff of the Board.

2. The plan is established under Section 126(a) of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act 1953 as amended 1955 and Section 35 of the Schools Administration Act 1954.

3. The plan shall be administered under the direction of the Executive Secretary who shall perform all things necessary for the conduct of the plan save that an employee shall have the right of appeal to the Board in cases of a dispute regarding the allowance or disallowance of any sick leave credit or deduction therefrom.

## Cumulative Sick Leave.

(a) Allowance for accumulation to date of adoption of the plan:—

1. Section 126a.(4) shall apply in determining accumulated credits to December 31, 1953 for all employees previously employed by a board of education in the Metropolitan Area.

2. From January 1, 1954 to the date of adoption of the plan an allowance shall be made for each employee on the basis of 2 days per month of completed service in the employ of the Metropolitan School Board up to a maximum of 20 days per annum.

3. Employees who are employed or who were employed by the Metropolitan School Board after December 31, 1953



and who were previously employed by a municipality or a local board in Ontario will of course be credited with the balance of accumulated sick leave held by them at their previous place of employment where a similar plan was in effect. (See Municipal Act Section 386, paragraph 49b as amended April 2, 1953.).

(b) Current sick leave accumulation:—

1. On January 1st of each year, each employee shall be credited with 2 days per month, or a total of 24 days for the current year. New employees hired during the year will receive a credit of 2 days per month remaining in the calendar year to the nearest single day.

2. No employee may add to his accumulated account more than 20 unused sick leave days from any year.

3. An employee may accumulate sick leave credits from year to year without any limitation other than that referred to in the previous section (2).

4. Sick leave pay shall be calculated at the rate of pay in effect at the time of the commencement of the illness.

(c) Deductions from accumulated sick leave credit:—

1. Absences for personal illness for periods not exceeding five days may be certified by the Executive Secretary. Absences beyond 5 days shall also be certified by a qualified medical or dental practitioner. The Board reserves the right to have a medical practitioner of its own choice examine the employee at any time before allowance for sick leave is given or while benefits from the plan are being received.

2. No deduction from the sick leave account shall be made for the following reasons:—

(i) Funerals—to a maximum of three days subject to the approval of the Executive Secretary.

(ii) Quarantine.

(iii) Jury Duty and Subpoena.

(iv) Accidents dealt with by Workmen's Compensation Board. Each employee on the permanent staff who is in-

jured in the course of his duty shall have his Workmen's Compensation salary awards supplemented from his sick leave account to provide for the payment of his full salary up to a maximum of 66 days, for any one accident unless he notifies the Executive Secretary in writing to the contrary.

3. Special leave may be granted for reasons other than those mentioned in 1. and 2. above at the discretion of the Executive Secretary acting for the Board up to a maximum of 6 days in any one year. Any such absence is chargeable to the employee's cumulative sick leave account.

4. Deductions shall be made from an employee's sick leave account for the number of days absent with salary due to personal illness or special leave. When an employee's sick leave account is exhausted, salary payments shall cease.

#### Retirement Gratuity.

1. Each employee who retires (a) at the normal retirement age (as determined in the pension plan in which the Board participates) or (b) earlier, by reason of poor health or long service, with the approval of the Board shall be granted a gratuity for a period equal to the unexpended portion of his accumulated sick leave credit up to the maximum amounts indicated in the following schedule:—

5 years service or less—	0% of annual salary at retirement
6 years service	—2% of annual salary at retirement
7 years service	—4% of annual salary at retirement

and for each additional year a further 2% up to a maximum allowance of 50% of salary after 30 years' service.

2. For the above purpose

(a) the number of days in a year shall be taken as 200

(b) years of service means the number of years service in a full time capacity with any school board or board of education in Metropolitan Toronto.

3. Benefits shall be paid to the retired employee in not more than 6 monthly instalments commencing not later than the month after retirement.

---

4. On the death of an employee:—

(a) Prior to retirement, an amount based on what would have been paid as retirement gratuity had he retired on the day of his death will be paid to the surviving wife (or husband where the employee is a woman), to his surviving children, or to his estate as shall be determined by the Board.

(b) After retirement but prior to receipt of the full retirement gratuity to which he is entitled, an amount equal to the balance of the retirement gratuity still unpaid will be paid to the surviving wife (or husband where the employee is a woman), to his surviving children, or to his estate as shall be determined by the Board.

---

REPORT No. 1 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, January 17, 1956.

1. That, as recommended by the Advisory Council, the Scarborough Board of Education be reimbursed the operating costs of the following opportunity classes to date from October, 1955:—

Ionview Public School	—Age range 8 plus—13 plus.
	I.Q. range 50 plus—75 plus.
G. P. Mackie Public School	—Age range 8 plus—13 plus.
	I.Q. range 50 plus—75 plus.

Approval of the Department of Education for these classes was received on November 28, 1955.

2. That, effective January 1, 1956, reimbursement of operating costs of approved special education classes commence from the first of the month in which the application is received, or from the opening date of the class, whichever is the later.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, January 31, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 1 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

---

Tuesday, January 17, 1956.

1. Your Committee had before it for consideration a communication from the North York Board of Education requesting approval to sell to the Corporation of the Township of North York for park purposes an area of 2.531 acres, being the extreme easterly portion of the Lillian Street Public School site. The communication indicated that the school site consists of two parcels of land of 4 and 6 acres which were purchased in 1946 and 1950 respectively and that the lands the North York Board propose to sell to the Corporation of the Township of North York comprise part of the 6 acres purchased by the First Township Area Board in 1950 at a cost of \$9,000.00. The North York Board proposes to sell the property for an estimated \$4,000.00. The capital expenditure of \$9,000.00 in 1950 was part of a debenture issue of \$2,540,000.00 under Township By-law 7339 which was assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation as of January 1, 1954. To facilitate the sale, the North York Board proposes that the Metropolitan Finance Commissioner purchase \$4,000.00 of debenture issue over and above the amount of annual retirement and bill the North York Council for the principal amount of the bonds plus interest and other costs involved. Payment of the foregoing amounts would then facilitate transfer of the land to the Corporation of the Township of North York without gain or loss to the North York Board of Education.

Your Committee recommends that, subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor, and, to compliance with the provisions of Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, the Board approve the sale of approximately 2.531 acres of the Lillian Public School Site to the Corporation of the Township of North York at the current market value.

Your Committee requested the Executive Secretary to secure an opinion from the Metropolitan Solicitor as to the legality of the procedure suggested by the North York Board for the sale of a portion of the Lillian Street Public School site to the Corporation of the Township of North York.

2. That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation on the understanding that prior to the calling of tenders the Board will again review the application:—

Wilmington Street Public School addition of 8 standard classrooms, conversion of one existing grade classroom to provide kindergarten.

Metro share .....	\$160,000.00
Local share .....	42,125.00
Total .....	202,125.00
Ceiling .....	202,125.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1956.

3. That FINAL approval be given to the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Hunters' Glen Public School 12 standard classrooms, 1 kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$260,000.00
Local share .....	70,750.00
Total .....	330,750.00
Ceiling .....	330,750.00

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

Manhattan Park Public School 10 standard classrooms, double kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$232,000.00
Local share .....	69,350.00
Total .....	301,350.00
Ceiling .....	301,350.00

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

4. On May 10, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board gave FINAL approval to an application of the Toronto Board of

Education for Ogden Public School (replacement) in the amount of \$397,000.00. The ceiling formula for this project is \$433,650.00, i.e., 16 standard classrooms, kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

The Board, on June 14, 1955, gave FINAL approval to an application of the Toronto Board of Education for Alexander Muir Satellite Junior School in the amount of \$192,000.00. The ceiling formula for this project is \$202,125.00, i.e., 7 grade classrooms, kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

The architects for these projects have indicated that the cost of construction will in all probability exceed the ceiling allowance in each instance. The Toronto Board of Education has therefore requested approval of the applications at the ceiling allowance. Any additional funds required in excess of the ceiling formula will be provided from current revenues of the Toronto Board of Education.

Your Committee recommends approval of the applications at the ceiling allowance in each case, i.e., Alexander Muir Satellite Junior School—\$202,125.00; Ogden Public School (replacement)—\$433,650.00.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, January 31, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 1 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, January 26, 1956.

1. In favour of the financial sections of Report No. 1 of School Accommodation Committee—Part II, and Report No. 1 of Buildings and Sites Committee—Part II.

FRED C. STINSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, January 31, 1956.

## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 2 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE —PART I.

Tuesday, February 7, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee, held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Grayson, Lockhart, Milgram, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education in connection with the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the North York Planning Area:—

Amendment No. 45—

(a) re-zoning an area at the south-west corner of Wardlaw Avenue and Jane Street from industrial to residential.

(b) re-zoning an area on the west side of Jane Street opposite Falstaff Avenue from residential to industrial.

(c) re-zoning an area on Keele Street north of Highway 401 from residential to commercial.

(d) re-zoning an area on the south-west corner of Keele Street and Diana Drive from residential to commercial.

(e) re-zoning an area on the east side of Hove Street between Sheppard Avenue and Cocksfield from residential to commercial.

(f) re-zoning an area between the H.E.P.C. right-of-way and the proposed Eglinton Avenue East extension, east from the C.N.R. right-of-way from residential to industrial and commercial.

(g) re-zoning an area north of the proposed Eglinton Avenue East Extension, west of the H.E.P.C. right-of-way from residential to commercial.

(h) re-zoning an area on the west side of Victoria Park Avenue north of Eglinton Avenue East extension from residential to commercial.

The North York Board of Education has indicated that it has no objection to the proposed amendment.

2. On April 26, 1955, the Board gave FINAL approval to the following application of the North York Board of Education:

Bathurst Heights Collegiate and Vocational School, addition of 6 standard classrooms, 2 sheet metal shops and drafting room.

Metro Share .....	\$142,000.00
Local Share .....	Nil
Total .....	\$142,000.00
Ceiling .....	\$297,000.00

The North York Board of Education has requested the Board to approve additional debenture financing for this project in the amount of \$35,000.00 to cover the cost of the project which is as follows:

Contract price.....	\$140,156.00
Architect's fees .....	8,409.00
Equipment .....	24,000.00
Contingency reserve .....	4,435.00
Total .....	\$177,000.00

The final approval of the Department of Education for legislative grant purposes is in the amount of \$160,000.00. Therefore, there will be a local share of \$17,000.00.

Your Committee recommends approval of the application of the North York Board of Education in the amount of \$177,000.00.

3. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for erection of secondary school accommodation:

Thistletown Collegiate, 12 standard classrooms, art room, music room, 2 science laboratories, library, 2 home



economics, 2 shops, typing room, double gymnasium, cafeteria.

Estimated Cost .....	\$918,000.00
Ceiling Formula .....	\$918,000.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—600.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—680.

4. The North York Board of Education has applied to the Metropolitan School Board for permission to lease the unused Westminster Parkway Site to the Corporation of the Township of North York for park purposes at a nominal annual rental. The Board agreed to lease the unused site in view of the fact that Township Council granted permission to the North York Board to lease Gorman Park for erection of a temporary public school to relieve overcrowded conditions at Dublin and Wilkie Public Schools. The use of Gorman Park as a school site deprived the local residents of parklands and the Township Council made application to use the Westminster Parkway site for park purposes. A condition of the exchange leases provides that no permanent buildings may be erected on either parcel of land and that the Township Council's lease for the Westminster Parkway site would end when the North York Board no longer requires Gorman Park for school purposes.

In view of the foregoing circumstances your Committee recommends that approval be granted to the leasing by the North York Board of the Westminster Parkway property to the Corporation of the Township of North York for park purposes subject to

(a) an opinion by the Metropolitan Solicitor that the lease arrangements are consistent with Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act,

(b) that the lease shall be automatically terminated when the Gorman Park property is no longer required for school purposes, and

(c) that the term of the lease shall not exceed 5 years with the understanding that if circumstances warrant consideration be given to an extension of the lease.

5. The North York Board of Education has applied to the Board for permission to sell a 4-acre parcel of land on the south side of Steeles Avenue, between Bathurst Street and Dufferin Street which was originally purchased by the predecessor school board for a school site. The North York Board advised that the area surrounding the site was originally designated as rural but since the time of purchase it has become increasingly apparent that the land, located on a main thoroughfare and immediately adjacent to the boundary of the Township is not suitable for a school site. Arrangements are being made to secure alternative sites in subdivisions being planned in the general area.

Funds for the purchase were provided to the required amount of \$1,700, as part of an issue of \$55,000 issued under Township By-law No. 3706 in 1945. The issue ran for ten years and as of January 1st, 1954, Metropolitan Corporation assumed the outstanding debentures to the amount of \$6,195.32 and paid this off with interest on the 1st of September, 1954 in the total amount of \$6,365.00.

In accordance with Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, the School Board's share of the proceeds of the sale would be as follows: —

$$\frac{1,700}{55,000} \times 6,195.32$$


---

of "net" sale price

$$1,700$$

or .11264 of the "net" sale price.

The Committee has been advised that the North York Board will dispose of the site by public tender.

Accordingly, it is recommended that approval be given to the sale of the aforementioned land in principle and that the North York Board be advised that, in the opinion of the School Board and, in accordance with the above calculation .11264 of the "net" sale price shall accrue to the Metropolitan School Board. Final approval of the sale will be subject, of course, to an opinion from the Metropolitan Solicitor that the terms of the sale are consistent with Section 131 of The

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act and that the offer to purchase which the North York Board proposes to accept is acceptable to the Metropolitan School Board.

6. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following subdivision plans and comments of area boards of education concerned:

Township of Etobicoke.

T-9189—14 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Albion Gardens Public School and ultimately a new school to be built adjoining the plan of subdivision on the east. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School for 1956-57; in 1957-58 and thereafter, Thistletown C.I. for pupils of General and Commercial courses, Weston Collegiate and Vocational School for pupils of Technical courses.

T-9215—23 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Thistletown Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School for the school year 1956-57; 1957-58 and thereafter Thistletown C.I. for pupils of General and Commercial courses, Weston Collegiate and Vocational School for pupils of Technical courses.

T-9264—150 lots.

The Etobicoke Board is endeavouring to acquire a public school site in the West Dean Subdivision which is to the south of the subdivision under consideration, so that a school site will not be required on this plan. However, the Hallfield Park plan would appear to be premature until there is a road pattern established which will permit access through the farm that separates Hallfield Park from West Deane. Secondary students will attend Etobicoke C.I. pending completion of the Burnhamthorpe C.I. for September, 1956.

Township of North York.

T-7811 Revised—695 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of at least 5 acres within the boundaries of the proposed

subdivision. The proposed public school site of 5.75 acres (Block E) is topographically acceptable to the Board. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., later Don Mills C.I. and eventually a secondary school within the immediate vicinity.

T-8211 (2nd Revision)—179 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Owen Boulevard Public School. This subdivision along with others in the immediate area will necessitate further consideration of a public school site within the vicinity of Lawrence Avenue and High Point Road. Secondary students will attend temporarily Earl Haig C.I. and eventually York Mills C.I.

T-8276 Revised—352 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of at least five acres within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. The proposed public school site of five acres (Block A) is topographically acceptable to the Board. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-8371 Revised—265 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately five acres within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-8381 Revised—296 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately four acres within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. The proposed public school site of 5.35 acres is slightly large in size. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-8816 Revised—328 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of at least five acres within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. The proposed public school site of five acres (Block C) is topographically acceptable to the Board. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-8954—29 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of at least 5 acres within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9187—29 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Wilmington Avenue Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-9203—17 lots

Public school pupils will attend temporarily Drewry Avenue Public School and eventually a school to be erected on the Pleasant Avenue site. Secondary students will attend Northview Heights C.I.

T-9257—5 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Roding Avenue Public School and eventually a school to be constructed on Southview Street. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-9303—20 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Wilkie Boulevard Public School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-9311—64 lots.

Public school pupils will attend McKee Avenue Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9328—11 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Hardington Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

T-9338—15 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Drewry Avenue Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-9347—21 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Overland Drive Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I. and eventually Don Mills C.I.

T-9368—16 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Churchill Avenue Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-9250—67 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Wilmington Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

Township of Scarborough.

T-9079 Revised—47 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Chapman Farm Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-9246—38 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ionview Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9249—9 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Agincourt Public School. Secondary students will attend Agincourt H.S.

T-9252—61 lots.

Public school pupils will attend a school to be erected on the Masaryktown site. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-9265—30 lots.

Public school pupils will attend McCowan Road Public School. Secondary students will attend R. H. King C.I.

T-9267—59 lots.

Public school pupils will attend McCowan Road Public School. Secondary students will attend R. H. King C.I.

T-9284—14 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ellesmere Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9306—34 lots.

Public school pupils will attend a school to be erected on the Gooderham Site. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

Township of York.

T-9107 Revised—46 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Roseland Public School.

Your Committee recommends:—

(a) That subdivision plan T-9264 (Township of Etobicoke) be approved with the exception of the second sentence to which no opinion is expressed;

(b) That subdivision plan T-7811 (Township of North York) be approved but that it be referred to the School Accommodation Committee for consideration as to the accommodation of secondary school students;

(c) That with regard to subdivision plan T-8954 (Township of North York), the Department of Planning and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board be advised that the Metropolitan School Board understands that negotiations are being made to acquire the site referred to by the North York Board and that the Metropolitan School Board does not request that the release of the plan be withheld;

(d) That the Board concur in the comments of the area boards of education with the exceptions noted in (a), (b) and (c) above.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 14, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 2 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, February 9, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Mr. Stinson (Chairman), Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Long, Might, Peck, Power and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 2, 3 and 5 of Report No. 2 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. That Disbursement List No. 39, dated February 9, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$1,052,836.56, be approved. (For details of List see Appendix page 84.)

## ESTIMATES.

3. Your Committee had before it for consideration the current estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956 as shown in Appendix "A". On the basis of its study, the Committee recommends that the estimates as shown in Appendix "A" be approved. The estimates provide for a total expenditure of \$8,994,043.00 for secondary school purposes and \$15,596,765.00 for public school purposes. Having regard for other revenues the estimates provide for a levy for secondary school purposes of approximately 3.07 mills and for public school purposes of approximately 6.37 mills. In approving the estimates the Committee points out that with the exception of certain recommendations with respect to salaries of staff the estimates are unchanged from the original draft submitted and distributed to members of the Board. (Amended—see Board minutes p. 16.)

FRED C. STINSON,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, February 14, 1956.

REPORT No. 2 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART II.

Tuesday, February 7, 1956.

1. That approval be given to the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of public school sites:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Highland Heights Public School Site:	
8 acres .....	\$34,540.00
East of Birchmount, south of 4th Concession and north of Lansing Road.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—10.	



	Estimated Total Cost
<b>Masaryktown Public School Site:</b>	
5.528 acres .....	26,480.00
South of Lawrence Avenue, east of Golf Club Road.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—8.	
<b>Wanita Public School Site:</b>	
8.079 acres approx. ....	30,460.00
East of Meadowvale, south of Wanita Road, north of Lawrence.	
Date school required—January 3, 1957.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—10.	

2. On November 22, the Board gave TENTATIVE approval to the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education on the understanding that prior to FINAL approval the Advisory Council would review the application and report on the necessity of providing home economics and industrial arts facilities:—

John English Public School, addition of 18 standard classrooms, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Auditorium-Playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$520,970.00
Ceiling .....	523,530 00

Your Committee has received a report from the Advisory Council dated January 5 in which Council expresses the opinion that existing enrolments in the public schools in the Lakeshore District do not warrant the construction of a third unit of Home Economics and Industrial Arts. However, it was noted that the Home Economics and Industrial Arts facilities are used by approximately 200 students from Mimico High School. In its examination of the application, the Council noted that the per pupil ceiling formula for construction of the addition consisting of 18 standard classrooms and a playroom-auditorium is \$463,050. A further allowance for the auditorium-playroom (not provided in the recently completed unit) would be \$20,720.00, i.e. 5 grade class-

rooms plus 3 kindergarten units equal 8 teaching areas x \$2,590.00.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends approval of the following recommendations of the Advisory Council:—

(a) That the application for the addition to John English Public School be approved at a ceiling allowance of \$483,770.00.

(b) That, when tenders for the project are received, if it be established that the addition cannot be built within the ceiling allowance of \$483,770.00 consideration be given to approving an additional allowance. Such allowance could be considered on the basis that 40% of the time in these units would be used to serve secondary students from Mimico High School.

3. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following application of the North York Board of Education for new school accommodation:—

Keele-Sheppard Public School, 20 standard classrooms, 2 Kindergartens, Auditorium-Playroom, Health room, Library, Principal's Office.

Estimated Cost .....	\$558,600.00
----------------------	--------------

Ceiling .....	558,600.00
---------------	------------

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

Anticipated opening enrolment—656.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—848.

The Committee has been advised that the proposed school will be erected mainly to accommodate children of R.C.A.F. personnel stationed at Downsview and that the Department of National Defence has tentatively agreed to make a capital grant to the North York Board of Education towards the cost of the school including land, building, equipment and site improvements, proportionate to the number of pupils from Crown lands to the pupil capacity of the school at the time of construction. In addition, the Department of National Defence has agreed to pay tuition fees for pupils on Crown lands on the basis of the actual operating costs. The application further indicated that approximately 238 children of R.C.A.F. personnel now in attendance at Hughes Public School (Toronto) would attend the new

Keele-Sheppard Public School upon completion and thereby create classroom space at Hughes Public School.

Your Committee recommends that the application be given TENTATIVE approval subject to:

(a) the School Accommodation Committee giving evidence to the Metropolitan School Board that the space released at Hughes Public School (Toronto) will be used adequately by York Township or Toronto pupils; and

(b) that the agreement between the Department of National Defence and the North York Board be submitted in detail for approval by the Metropolitan School Board.

The Committee further recommends that the North York Board of Education be requested to assume responsibility for educating children of R.C.A.F. personnel presently housed in Hughes Public School as of September 1, 1956, to facilitate use of classroom space by the York Township Board.

4. That approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of a public school site:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Martin Grove Gardens Site:	
1.65 acres .....	\$7,900.00
Adjoins northern boundary of Highbury development between Kipling Avenue and Martin Grove Road, south of Malton Road. It has frontage on the east on a street that is as yet not named.	
Date school required—not yet determined.	

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Amended by adding the following as section 5:—

“That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education for capital funds for the erection of public school accommodation:—

Second Street, addition of 4 standard classrooms.

Metro Share .....	\$ 80,000.00
Local Share .....	22,900.00
Total .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00

Date addition required—September 1956.

Present enrolment—385.

Anticipated increase—165.”

Adopted by the Board, as amended, February 14, 1956.

#### REPORT No. 2 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, February 9, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Report No. 2 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 39, dated February 9, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$2,089,582.65, be approved. (For details of List see Appendix page 85.)

FRED C. STINSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 14, 1956.

#### DUSBURSEMENT LIST No. 39.

February 9, 1956.

##### PART I.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments: due February, 1956 SEC. \$930,674.25; adj. re January, 1956 \$116,657.00 ..... \$1,047,331.25
  2. Carswell Company Limited, Intermediate School Reports ..... 660.00
- ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 25, 1955.
3. Bell Telephone Company Limited, January Service ..... 80.30
  4. Benny's Restaurant, Meeting Expense ..... 103.85
  5. Carswell Company Limited, supplies ..... 26.40
  6. H. E. Dean & Son, Florists, Flowers—Chairman's Wife ..... 15.00

## Appendix.

85

7. Dominion Maintenance Company, November and December Service .....	170.00
8. T. Eaton Company Limited, Gift for Retiring Chairman .....	40.50
9. F. & E. Lightning Cheque Writer Sales, Cheque Writer Service and Guarantee .....	37.50
10. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, Meeting Expense .....	39.85
11. Gestetner (Canada) Limited, Supplies .....	48.14
12. Grand and Toy Limited, Supplies .....	5.25
13. Mr. G. L. Gray, Editorial Assist.—November, December, 1955 .....	93.00
14. Mr. N. Hutton, Square foot surveys .....	68.50
15. International Business Machines, Quarterly Inspection (3 machines) .....	19.50
16. Jacobson, Lipson and Richmond, Parking Lot Rental, January \$50.00, February \$50.00 .....	100.00
17. Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Fidelity Bond Premium (3 years) .....	14.72
18. Ontario Towel Service Limited, December Service .....	10.00
19. Orange Crush Limited, Meeting Expense .....	4.70
20. Receiver General of Canada, Postage Stamps .....	64.00
21. Remington Rand Limited: Adding Machine Inspection \$20.25; Adding Machine Rental \$18.00; Adding Machine Supplies \$1.50 .....	39.75
22. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental January 15 to February 14, 1956 .....	1,087.50
23. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, December Service .....	19.91
24. Staff Expense Allowances, January .....	70.00
25. Staff Salaries: December 30, 1955 to January 12, 1956 \$1,343.47; January 13, 1956 to January 26, 1956 \$1,343.47 .....	2,686.94
	<hr/>
	\$1,052,836.56

## PART II

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments: due February, 1956, PUBLIC \$1,965,327.60; adj. re January, 1956 \$124,255.05 .....	\$2,089,582.65
---	----------------

## Appendix "A"

# Metropolitan School Board Current Estimates 1956

February 8, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the Metropolitan School Board:—

I have the honour to present the preliminary estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for current purposes for the year 1956.

It is estimated that the Board will be required to spend in 1956:

For Public School Purposes — \$25,661,882.00      For Secondary School Purposes — \$11,904,072.00

While this represents a significant increase over expenditures for 1955 it does not follow that the levy for Metropolitan School Board purposes in each municipality will be increased proportionately. The following factors will tend to offset the increased expenditures:—

- (1) A significant increase in the rateable assessment of the Metropolitan area.
- (2) An increase in legislative grants due to increasing enrolments.

(3) Inclusion in the revenues of an estimate of levies to be raised from assessment added to the roll during the current year.

Having regard to all sources of revenue the preliminary estimates are based upon a Metropolitan School levy:

For Public School Purposes — \$17,508,540.00      For Secondary School Purposes — \$8,915,858.00

While it is recognized that the demand made by the Metropolitan Authority on the Area Municipalities is for a stated sum of money rather than a rate, and while it is known that slight variations in local assessment policy may result in slight variations in rates; to raise the amounts levied for Metropolitan School purposes, the following approximate rates are given for the information of the Board.

	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>
For Public School Purposes .....	6.05	6.37
For Secondary School Purposes	<u>2.73</u>	<u>3.07</u>
Total .....	<u>8.78</u>	<u>9.44</u>

It is recommended that the estimates herein presented upon approval be submitted to the Metropolitan Council.

Respectfully submitted,  
W. J. McCORDIC,  
Executive Secretary.

## Metropolitan School Board.

THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD  
1956 CURRENT ESTIMATES

EXPENDITURE	1955 Estimates		1955 Actual		1956 Estimates	
	Public	Secondary	Public	Secondary	Public	Secondary
1. Maintenance Assistance Payments (Schedule "A") .....	\$18,410,726.00	\$8,140,173.00	\$18,401,005.00	\$ 8,131,757.00	\$19,653,276.00	\$ 9,306,743.00
2. Debt Service Charges (Schedule "B") .....	3,644,754.00	1,820,869.00	3,560,349.00	1,760,992.00	4,291,516.00	1,928,806.00
3. Auxiliary Classes—Net Cost of Operations (Schedule "C") .....	1,346,500.00	322,500.00	1,216,046.00	302,218.00	1,459,000.00	390,000.00
4. Non Resident Fees—Special Payment (Schedule "D") .....	25,000.00	25,000.00	1,464.00	.....	60,000.00	199,000.00
5. Transportation Costs .....	99,401.00	24,850.00	78,327.00	19,582.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
6. Administrative Expenses (Schedule "E") .....	45,000.00	20,000.00	91,025.00	41,918.00	98,090.00	24,523.00
7. Tax Deficiencies Charges Back by Area Municipalities .....					75,000.00	30,000.00
Total .....	\$23,571,381.00	\$10,353,392.00	\$23,348,216.00	\$10,256,467.00	\$25,661,882.00	\$11,904,072.00
REVENUE						
1. General Legislative Grants (Schedule "F") .....	\$ 6,699,000.00	\$ 2,665,000.00	\$ 6,636,121.00	\$ 2,601,879.00	\$ 7,221,000.00	\$ 2,647,000.00
2. Surplus from 1954 Operations .....	1,069,120.00	206,504.00	1,077,851.00	205,833.00	.....	.....
3. Surplus from 1955 Operations (Schedule "G") .....	.....	.....	607,342.00	236,214.00	607,342.00	236,214.00
4. Supplementary Tax Revenues Section 51, Assessment Act (1954 and 1956 at gross and 1955 at net) .....	352,671.00	159,277.00	790,996.00	362,358.00	325,000.00	105,000.00
Sub Total .....	\$ 8,120,791.00	\$ 3,030,781.00	\$ 7,897,626.00	\$ 2,933,856.00	\$ 8,153,342.00	\$ 2,988,214.00
5. Metropolitan Tax Levy for Current Year .....	\$15,450,590.00	\$ 7,322,611.00	\$15,450,590.00	\$ 7,322,611.00	\$17,508,540.00	\$ 8,915,858.00
Total .....	\$23,571,381.00	\$10,353,392.00	\$23,348,216.00	\$10,256,467.00	\$25,661,882.00	\$11,904,072.00



## SCHEDULE "A"

## MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

	1955 Estimate		1955 Actual		1956 Estimate	
	Public	Secondary	Public	Secondary	Public	Secondary
EAST YORK .....	\$1,097,058.00	\$ 405,492.50	\$1,097,121.00	\$ 405,510.00	\$1,076,253.00	\$ 421,806.50
ETOBICOKE .....	1,593,522.00	442,707.50	1,593,522.00	442,560.00	1,852,053.00	557,031.00
FOREST HILL .....	277,816.50	209,227.50	277,863.50	209,215.00	294,802.50	208,412.50
LAKE SHORE .....	526,636.50	273,521.00	526,636.50	273,532.00	534,021.00	293,991.50
LEASIDE .....	314,773.50	184,350.00	314,688.00	184,350.00	311,334.00	194,284.50
NORTH YORK .....	2,560,297.50	591,918.00	2,559,219.00	591,531.50	2,963,049.00	722,954.50
SCARBOROUGH .....	1,883,394.00	446,320.00	1,881,109.50	436,190.00	2,341,272.00	572,072.00
SWANSEA .....	104,313.00		104,308.50		103,539.00	
TORONTO .....	8,217,346.50	4,509,862.50	8,213,885.00	4,512,012.00	8,274,082.50	5,161,948.00
WESTON .....	174,768.00	266,079.50	173,936.77	266,079.50	181,996.50	313,559.50
YORK .....	1,660,800.00	810,694.00	1,659,409.50	810,776.50	1,720,873.50	860,682.50
Total .....	\$18,410,725.50	\$8,140,172.50	\$18,401,005.27	\$8,131,756.50	\$19,653,276.00	\$9,306,742.50

## SCHEDULE "A-1"

## 1956 MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

	Average Daily Attendance 1955			1956 Payments	
	Public	Academic	Commercial	Technical	Secondary
EAST YORK .....	7,175.02	1,473.71	177.93		\$ 421,806.50
ETOBICOKE .....	12,347.02	1,986.96	200.97		557,031.00
FOREST HILL .....	1,965.35	812.17	17.90		208,412.50
LAKE SHORE .....	3,560.14	602.21	223.97	190.62	293,991.50
LEASIDE .....	2,075.56	757.65	16.24		194,284.50
NORTH YORK .....	19,753.66	2,069.53	485.40	149.88	722,954.50
SCARBOROUGH .....	15,608.48	1,882.80	246.40	68.63	572,072.00
SWANSEA .....	690.26				
TORONTO .....	55,160.55	7,675.80	*3,846.06	5,222.95	5,161,948.00
WESTON .....	1,213.31	652.17	272.67	171.79	313,559.50
YORK .....	11,472.49	2,060.63	612.67	404.31	860,682.50
Total .....	131,021.84	19,973.63	6,100.21	6,208.18	\$9,306,742.50

NOTE: \*Grades 9 and 10 have been treated as Commercial for the purpose of the estimates.

## Metropolitan School Board.

## SCHEDULE "B"

## SUMMARY OF DEBENTURE DEBT CHARGES

	1955 Estimate Principal	1955 Estimate Interest	1955 Principal	1955 Actual Interest	1956 Principal	1956 Estimate Interest
<b>PUBLIC SCHOOL PURPOSES:</b>						
Debt Charges on Debentures assumed from Area Municipalities Dec. 31, 1953 .....	\$1,755,337.21	\$1,199,057.95	\$1,747,151.88	\$1,192,787.16	\$1,785,315.74	\$1,129,706.94
Debt Charges on Debentures Issued by Metropolitan Toronto .....	328,845.15	361,513.62	322,356.31	298,053.89	702,152.74	524,340.08
Debt Charges on Estimated 1956 Metropolitan Debenture Issues ....						150,000.00
	<u>\$2,084,182.36</u>	<u>\$1,560,571.57</u>	<u>\$2,069,508.19</u>	<u>\$1,490,841.05</u>	<u>\$2,487,468.48</u>	<u>\$1,804,047.02</u>
		<u>\$2,084,182.36</u>		<u>\$2,069,508.19</u>		<u>\$2,487,468.48</u>
		<u>\$3,644,753.93</u>		<u>\$3,560,349.24</u>		<u>\$4,291,515.50</u>
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL PURPOSES:</b>						
Debt Charges on Debentures assumed from Area Municipalities Dec. 31, 1953 .....	\$ 998,532.41	\$ 639,624.93	\$ 989,532.41	\$ 628,624.93	\$1,023,758.88	\$ 600,059.49
Debt Charges on Debentures Issued by Metropolitan Toronto .....	64,854.55	117,857.93	63,994.89	78,839.98	134,748.06	120,239.98
Debt Charges on Estimated 1956 1956 Metropolitan Debenture Issues .....						50,000.00
	<u>\$1,063,386.96</u>	<u>\$ 757,482.86</u>	<u>\$1,053,527.30</u>	<u>\$ 707,464.91</u>	<u>\$1,158,506.94</u>	<u>\$ 770,299.47</u>
		<u>\$1,063,386.96</u>		<u>\$1,053,527.30</u>		<u>\$1,158,506.94</u>
		<u>\$1,820,869.82</u>		<u>\$1,760,992.21</u>		<u>\$1,928,806.41</u>

SCHEDULE "B-1"  
DEBENTURE DEBT CHARGES DUE IN 1956  
ASSUMED DEBT

	Public		Secondary	
	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
	\$	\$	\$	\$
EAST YORK .....	154,725.85	93,766.36	13,733.93	2,937.36
ETOBICOKE .....	253,997.95	220,583.21	92,970.35	88,401.63
FOREST HILL .....	83,901.26	32,317.84	66,431.77	29,795.89
LAKESHORE .....	38,386.58	20,457.69	42,083.27	23,707.94
LEASIDE .....	45,640.29	19,397.52	49,442.66	26,550.01
NORTH YORK .....	441,510.98	328,398.86	156,554.79	113,013.15
SCARBOROUGH .....	219,104.20	193,091.55	86,749.17	70,266.35
SWANSEA .....	13,934.85	10,963.67	..	..
TORONTO .....	369,300.00	156,265.33	369,700.00	163,819.67
WESTON .....	13,360.73	6,750.66	28,500.00	35,450.00
YORK .....	149,453.05	47,714.25	117,592.94	44,117.49
	<u>\$1,785,315.74</u>	<u>\$1,129,706.94</u>	<u>\$1,023,758.88</u>	<u>\$600,059.49</u>

## Notes:

- (i) Items payable in foreign currency only are shown at the same figure in Canadian funds on the assumption that the Metropolitan Corporation will enjoy the gain or bear the loss.
- (ii) Where no precedent existed for dividing charges for administrative properties as between public and secondary, average daily attendance figures were used as a guide.

SCHEDULE "C"  
NET COST OF CLASSES OPERATED UNDER THE AUXILIARY CLASSES ACT

Area	Type	1955		1955		1956	
		Public	Budget Secondary	Public	Actual Secondary	Public	Budget Secondary
EAST YORK	Academic Vocational	\$ . . . . .		\$ . . . . .		\$ . . . . .	
	Opportunity	48,000.00		10,296.59		48,000.00	
	Hard of Hearing	8,000.00		40,075.58		9,000.00	
	Home Instruction	8,000.00		8,673.86		12,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
	Speech Correction	12,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	10,186.84		12,000.00	
ETOBICOKE	Special Transportation	14,000.00		10,290.13		2,000.00	
		2,000.00		1,681.20			
		\$ 84,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 81,204.20		\$ 83,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
	Academic Vocational	Opportunity		\$ . . . . .		\$ 5,000.00	
	Home Instruction	4,000.00		63,809.34		120,000.00	
FOREST HILL	Speech Correction	2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	5,322.43		7,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
	Initial Equipment	22,000.00		3,000.00 EST		3,000.00	
	Special Transportation	4,000.00		4,687.35		6,000.00	
		\$ 122,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 76,819.12		\$ 146,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
	Opportunity	9,000.00		6,585.37		7,500.00	
LAKESHORE	Home Instruction	400.00	\$ 500.00	137.50	\$ 210.00	500.00	\$ 500.00
	Special Transportation	100.00					
		\$ 9,500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 6,723.37	\$ 210.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 500.00
	Boys' Handicraft	Opportunity		7,802.74		8,000.00	
	Girls' Handicraft	17,000.00		5,986.74		6,000.00	
LEASIDE	Home Instruction	500.00	\$ 500.00	5,466.00		6,000.00	
	Speech Correction	1,500.00		102.50		500.00	\$ 500.00
	Initial Equipment	1,500.00		3,410.84		6,000.00	
	Special Transportation	500.00		225.00			
		\$ 21,000.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 22,993.82		\$ 26,500.00	\$ 500.00
NORTH YORK	Opportunity	13,000.00		15,806.26		16,000.00	
	Home Instruction	1,000.00	\$ 500.00	15.00	\$ 159.00	500.00	\$ 500.00
	Speech Correction	1,500.00		1,115.88		1,500.00	
		\$ 15,500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 16,937.14	\$ 159.00	\$ 18,000.00	\$ 500.00
	Academic Vocational	Opportunity		\$ . . . . .		\$ . . . . .	\$ 10,000.00
	Home Instruction	65,000.00		67,216.44		80,000.00	
	Hard of Hearing	2,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	7,523.58	\$ 280.50	10,000.00	500.00
	Speech Correction	6,000.00		9,960.22		10,000.00	
	Initial Equipment	14,000.00		20,842.46		22,000.00	
	Special Transportation	1,000.00	2,500.00	1,649.55		1,000.00	2,000.00
		2,000.00		8,036.70		10,000.00	
		\$ 90,000.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 115,228.95	\$ 280.50	\$ 133,000.00	\$ 12,500.00

SCARBOROUGH	Academic Vocational .....	\$ 60,000.00		\$ 55,946.66	\$ 16,000.00	
	Opportunity .....	3,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	3,860.96	64,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
	Home Instruction .....	5,000.00		1,914.40	5,000.00	
	Speech Correction .....	4,000.00		13,443.29	7,000.00	
	Special Transportation .....	.....		1,770.20	15,000.00	
	Initial Equipment .....	\$ 72,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 76,935.51	\$ 114,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
SWANSEA	Opportunity .....	\$ 500.00		.....	.....	
	Home Instruction .....	\$ 500.00		.....	.....	
TORONTO	Deaf .....	\$ 125,000.00		\$ 106,521.43	\$ 125,000.00	
	Hard of Hearing .....	30,000.00		30,799.98	30,000.00	
	Opportunity .....	260,000.00		256,630.98	280,000.00	
	Academic Vocational .....	225,000.00		203,529.41	225,000.00	\$ 63,000.00
	Sight Saving .....	30,000.00		30,308.50	32,000.00	
	Open Air .....	133,000.00		119,917.51	125,000.00	
	Orthopaedic .....	155,000.00		157,244.45	170,000.00	
	Institutions .....	60,000.00		52,310.01	60,000.00	
	Church Street .....	100,000.00		88,439.09	90,000.00	
	High Park Forest .....	60,000.00		37,819.11	40,000.00	
	Home Instruction .....	15,000.00		14,216.28	16,000.00	
	Speech Correction .....	38,000.00		37,558.63	40,000.00	
	Handicraft .....	.....	\$500,000.00	.....	.....	530,000.00
	Aphasic .....	.....		2,898.02	6,000.00	
	Special Equipment .....	3,000.00		2,134.28	14,000.00	
	Opportunity .....	\$1,234,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$1,140,127.68	\$1,253,000.00	\$605,000.00
	Home Instruction .....	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 5,202.34	5,500.00	
WESTON	Opportunity .....	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 534.34	\$ 6,000.00	
YORK	Hard of Hearing .....	\$ 6,000.00		\$ 6,108.48	\$ 6,500.00	
	Opportunity .....	48,000.00		36,636.24	40,000.00	
	Academic Vocational .....	.....		15,356.63	18,000.00	
	Handicraft .....	52,000.00		36,581.44	40,000.00	
	Home Instruction .....	12,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	12,622.56	13,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
	Speech Correction .....	12,000.00		11,163.62	12,000.00	
	Special Transportation .....	2,500.00		1,437.20	2,000.00	
		\$ 132,500.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 119,906.17	\$ 131,500.00	\$ 1,000.00
		\$1,786,500.00	\$512,500.00	\$1,662,230.30	\$1,919,000.00	\$623,000.00
Maintenance Assistance payments provided for on behalf of these pupils		440,000.00	190,000.00	446,184.00	460,000.00	233,000.00
		\$1,346,500.00	\$322,500.00	\$1,216,046.30	\$1,459,000.00	\$390,000.00
	Net Total .....					
	Total .....					

SCHEDULE "D"  
NON RESIDENT FEES—SPECIAL PAYMENT

Estimated payments to be made on behalf of	Public	1956 Estimate	Secondary
EAST YORK .....	\$21,000.00	\$	\$ 10,000.00
ETOBICOKE .....	1,000.00		15,000.00
FOREST HILL .....	.....		1,000.00
LAKESHORE .....	.....		2,000.00
LEASIDE .....	.....		5,000.00
NORTH YORK .....	20,000.00		82,000.00
SCARBOROUGH .....	6,000.00		55,000.00
SWANSEA .....	.....		10,000.00
TORONTO .....	.....		.....
WESTON .....	12,000.00		1,000.00
YORK .....	.....		18,000.00
	<u>\$60,000.00</u>		<u>\$199,000.00</u>

Note:

The above amounts are included in the Estimates to provide for the liability of the Metropolitan School Board to pay to the receiving board for non-resident pupils the excess, if any, of the receiving board's cost over the sending board's cost. The payments are subject to the necessary change in legislation being made by the Government and will be applicable only to residents of Metropolitan Toronto.

## TRANSPORTATION

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act 1953 provides that it shall be the duty of the School Board and it shall have the power:

"to determine the basis upon which the cost of transportation, if any, of the resident pupils of one public school division or high school district in the Metropolitan Area attending a school in another public school division or high school district in the Metropolitan Area shall be paid, and the respective responsibilities therefor of the sending board, the receiving board and the School Board."

Although there has not been a great deal of money spent on transportation as yet by the Metropolitan School Board, it is deemed expedient to retain amounts in the estimates to allow for payments to be made in 1956 should the Board deem it advisable to do so.

Public  
\$25,000.00

Secondary  
\$25,000.00

SCHEDULE "E"  
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE

	1955 Estimate	1955 Actual	1956 Estimate
Salaries .....	\$ 52,820.00	\$ 38,929.00	\$ 52,885.00
Expense Allowances .....	21,840.00	18,436.00	21,500.00
Equipment .....	4,665.00	3,824.00	2,708.00
Telephone, Insurance, Hydro .....	1,356.00	1,319.00	1,450.00
General Expenses .....	9,000.00	6,966.00	10,000.00
Building Rental .....	13,050.00	13,050.00	13,050.00
Office Maintenance .....	1,020.00	1,020.00	1,020.00
Staff Welfare & Pension .....	1,000.00	796.00	1,000.00
Area Survey Trips .....	500.00	69.00	500.00
Legal Fees .....	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00
Audit Fees .....	9,000.00	8,500.00	8,500.00
Contingencies .....	5,000.00	nil	5,000.00
	<u>\$124,251.00</u>	<u>\$ 97,909.00</u>	<u>\$122,613.00</u>
Divided	<u>\$ 99,400.80</u>	<u>\$ 78,327.20</u>	<u>\$ 98,090.40</u>
Public—80%	24,850.20	19,581.80	24,522.60
Secondary—20%			

Note:

The 1955 Estimates were divided between the Public and Secondary accounts on the basis of the Average Daily Attendance figures for 1954 of all pupils resident within the Metropolitan Toronto Area. The 1956 Estimates and the 1955 Actual have been divided on the basis of the Average Daily Attendance figures for 1955:

For both purposes the division was

Public—80%  
Secondary—20%



SCHEDULE "E-1"  
SALARIES

	Salary Range	Annual Salary Jan. 1, 1956	Increment Date Sept. 1	1956 Salary
Executive-Secretary .....	\$10,000.00-\$14,000.00	\$11,600.00	\$800.00	\$11,870.00
Treasurer .....		5,000.00		5,000.00
Assistant Secretary—Finance .....	6,500.00- 9,500.00	7,700.00	600.00	7,900.00
Assistant Secretary—Records .....	4,500.00- 6,500.00	5,300.00	400.00	5,430.00
Secretary .....	3,100.00- 3,700.00	3,500.00	200.00	3,570.00
Steno-Bookkeeper .....	2,900.00- 3,500.00	3,200.00	200.00	3,270.00
Stenographer .....	2,600.00- 3,200.00	2,800.00	200.00	2,870.00
Clerk-Typist .....	2,400.00- 3,000.00	2,600.00	200.00	2,670.00
Assessment Revisement Staff .....				8,305.00
Editorial Assistant (Part Time) .....				2,000.00
				<u>\$52,885.00</u>

SCHEDULE "E-2"

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES

1. Trustees	—Expense Allowance .....22 x \$300.00	\$6,600.00
	—Mileage Allowance .....22 x 40.00	880.00
2. Advisory Council	—Honorariums .....12 x \$800.00	\$9,600.00
	—Expense Allowance .....12 x 200.00	2,400.00
3. Staff Expense Allowance	—Executive Secretary .....	\$ 420.00
	—Assistant Secretary—Finance .....	420.00
	—General .....	180.00
4. Conferences and Conventions	.....	1,020.00
		<u>1,000.00</u>
		<u>\$21,500.00</u>

## SCHEDULE "E-3"

## EQUIPMENT

Filing Cabinets .....	\$ 240.00
I.B.M. Typewriter .....	555.00
Typewriter Desk .....	187.00
Stenographer's Chair .....	76.00
Map Hanging Equipment, etc. ....	200.00
Reference Library .....	1,000.00
Camera and Projector .....	250.00
Reception Room Furnishings .....	200.00
	<u>\$2,708.00</u>

## SCHEDULE "E-4"

## TELEPHONE, HYDRO, INSURANCE

Telephone .....	\$ 950.00
Hydro .....	200.00
Insurance .....	300.00
	<u>\$1,450.00</u>

## SCHEDULE "E-5"

## GENERAL EXPENSES

Parking Lot Rental .....	12 x \$50.00
Supplies .....	\$ 600.00
Meeting Expense .....	2,600.00
Postage .....	1,000.00
Printing Minutes .....	600.00
Analysis of School Plans .....	2,000.00
Board Picture .....	700.00
Printing of Reports .....	200.00
Miscellaneous .....	1,500.00
	<u>\$10,000.00</u>

SCHEDULE "F"  
ESTIMATE OF GENERAL LEGISLATIVE GRANTS

	1955 Estimate	1955 Actual	1955 Estimate
<b>PUBLIC</b>			
East York .....	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 452,649.00	\$ 450,000.00
Etobicoke .....	850,000.00	853,928.00	940,000.00
Forest Hill .....	100,000.00	95,153.00	96,000.00
Lakeshore .....	125,000.00	140,810.00	140,000.00
Leaside .....	90,000.00	90,473.00	87,000.00
North York .....	1,600,000.00	1,390,469.00	1,600,000.00
Scarborough .....	1,100,000.00	1,241,504.00	1,500,000.00
Swansea .....	30,000.00	30,687.00	29,000.00
Toronto .....	1,60,000.00	1,680,619.00	1,700,000.00
Weston .....	44,000.00	48,473.00	49,000.00
York .....	610,000.00	611,356.00	630,000.00
	<u>\$6,699,000.00</u>	<u>\$6,636,121.00</u>	<u>\$7,221,000.00</u>
<b>SECONDARY</b>			
East York .....	\$ 165,000.00	\$ 168,742.00	\$ 160,000.00
Etobicoke .....	275,000.00	271,711.00	270,000.00
Forest Hill .....	65,000.00	77,308.00	78,000.00
Lakeshore .....	125,000.00	113,952.00	94,000.00
Leaside .....	85,000.00	76,849.00	70,000.00
North York .....	375,000.00	313,961.00	359,000.00
Scarborough .....	225,000.00	233,880.00	300,000.00
Swansea .....	20,000.00	20,000.00 Est.	20,000.00
Toronto .....	960,000.00	961,180.00	950,000.00
Weston .....	30,000.00	30,811.00	26,000.00
York .....	340,000.00	333,485.00	320,000.00
	<u>\$2,665,000.00</u>	<u>\$2,601,879.00</u>	<u>\$2,647,000.00</u>

## Notes:

1. All figures represent the gross General Legislative Grants receivable by the Metropolitan School Board and do not have superannuation fund payments deducted therefrom.
2. Swansea secondary grant is based on 1955 non-resident fee costs and has not yet been definitely established.

## SCHEDULE "G"

## SURPLUS FROM 1955 OPERATIONS

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	1955 Estimate	1955 Actual	Surplus + or Deficit -
Exp. Maintenance Assistance Payments .....	\$18,410,726.00	\$18,401,005.00	\$ 9,721.00 +
Debt Service Debt Charges .....	3,644,754.00	3,560,349.00	84,405.00 +
Transportation Costs .....	25,000.00	1,464.00	23,536.00 +
Auxiliary Classes—Net Cost of Operations .....	1,346,500.00	1,216,046.00	130,454.00 +
Administrative Expense .....	99,401.00	78,327.00	21,074.00 +
Tax Deficiencies .....	45,000.00	91,025.00	46,025.00 -
Legislative Grants .....	6,699,000.00	6,636,121.00	62,879.00 -
Supplementary Tax Revenues, 1954 (Net) .....	352,671.00	348,141.00	4,530.00 -
Supplementary Tax Revenues, 1955 (Net) .....	1,069,120.00	442,855.00	442,855.00 +
Surplus from 1954 .....	15,450,590.00	1,077,851.00	8,731.00 +
1955 Tax Levy .....	Nil	15,450,590.00	.....
Net Surplus .....	Nil	\$ 607,342.00	\$607,342.00
SECONDARY SCHOOLS			
Exp. Maintenance Assistance Payments .....	\$ 8,140,173.00	\$ 8,131,757.00	\$ 8,416.00 +
Debt Service Debt Charges .....	1,820,869.00	1,760,992.00	59,877.00 +
Transportation Costs .....	25,000.00	.....	25,000.00 +
Auxiliary Classes—Net Cost of Operations .....	322,500.00	302,218.00	20,282.00 +
Administrative Expense .....	24,850.00	19,582.00	5,268.00 +
Tax Deficiencies .....	20,000.00	41,918.00	21,918.00 -
Legislative Grants .....	2,665,000.00	2,601,879.00	63,121.00 -
Supplementary Tax Revenues, 1954 (Net) .....	159,277.00	156,233.00	3,044.00 -
Supplementary Tax Revenues, 1955 (Net) .....	206,504.00	206,125.00	206,125.00 +
Surplus from 1954 .....	7,322,611.00	7,322,611.00	671.00 -
1955 Tax Levy .....	Nil	7,322,611.00	.....
Net Surplus .....	Nil	\$ 236,214.00	\$236,214.00

ESTIMATED TAX REVENUE RECEIVABLE BY THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD  
ARISING OUT OF ASSESSMENTS MADE UNDER SECTION 51 OF THE ASSESSMENT ACT

	Public	Secondary
<b>1955 ACTUAL</b>		
(a) Supplementary Taxes 1954 (net)—This includes Section 51 revenue deferred from 1954 and also adjustments to both the 1954 revenue and to the 1954 uncollectible taxes .....	\$348,141.00	\$156,233.00
(b) Supplementary Taxes 1955—as reported by local councils .....	442,855.00	206,125.00
	<u>\$790,996.00</u>	<u>\$362,358.00</u>
(c) Uncollectible Taxes 1955—as reported by local councils .....	91,025.00	41,918.00
	<u>\$699,971.00</u>	<u>\$320,440.00</u>
<b>1956 ESTIMATE</b>		
In view of the ever present possibility of a slackening off in construction, it is suggested that the following figures be used for the 1956 estimates.		
Supplementary Taxes 1956 (Gross) .....	\$325,000.00	\$105,000.00
Uncollectible Taxes 1956 .....	<u>75,000.00</u>	<u>30,000.00</u>
	<u>\$250,000.00</u>	<u>\$ 75,000.00</u>



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 2 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, February 21st, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Eve, Ferguson, Lang and Long, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. Your Committee had before it for information a report of the Executive Secretary outlining permanent attendance area changes approved by the Metropolitan School Board during the past two years. The report indicated:

(i) That approximately 1358 public pupils from approved attendance areas are accommodated in schools beyond their resident municipality;

(ii) That approximately 941 academic secondary students from approved attendance areas are accommodated in schools beyond their resident municipality;

(iii) That approximately 665 vocational secondary students from approved attendance areas are accommodated in schools beyond their resident municipality.

The Committee noted instances where large numbers of students from one municipality are in attendance at schools in adjacent municipalities, being arrangements which existed prior to the formation of the Metropolitan School Board. In the opinion of the Committee such arrangements should be recognized by the School Board. Accordingly, your Committee recommends:

(a) that the East York Board of Education be requested to define the present relationship of secondary school students in the Bennington Heights area of the Township to schools in adjacent municipalities in order that existing arrangements might be recognized by the School Board;

(b) that the Swansea Board of Education be requested to define the relationship of secondary school students of the Village to schools in adjacent municipalities in order that existing arrangements might be recognized by the School Board.

Your Committee has also requested the Executive Secretary to review the attendance area recently established for Weston Collegiate and Vocational School and to report thereon to the Committee.

2. The School Board at its meeting held on February 14th referred to the School Accommodation Committee for study, the comment of the North York Board of Education regarding accommodation of secondary school students from subdivision T-7811, located adjacent to Victoria Park Avenue, north of Lawrence Avenue East.

The North York Board indicated that the students from this area would be accommodated temporarily at Earl Haig C.I., later Don Mills C.I. and eventually a secondary school within the immediate vicinity.

Your Committee is of the opinion that the accommodation of secondary students residing in the vicinity of Victoria Park Avenue and Lawrence Avenue East at Earl Haig C.I. is not satisfactory in view of the distance involved. As there are other major topographical problems in respect of housing development adjacent to Victoria Park Avenue in the Township of North York the Committee feels that alternative accommodation might be provided in an adjacent municipality, viz., Scarborough Township.

Accordingly, the Committee has requested the Advisory Council to undertake a study of the question of secondary school accommodation for students adjacent to the North York-Scarborough boundary and to report thereon.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.



---

REPORT No. 3 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART I.

Tuesday, February 21, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Ferguson, Lockhart, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education in connection with the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the Etobicoke Planning Area:

Amendment No. 97—re-zoning of an area on the south side of Bloor Street west of Highway No. 27 from residential to commercial.

The Etobicoke Board of Education has indicated that it has no objection to the proposed amendment.

2. That the Board concur in the comments of area boards of education with respect to the following subdivision plans and so advise the Department of Planning and Development and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board:

Township of Etobicoke.

T-8990—36 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Eatonville Public School until a new school is erected north of Burnhamthorpe Road on a site yet to be selected. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I.

T-9333—81 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School until a new school is erected on the Chapman Avenue Site. Secondary students will be accommodated at Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until accommodation is provided either at Thistletown Collegiate or another new school to be erected in the vicinity of Richview Side Road and Islington Avenue.

T-9334—65 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Elmlea Public School, but an addition to this school will be required. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until Thistletown Collegiate is opened in September, 1957.

T-9335—32 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Bay Public School until a new school is erected at the corner of Cloverhill Road and Kinsdale Boulevard. Secondary students will attend Royal York Collegiate Institute.

T-9351—9 lots

Public school children, grades kindergarten to 6, will attend Lanor Public School. Grades 7 and 8 will attend Franklin Horner Senior School. Secondary students will attend Alderwood Collegiate.

T-9383—510 lots.

A public school site will be required either in the plan of subdivision under consideration or in the Township Lot to the north. Since the board has not yet been able to reach an agreement in regard to the purchase of a school site, it would be appreciated if the release of the plan could be withheld. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe Collegiate.

T-9411—8 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Cloverdale Public School. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I. when it opens in September 1956.

T-9443—23 lots.

Public school pupils, kindergarten to grade 6, will attend Douglas Park Junior School. Grades 7 and 8 will attend Franklin Horner Senior School. Secondary students will attend Alderwood Collegiate.

#### Township of North York.

T-8344 (2) Revised—259 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately 8 acres with 3 to 4 acres being part of this

subdivision and the remainder being part of the Downsview Golf and Country Club in the vicinity of Northpark Boulevard and Brewood Road. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview Collegiate and eventually a collegiate to be located in the northwest of the township.

T-8345 (1) Revised—588 lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of at least 5 acres within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision and being more central to the area which the school will be required to serve. The proposed public school site of 5.58 acres (Block B) is unsatisfactory since it is not central to the area to be served. A suitable site has been indicated on the plan. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. and eventually a collegiate to be located in the northwest of the township.

T-8359 Revised—138 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Blaydon Avenue Public School and eventually a school to be located on Southview Street. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. and eventually a collegiate to be located in the northwest of the township.

T-8675 Revised—22 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Wilmington Avenue Public School and eventually a school to the north of Wilmington Avenue Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-8824 (2nd Revision)—1053 lots.

The North York Board will require two public school sites within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. The proposed public school sites of 5 acres each (Block K and Block B) are geographically acceptable to the Board. Public school pupils will temporarily attend public schools in the Don Mills area. Secondary students will temporarily attend York Mills C.I. and eventually a collegiate in the vicinity.

T-9401—72 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Cummer Avenue Public School and eventually a school in the vicinity.

Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I. and eventually a collegiate in the northeast of the township.

Township of Scarborough.

T-8515 Revised—90 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Galloway Road Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill Collegiate.

T-9267 Revised—57 lots.

Public school pupils will attend McCowan Road Public School. Secondary students will attend R. H. King Collegiate.

T-9377—17 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Eastview Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill Collegiate.

T-9384—62 lots.

Public school pupils will attend George B. Little Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill Collegiate.

T-9412—8 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ellesmere Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill Collegiate.

T-9427—178 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Golf Road Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill Collegiate.

Township of York.

T-9361—20 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Roseland Public School.

3. On June 30, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board approved the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds:

Royal York C.I.—addition of 12 standard classrooms,  
Auditorium.

Metro Share .....	\$240,000.00
Local Share .....	\$246,000.00
Total .....	\$486,000.00
Ceiling .....	\$486,000.00

The Etobicoke Board of Education has submitted a capital fund request in the amount of \$514,000.00 as follows:

General Contractor .....	\$442,200.00
Architect's Fee .....	26,800.00
Furniture and Equipment including audi- torium seats, etc. ....	30,000.00
Contingencies .....	15,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$514,000.00

This application is \$28,000.00 in excess of the ceiling formula for the above addition. However, when the previous addition to Royal York Collegiate was approved the ceiling formula was \$324,000.00. The Etobicoke Board made application for capital funds in the amount of \$218,000.00 being \$106,000.00 less than the ceiling formula.

As the ceiling formula provides that a local board may apply unused funds from a previous addition to any future addition, your Committee recommends that the application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$514,000.00 be approved.

4. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for the erection of secondary school accommodation:

Warden-St. Clair School, 16 standard classrooms, Art, Music,  
3 Science Labs, Library-Classroom, Industrial Arts,  
Home Economics, Typing Room, Double Gymnasium,  
Cafeteria.

Estimated Cost ..... \$1,066,500.00

Ceiling ..... 1,066,500.00

Date School required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—572.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—790.

5. Your Committee had before it for consideration a communication from the Ontario Municipal Board enquiring as to whether the York Mills and Don Mills High Schools, which received tentative approval of the Ontario Municipal Board in 1954, will be proceeded with or whether these applications have been withdrawn. The Executive Secretary

advised the Committee that the application for the York Mills High School may be expected to be presented for final approval of the Ontario Municipal Board within a matter of weeks.

Your Committee recommends that the Ontario Municipal Board be advised of the status of the York Mills C.I. application. In consideration of the application for Don Mills C.I., it was observed that no provision has been made in the North York building plans to proceed with this project during 1956. Consideration was given to the possibility that this application be tentatively withdrawn if this action could be used to the advantage of area boards of education by increasing the 1956 composite capital proposal by an amount equivalent to the estimated cost of the Don Mills C.I.

The Committee therefore recommends that the Executive Secretary request the North York Board to give consideration to the withdrawal of this application for the year 1956 with the afore-mentioned action in mind.

#### CAPITAL ESTIMATES

6. Your Committee had before it for consideration the capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956, a copy of which was forwarded to all members. As the capital estimates as presented are considerably in excess of the capital estimates of 1955, the Committee has requested the Executive Secretary to confer with area boards of education to ascertain whether, through further study, their capital estimates for 1956 might be reduced.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.

---

#### REPORT No. 3 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, February 23, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs.

Stinson (Chairman), Ferguson, Long, Power, Van Esterik, Mrs. Temple and Miss Perney, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. In favour of sections 3 and 4 of Report No. 3 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. That the Executive Secretary be authorized to purchase an I.B.M. Electric Typewriter, 18" carriage, at an approximate cost of \$550.00. Funds are included in the current estimates for this purchase.

3. That Disbursement List No. 40, dated February 23, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$964,803.10 be approved. (For details of List see Appendix p. 120.)

FRED C. STINSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 1 OF LEGISLATION AND BY-LAWS  
COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, February 23, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Dr. Long (Chairman), Messrs. Campbell, Ferguson, Stinson and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

Since the Metropolitan School Board was created in April, 1953, the School Board has undertaken the responsibilities assigned to it under The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. In view of the fact that the establishment of the School Board was a departure from any previous municipal arrangement your Committee is of the opinion that an evaluation of the role and activities of the Board to date should be undertaken. The Committee is also of the opinion that a study should be made of the future activities of the Board. From such an evaluation and study it could be expected that certain long range decisions about the role of the

School Board might be determined at least on a tentative basis.

It is proposed therefore that the Legislation and By-laws Committee institute an enquiry, on an informal basis, arranged in such a way that the participants would be free to express their own personal opinions. Specifically it is suggested that the Committee hear the views of four groups of people, each group to be as representative as possible of the various agencies which have been in a position to work with and be informed about the Metropolitan School Board. The Committee proposes to invite the following representatives:

- (a) A representative of the Department of Education.
- (b) An elected representative of the Metropolitan Corporation.
- (c) A senior official of the staff of the Metropolitan Corporation.
- (d) A member of the Metropolitan School Board not on the Legislation and By-laws Committee.
- (e) A former member of the Metropolitan School Board, either retired from public life or now serving on an area board or council.
- (f) A member of the Board's Advisory Council.
- (g) A representative from an area board of education who has not served on the Metropolitan School Board.

The Committee proposes a common agenda for each of the four meetings and the following topics are suggested for inclusion in such an agenda:

- (a) Role of the Metropolitan School Board in the co-ordination and expansion of technical school services.

The agenda would include a brief statement of the activities to date of the Metropolitan School Board in co-ordinating technical school plans of area boards. Provision would be made for the discussion of the advisability of the appointment, probably for a stated period, of a co-ordinator of technical school services by the Metropolitan School Board.



- (b) The role of the Metropolitan School Board in the co-ordination of special education.

The agenda would include a statement of the present role and consideration of the advisability of the appointment of an officer to serve the Board in this regard.

- (c) Apportionment of capital costs between the Metropolitan School Board and area boards of education.

At the present time the statutes provide that the Metropolitan share of capital cost of school buildings shall be the amount approved for legislative grant purposes by the Department of Education. It has been demonstrated that this division may not be consistent with the original intent of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. Consideration might be given by the groups to the alternative methods approved for discussion by the Metropolitan School Board at its meeting January 31, i.e.:

- (i) to provide that the Metropolitan School Board shall determine in connection with each application for capital funds the proportion of debt which shall be borne by the Metropolitan School Board and that proportion which shall be borne by the area board of education;

or

- (ii) to provide that the Department of Education shall, in addition to indicating an amount approved for legislative grant purposes, indicate a second amount for all municipalities in the Metropolitan area which shall be the amount of debt to be borne by the Metropolitan School Board.

- (d) Representation.

There is evidence that, in view of the growing disparity between the population of the municipalities in the Metropolitan area and the representation they enjoy on the two Metropolitan bodies, this matter will be subject to review. Consideration should be given to whether or not the method proposed for the Metropolitan Council should necessarily be the method used for the Metropolitan School Board. The groups might be requested to give study to a plan specifically designed to meet the school situation.

(e) Assessment Revision.

The Metropolitan School Board has had before it for some time the proposal that the Metropolitan School Board appoint an officer or officers to represent the interest of the public school supporters within the Metropolitan area in matters of assessment revision. The groups could be furnished with observations of area boards of education to this proposal and their reaction secured.

(f) Methods of achieving some approach to uniformity of teacher salaries in the Metropolitan area.

The Committee proposes that following the series of four meetings outlined above a fifth meeting be held at which time Dr. R. W. B. Jackson and the three secretaries of the Board would be requested to express their opinions relative to the ideas presented at the group discussions. On the basis of the five meetings, your Committee would submit a report to the Board satisfying the purposes for which the enquiry was made and would include such comments and recommendations to the Board as deemed appropriate, including possible changes in legislation.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Your Committee recommends:

- (i) That the Board authorize the study as outlined above;
- (ii) That the Chairman of the Legislation and By-laws Committee be requested to extend invitations to various representatives as shown on page 112 of the report;
- (iii) That the Executive Secretary be authorized to have prepared a brief outlining the problems to be discussed at the special meetings, such brief to be forwarded to invited representatives prior to the meetings.

JOHN A. LONG,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 2 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

February 21, 1956.

1. At the last meeting of the Board the Board approved an application of the North York Board of Education for erection of the Keele-Sheppard Public School to provide accommodation for resident pupils of North York Township in the vicinity of Keele St. and Sheppard Avenue West and children of R.C.A.F. personnel at Downsview Airport. As the children of R.C.A.F. personnel at Downsview are now being accommodated at Hughes Public School, Toronto, the Board gave tentative approval to the application for the new school on the understanding that the School Accommodation Committee gave evidence to the School Board that the space released at Hughes Public School will be adequately used by York Township or Toronto pupils.

Your Committee has requested the Executive Secretary to undertake a survey of public school enrolments of schools adjacent to the Toronto-York boundary in close proximity to Hughes Public School and to report thereon.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 3 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART II.

Tuesday, February 21, 1956.

1. That the following applications for capital funds for the purchase of public school sites be approved:

	Estimated Total Cost
Etobicoke Board of Education:	
Park Lawn Relief School Site .....	\$70,000.00
1.6 acres contiguous to a Park 357 feet front- ing on Cloverhill Road 236 feet fronting on Kinsdale Boulevard.	

Date School required—January 1, 1957.  
 No. of classrooms proposed—8 classrooms,  
 kindergarten, General Purpose.

North York Board of Education:

Belmar Park West Site (temporary name):

4 acres ..... 30,000.00

Frontage on west side of unnamed street,  
 midway between Wilson Avenue and  
 Sheppard Avenue.

Date School required—Indefinite.

No. of Classrooms proposed—Indefinite.

Brian Drive Site (Pleasantville):

5 acres ..... 23,000.00

Brian Drive north of Sheppard Avenue  
 between Woodbine Avenue and Victoria  
 Park Avenue.

Date School required—Indefinite, probably  
 September 1957.

No. of Classrooms proposed—8 and kinder-  
 garden.

Brookbank Drive Site:

5 acres ..... 35,000.00

Frontage on Brookbank Drive, York Mills  
 Road on the north, Woodbine Avenue on  
 the west, Victoria Park on the east, Pro-  
 perty of Christian Brothers on the south.

Date School required—Probably December,  
 1957.

No. of Classrooms proposed—10 and kinder-  
 garden.

Linthurst Avenue Site (Belmar Park East):

5 acres ..... 37,000.00

Frontage on Linthurst Avenue east of Jane  
 Street, between Sheppard Avenue and  
 Wilson Avenue in Belmar Park proposed  
 subdivision.

Date School required—Indefinite.

No of Classrooms proposed—Indefinite.

## Silverview Drive Site:

5 acres .....	\$38,000.00
Frontage on Silverview Drive in subdivision at southeast of intersection Yonge Street and Cummer Avenue.	
Date School required—Probably September, 1957.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—12 and kinder- garten.	

## Three Valleys Drive Site:

5 acres .....	35,000.00
Frontage on Three Valleys Drive, York Mills Road on north, Woodbine Avenue on east, Don River Valley on west and south.	
Date School required—Probably September, 1957.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—12 and kinder- garten.	

2. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for the erection of public school accommodation:

Park Lawn Relief School—8 standard classrooms, kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$227,850.00
Ceiling .....	227,850.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—275.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—280.

3. Your Committee had before it a communication from the North York Board of Education advising that the North York Board has terminated all consideration of possible construction of a school unit on the proposed school site in the Bayview-Blythwood area (Stratheden site) and wishes to withdraw its application for capital funds in the amount of \$95,000.00 for purchase of the school site.

Your Committee recommends that the application for purchase of the Bayview-Blythwood public school site in

the amount of \$95,000.00 be withdrawn, and that the Ontario Municipal Board be so advised.

4. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of a public school site extension:

	Estimated Total Cost
Park Lawn Public School Site extension:	
5 acres .....	\$30,000.00
At easterly end of Bethnal Avenue having (but prop- 500 feet frontage on Park Lawn Road erty must be expro- priated.)	

In its consideration of the foregoing application the Committee noted that the Park Lawn Public School site is comprised of 6.2 acres of which only 2.9 acres are available for play area due to design of the school. The Committee was further advised that a park area of 3.8 acres lies immediately north of the school site. (The Etobicoke Board disposed of the 3.8 acres to the Corporation of the Township of Etobicoke in 1954.) As the existing site consists of 6.2 acres and as a park area immediately adjoins, the Committee could not see its way clear to approve the application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of 5 additional acres.

With respect to purchase of public school sites from the bulk site purchase fund the Board previously agreed to approve a maximum area of 8 acres. Accordingly, your Committee recommends that the Etobicoke Board be advised:

1. That the Metropolitan School Board would consider approval of capital funds from the bulk site purchase fund for purchase of 1.8 acres of additional property in order to bring the Park Lawn Public School site up to a maximum of 8 acres.

2. That, in the event the Etobicoke Board of Education desires to acquire in excess of the 1.8 acres, one of the following plans could be used whereby funds would not be drawn from the bulk site purchase fund:

(a) that area boards desiring lands in excess of 8 acres for public schools may by separate application apply to the Metropolitan School Board for approval of the issuance of the necessary debentures and that such applications will be processed as previously, i.e., through the Metropolitan Council and the Ontario Municipal Board.

(b) in the event that sites in excess of 8 acres may be desired in order that the site may more effectively serve community needs, that an area board has the option of arranging that such lands be purchased by the local municipal council and that debenture funds required for these purposes be processed by that council through the Metropolitan Council.

(c) that area boards of education desiring to finance the cost of lands in excess of 8 acres for public school sites may do so from current funds.

GEORGE PECK

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 3 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, February 23, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2 and 4 of Report No. 3 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 40, dated February 23, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$2,208,025.68 be approved. (For details of list see Appendix p. .)

FRED C. STINSON,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, February 28, 1956.

## DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 40.

February 23, 1956.

## PART I.

1. Auxiliary Class Costs, Final 1955 Payment, Secondary .....	\$ 32,559.60
2. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due March, 1956, Secondary .....	930,674.25

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956

3. Bell Telephone Company, February Service .....	83.25
4. Carswell Company Limited, Printing Min- utes .....	113.50
5. Dominion Maintenance Company, January Service .....	85.00
6. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, Meeting Ex- pense .....	73.00
7. New York Window Cleaning Company, Janu- ary Service \$12.00; February Service \$12.00 .....	24.00
8. Ontario Towel Service Limited, January Service .....	10.00
9. Orange Crush Limited, Meeting Expense .....	2.40
10. Receiver General of Canada, Postage Stamps .....	44.00
11. Stainton & Evis Limited, Supplies .....	22.90
12. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental, February 15 to March 14 .....	1,087.50
13. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, January Service .....	20.10
14. Underwood Limited, Supplies .....	3.60

---

 \$ 964,803.10

## PART II.

1. Auxiliary Class Costs, Final 1955 Payment (excluding Etobicoke and Scarborough) Public .....	242,698.08
2. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due March, 1956, Public .....	1,965,327.60
	<hr/> \$2,208,025.68



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 4 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE —PART I.

Tuesday, March 6, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Ferguson, Grayson, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That final approval of the Ontario Municipal Board has been received in connection with the following projects:

	Amount
North York Board of Education	
Champlain Boulevard Public School .....	\$176,400.00
Sloane Avenue Public School .....	\$260,000.00
Scarborough Board of Education	
Chapman Farm Public School .....	\$287,768.00
Walter Perry Public School .....	\$179,525.00
R. H. King Collegiate Institute .....	\$324,000.00
Weston Board of Education	
Memorial Public School .....	\$120,000.00

2. That the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education in connection with the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the Township of North York and so advise the Department of Planning and Development. The North York Board has no objection to the amendment.

Amendment No. 46—

re-zoning an area at the southwest corner of Elm Park Drive and Jane Street from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning an area at the southeast corner of Keele Street and Lawrence Avenue from Commercial to Residential.

re-zoning an area at the northeast corner of Keele Street and Lawrence Avenue from Industrial to Commercial.

re-zoning an area on the east side of Bathurst Street north from Haddington Avenue to Dunblaine Avenue from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning an area at the southeast corner of Yonge Street and Cummer Avenue from Industrial to Commercial.

re-zoning an area on the south side of Cummer Avenue, east of Yonge Street to Willowdale Avenue from Commercial to Residential.

re-zoning an area on the south side of Cummer Avenue, west of Willowdale Avenue and an area south of St. John Convalescent Hospital from Commercial to Open Space and from Residential to Open Space.

re-zoning an area on the west side of Keele Street, north of Maple Leaf Drive from Residential to Commercial.

3. That the Board concur in the comments of the area boards of education in connection with the following subdivision plans and so advise the Department of Planning and Development and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board:—

Township of York

T-9459—20 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Blythwood Public School or Bedford Park Public School subject to the approval of the Toronto Board of Education. Secondary students will attend North Toronto Collegiate subject to the approval of the Toronto Board of Education.

T-9467—30 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Downsview Public School. Secondary students will attend Downsview Collegiate.

Township of Scarborough

T-9424—112 lots.

Public school pupils will attend a school at Coombe and Nelson (Cedar Glen Site). Secondary students will attend West Hill Collegiate.

4. That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for the erection of secondary school accommodation:—

Thistletown Collegiate, 12 standard classrooms, Art, Music, 2 Science Labs, Library, 2 Home Economics, 2 Shops, Typing Room, Double Gymnasium, Cafeteria.

Metro Share .....	\$360,000.00
Local Share .....	\$558,000.00
Total .....	\$918,000.00
Ceiling .....	\$918,000.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—600.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—680.

5. The composite capital proposal of the School Board for 1956 contains an amount of \$500,000.00 for an addition to Runnymede Collegiate. The York Township Board has requested that the estimated cost of the addition be increased by an amount of \$150,000.00 to provide for installation of a swimming pool in the school.

Your Committee recommends that the amount included in the composite capital proposal for the addition to Runnymede C.I. be not increased and that the York Township Board of Education be advised that the ceiling formula for construction of secondary schools does not provide an allowance for inclusion of swimming pools. The Committee further recommends that the York Township Board be advised that the Provincial Government has under consideration at the present time an amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act which would permit councils of area municipalities to make grants-in-aid to area boards for the construction of swimming pools by area boards on school property. (This method was used by the North York Board of Education and the local council for the provision of swimming pools in the Northview Heights and the York Mills Collegiate Institutes.)

6. In 1954 the Department of Planning and Development referred subdivision plan T-7365 to the Metropolitan School Board and the Etobicoke Board of Education for comment.

At that time the Etobicoke Board reported that it did not consider it in the public interest to release the above plan until it could be determined if and where another school site could be purchased in the area to serve the over-flow from Park Lawn Public School. The Metropolitan School Board concurred in the comment of the area board and so advised the Department of Planning and Development.

On February 14 the Department of Planning and Development indicated that the Minister had referred the application to the Ontario Municipal Board pursuant to provision of Section 29 of The Planning Act. Subsequent to this notification the Etobicoke Board of Education advised that if that board's application for purchase of a school site and erection of a school to relieve the Park Lawn School were approved by the Metropolitan School Board the Etobicoke Board would have no further objection to release of this plan nor any objection to re-zoning in the general area from greenbelt to residential.

As the Metropolitan School Board approved the applications referred to above your Committee recommends that the Department of Planning and Development and the Ontario Municipal Board be advised that the Etobicoke Board and the Metropolitan School Board are agreeable to release of subdivision plan T-7365.

7. Your Committee has been advised that the Metropolitan Council at its meeting held on March 6 adopted the following recommendation of the Commissioner of Finance:

"(c) That the Capital programme for new schools in each Area Municipality be considered and approved by the local Council before being processed through the Metropolitan School Board and the Metropolitan Council for approval."

Your Committee recommends that the Board concur in the recommendation of the Metropolitan Council and that area boards of education be requested in future years to arrange for a review and approval of their respective capital estimates by their local council not later than February 1st in each year.

8. Your Committee was advised that the Metropolitan School Board has been requested to submit to the Metropolitan Council possible dates for a meeting of representatives of the Metropolitan Council and the School Board to discuss the current and capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for 1956.

Your Committee recommends:

(a) that the following dates be submitted to the Metropolitan Council, i.e. Thursday, March 15 or Friday, March 16 at 4.00 p.m. and Tuesday, March 20 at 8.00 p.m.,

(b) that the Chairmen's Committee be authorized to meet with the representatives of the Metropolitan Council.

#### CAPITAL ESTIMATES.

9. Your Committee had before it for consideration the revised capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956, for details of which see Appendix "A". Amended.

Your Committee had before it for information an analysis of additional pupil spaces which will become available as a result of building activities during 1954 and 1955. Although the analysis is not complete, the Committee was advised that whereas the enrolment in public schools as of January 1, 1954, exceeded the spaces in the Townships of Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough the effect of the 1954 and 1955 programmes has been to provide permanent spaces at least equivalent to the anticipated enrolment for September, 1956. In addition, the volume of proposed programme in these three townships for 1956 is such that by September, 1957 there would be some surplus space approved to be applied against future need.

In view of this information, your Committee recommends that the detail of the programme remain unchanged but that the Metropolitan School Board give an undertaking to the Metropolitan Council to restrict approvals during 1956 of building projects to a maximum of \$21,000,000.00. It is the belief of the Committee that this restriction will not handicap the Boards with respect to essential building. Amended.

The Committee further recommends that in presenting the programme, the Metropolitan School Board reserve the right in its consideration of individual applications to make substitutions where any unexpected development makes such substitution necessary.

As in the 1955 proposals it is recommended that the Ceiling Cost Formula previously approved by the Metropolitan School Board for 1956 be incorporated in the Capital Programme for presentation to the Metropolitan Council.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Amended as follows:—

With respect to Appendix "A" of section 9 being the detail of the composite capital estimates of the Board the Board directed (a) that the following projects be added to the capital estimates of the Toronto Board of Education to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1956:—

Regents Park Public School (Jr. Kindergarten) .....	\$ 44,100.00
Parkdale Senior Public School .....	309,670.00
Huron Junior Public School .....	442,635.00
	<hr/>
	\$796,405.00

and (b) that the following project included in the capital estimates of the Toronto Board of Education to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1956, be deleted:—

North Toronto C.I. (Renovations) .....	\$ 70,000.00
--	--------------

Appendix "A" as amended was approved, increasing the total for new projects to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1956 from \$22,759,395.00 to \$23,485,800.00.

Section 9 was further amended by deleting paragraph 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"It is recommended that the capital estimates as shown in Appendix "A", as amended, including the 1956 estimated

site purchases be approved, and presented to the Metropolitan Council."

Adopted by the Board, as amended, March 13, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 4 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, March 8, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Ferguson, Power, Van Esterik, Miss Perney and Mrs. Temple, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 of Report No. 4 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. That Disbursement List No. 41, dated March 8, containing Part I accounts totalling \$5,578.17 be approved. Appendix p. 133.

3. The Finance Committee has had under consideration at its last two meetings a report prepared by the Advisory Council on the function and importance of swimming pools. For the information of the members a copy of the report is shown in Appendix "B".

During a review of the report the Committee also considered the question of provision of capital funds for construction of swimming pools in schools. On the basis of an expenditure of approximately \$150,000.00 for construction of each pool, it is estimated that if pools were provided in all secondary schools to be erected during the next 10 years, the total cost would be in the neighbourhood of \$3,000,000.00. In addition, a further estimated cost of \$3,000,000.00 would be required to provide swimming pools in existing secondary schools where no such facilities exist at the present time. The Committee had before it the following methods previously used to finance school swimming pools:—

(a) Debenture funds against the school account.

The majority of all school swimming pools constructed prior to 1954 were financed by debentures repayment of which was the responsibility of the local school board. In the case of the City of Toronto an arrangement was reached with the City Council whereby the Toronto Board of Education was reimbursed by the municipality in an amount equal to 50% of the annual debt charges of swimming pools. This arrangement applies, however, to pools constructed in recent years only and resulted from the growing use of pools for community purposes.

(b) Debenture funds against the municipal account.

In 1955 the Township of North York secured by private bill, Legislation authorizing the municipal council to issue debentures against the municipal account the proceeds of which were to be used for construction of swimming pools as part of a school plant.

(c) Current funds.

Although this office has no record of swimming pools constructed from current funds this method was considered in connection with the swimming pools at Queen Alexandra Senior School and North Toronto Collegiate Institute.

As swimming pools are used both for school purposes and a variety of community activities after school hours, your Committee is of the opinion that the provision of capital funds for swimming pools should be undertaken by the area municipality rather than the school board.

As the Legislative Assembly has before it for consideration an amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act which will permit area councils to make application for the issuance of debentures for construction of swimming pools as part of a school plant and as it is anticipated that such legislation will be given Royal Assent in the near future, your Committee recommends that no allowance be made in the ceiling formula for capital funds for provision of swimming pools and that area boards de-



sirous of providing swimming pools in schools apply to their respective councils for the necessary capital funds.

JOHN C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, March 13th, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 4 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART II.

Tuesday, March 6, 1956.

1. That the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of a public school site be approved:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Public school site (name not selected)	
1.8 acres .....	\$5,000.00*

Located on or near Villa Road south of the Lakeshore Road in Long Branch and running approximately westward to 41st Street.

Date school required—September, 1956.

No. of Classrooms proposed—4.

\*The amount of \$5,000.00 is required to complete the purchase of the public school site in Long Branch. (In 1955 the Metropolitan School Board approved an application of the Lakeshore District Board for \$20,000.00 for the purchase of this site.)

2. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following applications for capital funds for the erection of public school accommodation:—

Etobicoke Board of Education:

Elmlea Public School—Addition of 4 standard classrooms.	
Estimated Cost .....	\$102,900.00

Ceiling .....	\$102,900.00
Date addition required—September, 1956.	
Present enrolment—413.	
Anticipated increase—18.	

North York Board of Education:

Ancaster Street Public School—10 standard classrooms, kindergarten, Auditorium-Playroom, Principal's office, staff room, Library, Health room.

Estimated Cost .....	\$279,300.00
Ceiling .....	\$279,300.00
Date school required—January 1, 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—350.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—520.	

Yorkview Drive Public School—Addition of 8 standard classrooms, Convert 1 existing classroom to kindergarten.

Estimated Cost .....	\$195,150.00
Ceiling .....	\$202,125.00
	less 6,975.00*
	<hr/> \$195,150.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1957.

Present enrolment—school not completed.

Anticipated increase—95.

\*amount by which original building exceeded the basic formula.

Brian Drive Public School—6 standard classrooms, kindergarten, Principal's office, Library, Staff room, Health room.

Estimated Cost .....	\$176,400.00
Ceiling .....	\$176,400.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—160.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—240.

3. Your Committee had before it for consideration an application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for an addition of 4 classrooms, kindergarten, staff room, health room and rehabilitation to the Briar Hill Public School in the amount of \$210,310.00. Final approval

was given to this project in the amount of \$124,950.00 on March 22, 1955. Since that time the York Township Board has deemed it desirable to include ancillary features (staff room and health room) and have extensive rehabilitation work done at the same time as the construction of the addition. The cost of the rehabilitation is \$76,000.00. The ceiling formula for this project would be:—

Addition of 4 classrooms and Kindergarten	\$124,950.00
Allowance for ancillary space .....	9,360.00
Allowance for rehabilitation costs .....	76,000.00
<hr/>	
Total	\$210,310.00

Your Committee recommends that a revised FINAL approval be given to the application of the York Township Board of Education in the amount of \$210,310.00.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, March 13th, 1956.

#### REPORT No. 4 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, March 8, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2 and 3 of Report No. 4 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 41, dated March 8, containing Part II accounts totalling \$14,717.02 be approved. Appendix p. ....

3. Your Committee had before it for consideration an application on behalf of F/S L. E. Dewis, R.C.A.F., Downsview, that his son, James, be admitted to the Orthopaedic Class at Sunny View School on compassionate grounds as the parents are unable to pay the regular non-resident fee. In December 1955 the Board also considered an application for admission of the daughter of Sgt. M. R. Romanoff, R.C.A.F., Downsview, to the Orthopaedic Class at Sunny View School at a reduced fee as the Department of National

Defence will only assume a non-resident fee in the amount of \$256.00 being the regular non-resident fee for admission to a Toronto public school.

In view of the fact (a) that the draft of a proposed agreement between the Department of National Defence and the North York Board of Education with respect to the future education of children resident on the R.C.A.F. Station, Downsview, provides that the Department of National Defence will undertake to pay additional non-resident fees on behalf of students accommodated in special education classes upon recommendation of the North York Board and (b) that it has been suggested that in the intervening period before the aforementioned agreement becomes effective that the balance of non-resident fees might be secured through the R.C.A.F. Benevolent Fund, your Committee therefore recommends: Amended.

(i) that the Metropolitan School Board agree to accept the costs of education in connection with the attendance of the daughter of Sgt. M. R. Romanoff on compassionate grounds and on the understanding that the Executive Secretary together with the appropriate officials of the Toronto Board of Education will continue the present effort to secure the balance of the fee through the R.C.A.F. Benevolent Fund, and

(ii) that James Dewis be admitted to Sunnyview School on the same basis as outlined above, provided that the appropriate authorities certify as to his eligibility for admission to Sunny View School.

JOHN C. VAN ESTERIK.

Chairman pro tem.

Amended by adding the following as sub-section (iii) of section 3:—

“that the afore-mentioned pupils be admitted to Sunny View School until June 30, 1956, on the understanding re-admission of the pupils in September 1956 be subject to the agreement of the Department of National Defence and the North York Board of Education becoming effective September 1st, 1956, insofar as the agreement relates to the as-

sumption by the Department of National Defence of non-resident fees for pupils in special education classes outside the Township of North York but within the Metropolitan area."

Adopted by the Board, as amended, March 13th, 1956.

---

DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 41.

March 8, 1956.

PART I.

ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

1. Advisory Council, January and February— Honorariums \$1,920.00—Travelling Expenses \$480.00 .....	\$2,400.00
2. Barber-Ellis of Canada Limited, Supplies .....	74.37
3. Commercial Office Appliances, Supplies .....	3.35
4. Richard De Boo Limited, Library .....	11.00
5. Jacobson, Lipson and Richmond, Parking Lot Rental, March .....	50.00
6. Maclean-Hunter Publishing Co., General Expense .....	.45
7. Longmans Green & Company, Library .....	4.54
8. Receiver General of Canada, Postage .....	28.00
9. Ryerson Press, Library .....	6.40
10. Staff Salaries, Jan. 27 to Feb. 9/56 \$1,343.47 Feb 10 to Feb. 23/56 \$1,586.59 .....	2,930.06
11. Staff Expense Allowances, February .....	70.00
	<hr/>
	\$5,578.17

PART II.

1. Auxiliary Class Costs, Final 1955 Payment —Scarborough, Public .....	\$14,318.02
--	-------------

ITEM PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

2. Auxiliary Class Cost, Final 1955 Payment re Special Transportation — Toronto, Public .....	399.00
	<hr/>
	\$14,717.02

## APPENDIX "A"

## CAPITAL ESTIMATES 1956

March 7, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members of the  
Metropolitan School Board:

I have the honour to present a composite proposal with respect to the erection of new school accommodation in the Metropolitan area for the year 1956. This programme has been prepared in consultation with the appropriate officials of the area boards of education. In its preparation there has been set forth:—

- (a) A list of all projects which area boards of education have indicated will be presented for approval of the Metropolitan School Board and the Metropolitan Council during 1956.
- (b) An estimate of the actual cash advances likely to be required in 1956 to finance (i) projects already approved by the Metropolitan Council and (ii) new projects to be considered in 1956.

On May 26, 1954, at the request of the Metropolitan Council an estimate was made of capital expenditures over a period of 10 years of \$120,000,000.00. Four major reasons were advanced last year for the 1955 budget exceeding substantially the annual estimate of \$12,000,000.00. These factors are still valid with respect to the 1956 programme and appropriate comments regarding each are given below.

1. Initial delay in building programme.

During 1955 significant progress was made by area boards in overcoming the lag in school building which existed as of January 1, 1954. Unprecedented expansion over the last 12 months has,

however, handicapped boards in their goal of keeping abreast of the expansion. This is evidenced by the fact that over 100 portables were required last year.

2. Lag in building programme due to area problems.

The significance of this factor has decreased during the past year. All boards are now staffed and organized to meet expansion problems successfully and the size of the 1956 programme reflects their efforts.

3. Secondary schools.

At January 1, 1954, peak enrolments were registered in the mid-grades of the elementary schools. Each year this peak will advance by one grade and this internal growth together with increased population is now beginning to increase the need for secondary school accommodation. The construction time of secondary schools is so much longer than elementary schools that plans must be predicated upon future needs rather than present. This programme, therefore, includes a substantial amount for secondary school projects.

4. Redevelopment of older areas.

Rehabilitation and replacement of existing accommodation will be an important part of the capital school programme for the foreseeable future. This factor was not included in the original 10 year estimate and on the basis of the programme presented this year it is obvious that this factor will give rise to a revision of that estimate. It now appears that redevelopment projects, i.e., Regents Park, will increase the school building programme and planning authorities are respectfully urged to have regard for school needs in their plans for redevelopment. Specifically, before redevelopment plans are approved a survey of the probable school needs should be made and lands required for additional school facilities allocated as a part of any plan.

### Sites

In 1954 the Ontario Municipal Board gave approval to the first bulk site appropriation. Since this approval pre-dated the preparation of the 1955 composite proposal, no allowance was made in this proposal for sites. The approval of the Ontario Municipal Board however limited the use of the bulk appropriation to the current year. It was therefore necessary to re-apply for a similar appropriation to cover capital expenditures for site purchases during 1956. A summary of the total needs as estimated by area boards of education has been added to this proposal. It is expected that the Metropolitan Council shall regard this addition as part of the proposal for the current year. In the meantime to expedite site purchases which are already underway, a bulk appropriation of four million dollars has already been approved by the Metropolitan School Board and the Metropolitan Council.

The attached proposal is the result of careful examination and study by the Buildings and Sites Committee and the Board itself. The estimates contained herein have already been reduced by several millions of dollars below the original proposals submitted by area boards of education.

The responsibilities of trustees are clearcut. They are required by law to provide school facilities for the children of the area. Trustees, of course, have no control over the rate of development and it is a fair statement of fact that the school needs have increased much more rapidly than when the original estimate of 12 million dollars a year for new school buildings was submitted.

It is true that the attached programme and the composite proposals which have preceded it in 1954 and 1955 will when complete overcome a serious backlog which existed as of January 1st, 1954. It is our belief that this objective was one of the prime purposes in the establishment of a Metropolitan authority and the Board is gratified that its efforts may make the achievement of this goal possible.



Our studies would seem to indicate that once the building lag has been overcome the annual submission for approval of new school buildings in expanding townships will be reduced significantly. This, of course, will depend upon the rate of development. It is impossible to forego school construction in new areas.

The rehabilitation and replacement of schools constructed 50 years or more ago is a problem of equal importance with the erection of new schools. Like new school construction this programme was delayed during the depression years and later during World War II. In every instance this work is long overdue. Much of the rebuilding and rehabilitation must take place in the City of Toronto. A carefully prepared programme extends through 1957 and 1958. While this programme will not complete all projects it is expected that the volume of rehabilitation and replacement will slacken after two or three years.

The Metropolitan School Board therefore earnestly petitions the Metropolitan Council to approve the present composite proposal. Deferment of projects would only serve to perpetuate an inequality of opportunity which existed in January, 1954, and which the Metropolitan authority was created to correct.

Respectfully submitted,  
GORDON F. FERGUSON,  
Chairman.

## CAPITAL ESTIMATES—1956

## SUMMARY

## SCHEDULE "A"

PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR  
TO 1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955			Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
	Total	Metro Share	Local Share	
<b>PUBLIC</b>				
East York .....	\$ 382,150.00	\$ 382,150.00	.....	\$ 382,150.00
Etobicoke .....	2,121,991.00	1,484,900.00	637,091.00	2,121,991.00
Lakeshore .....	69,030.00	40,000.00	29,030.00	69,030.00
North York .....	3,570,550.00	2,780,900.00	789,650.00	3,570,550.00
Scarborough .....	3,731,467.00	2,449,600.00	1,281,867.00	3,731,467.00
Toronto .....	4,429,578.00	2,472,000.00	1,957,578.00	3,175,026.00
Weston .....	120,000.00	120,000.00	.....	120,000.00
York .....	882,400.00	500,000.00	382,400.00	882,400.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$15,307,166.00</b>	<b>\$10,229,550.00</b>	<b>\$ 5,077,616.00</b>	<b>\$14,052,614.00</b>
<b>SECONDARY</b>				
Etobicoke .....	\$ 486,000.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 246,000.00	\$ 486,000.00
Lakeshore .....	202,500.00	80,000.00	122,500.00	202,500.00
North York .....	3,962,000.00	1,777,000.00	2,185,000.00	2,027,000.00
Scarborough .....	2,033,444.00	940,000.00	1,093,444.00	2,033,444.00
Toronto .....	847,273.00	100,000.00	747,273.00	847,273.00
York .....	360,000.00	240,000.00	120,000.00	360,000.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$ 7,891,217.00</b>	<b>\$ 3,377,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 4,514,217.00</b>	<b>\$ 5,956,217.00</b>
<b>Grand Total .....</b>	<b>\$23,198,383.00</b>	<b>\$13,606,550.00</b>	<b>\$ 9,591,833.00</b>	<b>\$20,008,831.00</b>

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

PUBLIC	Estimated Cost to be Debentured		Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
	Total	Metro Share	Local Share
East York .....	\$ 308,700.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 68,700.00
Etobicoke .....	3,469,250.00	2,232,000.00	1,237,250.00
Lakeshore .....	689,570.00	520,000.00	169,570.00
North York .....	4,005,975.00	3,079,000.00	926,975.00
Scarborough .....	5,802,400.00	4,480,000.00	1,322,400.00
Toronto .....	4,584,270.00	2,340,000.00	2,244,270.00
Weston .....	52,000.00	52,000.00	.....
York .....	441,835.00	280,000.00	161,835.00
Sub-Total .....	\$19,354,000.00	\$13,223,000.00	\$ 6,131,000.00
1956 Site Purchases—Estimate .....	6,800,000.00	.....	6,800,000.00
Total .....	\$26,154,000.00	\$13,223,000.00	\$12,931,000.00
			\$16,552,710.00
SECONDARY			
Etobicoke .....	\$ 1,019,800.00	\$ 360,000.00	\$ 659,800.00
North York .....	601,000.00	238,000.00	363,000.00
Scarborough .....	1,050,000.00	320,000.00	730,000.00
Toronto .....	761,000.00	260,000.00	501,000.00
York .....	700,000.00	160,000.00	540,000.00
Sub-Total .....	\$ 4,131,800.00	\$ 1,338,000.00	\$ 2,793,800.00
1956 Site Purchases—Estimate .....	1,400,000.00	.....	1,400,000.00
Total .....	\$ 5,531,800.00	\$ 1,338,000.00	\$ 4,193,800.00
			\$ 2,471,800.00
Grand Total—Buildings .....	\$23,485,800.00	\$14,561,000.00	\$ 8,924,800.00
—Sites .....	8,200,000.00	.....	8,200,000.00
	\$31,685,800.00	\$14,561,000.00	\$17,124,800.00
			\$19,024,510.00

SCHEDULE "A"  
PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO  
1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Celling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955 Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>EAST YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Plains Road Addition ....	Oct. 28, 1955	6 & K	240	\$ 176,400.00	\$ 140,000.00	Nil \$ 140,000.00
Portables (4) .....	Nov. 8, 1955	4	140	n/a	24,000.00	Nil 24,000.00
Selwyn School .....		11	385	282,975.00	218,150.00	Nil 218,150.00
				\$ 382,150.00	\$ 382,150.00	Nil \$ 382,150.00
<b>ETOBICOKE—PUBLIC</b>						
Albion Gardens School ....		8 & K	310	227,850.00	\$ 227,850.00	\$ 47,850.00 \$ 227,850.00
Castlebar School .....		8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	47,850.00 227,850.00
Douglas Park School ....	Nov. 29, 1955	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	38,231.00 218,231.00
Eatonville Addition ....		4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00 102,900.00
Franklin Horner Addition .	Oct. 7, 1955	3 & 2S & G-K	145	198,601.00	196,000.00	116,700.00 196,000.00
Gainsford School .....		10	350	272,685.00	200,000.00	72,685.00 272,685.00
Kingsview Village School .	Oct. 28, 1955	8 & K	310	227,850.00	175,600.00	52,250.00 227,850.00
Portables (3) No. 27, 28, 29	Sept. 30, 1955	3	105	n/a	18,000.00	Nil 18,000.00
Queensway Rehabilitation .	Nov. 29, 1955	Renov.		45,000.00	Nil	45,000.00 45,000.00
Rivercrest School .....	Oct. 7, 1955	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00	80,800.00 352,800.00
Sir Adam Beck Addition . .	Oct. 28, 1955	6 & Ren.	210	172,770.00	120,000.00	52,770.00 172,770.00
Bulk Site Fund Advances:						
Gale .....				500.00	.....	500.00 500.00
Castlebar .....				59,555.00	.....	59,555.00 59,555.00
				\$2,121,991.00	\$1,484,900.00	\$ 637,091.00 \$2,121,991.00
<b>ETOBICOKE—SECONDARY</b>						
Royal York Addition .....		12	360	486,000.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 246,000.00 \$ 486,000.00
<b>LAKESHORE—PUBLIC</b>						
Seventh Street Addition . .	Dec. 7, 1955	2 & Ren.	70	58,104.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 13,800.00 \$ 53,800.00
Bulk Site Fund Advances:						
West Long Branch . .				15,230.00	.....	15,230.00 15,230.00
				\$ 69,030.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 29,030.00 \$ 69,030.00
<b>LAKESHORE—SECONDARY</b>						
Mimico Addition .....		4 & G	150	202,500.00	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 122,500.00 \$ 202,500.00

SCHEDULE "A"  
PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO  
1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955 Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>NORTH YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Buntly Drive School .....		12 & K & (2S)	450	\$ 370,750.00	\$ 370,750.00	\$ 370,750.00
Champlain School .....		6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00	176,400.00
Downsview Addition .....		6 & K	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	154,350.00
Highland Hill School .....		14 & DK	550	404,250.00	300,000.00	404,250.00
Highview Avenue School .....		6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00	176,400.00
Lawrence Heights School .....		16 & DK	620	455,700.00	352,000.00	455,700.00
Mallow Road School .....		8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	227,850.00
Maple Leaf Addition .....	Nov. 29, 1955	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00	279,300.00
Rippleton Road School .....	Sept. 20, 1955	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	330,750.00
Sloane School .....		10 & K	380	279,300.00	216,400.00	279,300.00
Wilkie Addition .....		12	420	308,700.00	240,000.00	308,700.00
Wilmington Addition .....		4 & K	170	124,950.00	100,000.00	124,950.00
(See Schedule "B" For Extra Cost)						
Yvonne School .....	July 26, 1955	12 & K	450	330,750.00	252,500.00	330,750.00
Bulk Site Fund Advances:						
Rippleton .....				3,000.00	.....	3,000.00
Highview .....				11,200.00	.....	11,200.00
Don River Heights .....				19,000.00	.....	19,000.00
Sloane .....				27,000.00	.....	27,000.00
				\$3,570,550.00	\$2,780,900.00	\$3,570,550.00
<b>NORTH YORK—SECONDARY</b>						
Bathurst Heights—Addition (See Schedule "B" For Extra Cost)		6 & 2S	220	297,000.00	\$ 142,000.00	\$ 142,000.00
Don Mills School .....		25 & 3S	810	1,093,500.00	460,000.00	540,000.00
Downsview Extra Costs .....		36 & 4S	1160	1,566,000.00	35,000.00	285,000.00
Northview Heights School .....		25 & 3S	810	1,093,500.00	680,000.00	1,000,000.00
York Mills School .....				1,000,000.00	460,000.00	600,000.00
				\$3,962,000.00	\$1,777,000.00	\$2,185,000.00

SCHEDULE "A"									
PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO 1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED									
Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955	Total Metro Share	Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956	
<b>SCARBOROUGH—PUBLIC</b>									
Administration Bldg. . . . .80%	Dec. 7, 1955	5	175	128,625.00	\$ 349,376.00		\$ 349,376.00	\$ 349,376.00	
Birchcliffe Addition . . . . .				128,625.00		100,000.00		28,625.00	128,625.00
Chapman School . . . . .	Feb. 3, 1956	10 & DK	410	301,350.00	287,768.00		55,768.00	287,768.00	
Chine Dr. School . . . . .		5 & K	205	150,675.00	150,675.00		30,675.00	150,675.00	
Cliffside Addition . . . . .		2	70	51,450.00		40,000.00		11,450.00	51,450.00
Ellesmere Addition . . . . .	Sept. 30, 1955	10 & DK							
General Brock School . . . . .	Oct. 27, 1955	12 & DK	410	361,920.00	361,709.00	232,000.00		129,709.00	361,709.00
Geo. B. Little School . . . . .		12 & DK	480	352,800.00	309,372.00	255,600.00		53,772.00	309,372.00
Golf Road Addition . . . . .		6 & DK	480	352,800.00	352,800.00	272,000.00		80,800.00	352,800.00
Lynwood School . . . . .		8 & K	270	198,450.00	198,450.00	152,000.00		46,450.00	198,450.00
Portables (15) No.'s 65-79 . . . . .	Oct. 28, 1955	14	490	227,850.00	227,850.00	180,000.00		47,850.00	227,850.00
Portables (24) No.'s 80-103 . . . . .	Oct. 28, 1955	24	840	n/a	105,400.00	84,000.00		21,400.00	105,400.00
Regent Heights Addition . . . . .	Dec. 5, 1955	6	210	154,350.00	154,347.00	144,000.00		10,347.00	154,347.00
Terraview Addition . . . . .	Nov. 29, 1955	8	280	233,950.00	157,550.00	120,000.00		37,550.00	157,550.00
Vradenburgh School . . . . .		12 & DK	480	352,800.00	352,800.00	272,000.00		80,800.00	352,800.00
Walter Perry Addition . . . . .	Jan. 6, 1956	6	210	202,970.00	179,525.00	120,000.00		59,525.00	179,525.00
<b>Bulk Site Fund Advances:</b>									
Bennett Farm . . . . .				35,750.00				35,750.00	
Birchmount-St. Clair . . . . .				250.00				250.00	
Cedar Glen . . . . .				40,500.00				40,500.00	
Danforth Gardens . . . . .				43,500.00				43,500.00	
George Peck . . . . .				800.00				800.00	
Gooderham . . . . .				51,000.00				51,000.00	
Gore Road . . . . .				14,800.00				14,800.00	
Knob Hill . . . . .				4,100.00				4,100.00	
Lynwood . . . . .				407.00				407.00	
Vradenburgh . . . . .				8,150.00				8,150.00	
				\$3,731,467.00	\$2,449,600.00	\$1,281,867.00		\$3,731,467.00	
<b>SCARBOROUGH—SECONDARY</b>									
Administration Bldg. . . . .20%	Dec. 7, 1955	19	570	\$ 87,344.00	\$ 87,344.00			\$ 87,344.00	\$ 87,344.00
Agincourt Addition . . . . .	Sept. 30, 1955	6 & 3S	240	961,500.00	826,200.00	340,000.00		486,200.00	826,200.00
R.H. King Addition . . . . .	Dec. 24, 1955	18 & 4S	620	324,000.00	324,000.00	180,000.00		144,000.00	324,000.00
Winston Churchill Addn. . . . .	Nov. 29, 1955			837,000.00	795,900.00	420,000.00		375,900.00	795,900.00
				\$2,033,444.00	\$ 940,000.00	\$1,093,444.00		\$2,033,444.00	

## SCHEDULE "A"

PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO  
1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955 Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>TORONTO—PUBLIC</b>						
Cottingham School .....	Dec. 6, 1955	6 & K	240	\$ 176,400.00	\$ 176,400.00 \$ 36,400.00	\$ 176,400.00
Givins Sr. School .....		15 & 2S & G	595	624,750.00	300,000.00 324,750.00	312,000.00
King Edward School (Jr.-Sr.) .....		32 & K & 2S	1190	1,041,600.00	660,000.00 110,000.00	250,000.00
Ogden School (See Sched. "B" for extra cost) .....		16 & K	590	433,650.00	397,000.00 57,000.00	250,000.00
Old Orchard Jr. School (See Sched. "B" for extra cost) .....		7 & K	275	202,125.00	160,000.00 32,000.00	192,000.00
Palmerston School .....	Nov. 21, 1955	22	770	601,140.00	573,171.00 133,171.00	573,171.00
Queen Alexandra School (Jr.-Sr.) .....	Oct. 12, 1955	20 & DK 4S 2G	900	n/a	973,207.00 432,000.00	698,405.00
Bulk Site Purchase						
Advances:						
Alexander Muir .....					173,000.00	173,000.00
Essex .....					10,050.00	10,050.00
Fern .....					340,000.00	340,000.00
Wellesley .....					200,000.00	200,000.00
					\$4,429,578.00 \$2,472,000.00 \$1,957,578.00	\$3,175,026.00
<b>TORONTO—SECONDARY</b>						
North Toronto C.I. Add. ..	Oct. 11, 1955	8 & G	270	n/a	\$ 847,273.00 \$ 100,000.00 \$ 747,273.00	\$ 847,273.00
<b>WESTON—PUBLIC</b>						
Memorial Addition .....		4 & DK	200	147,000.00	\$ 120,000.00 \$ Nil	\$ 120,000.00
<b>YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Briar Hill Addition .....		4 & K	170	124,950.00	\$ 100,000.00 \$ 24,950.00	\$ 124,950.00
C. E. Webster Addition ..	Oct. 11, 1955	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00 34,350.00	154,350.00
Lambton Park Addition ..		3	105	77,175.00	60,000.00 15,000.00	75,000.00
Rockcliffe School .....		5 & 6S	240	n/a	100,000.00 286,100.00	386,100.00
Roseland Addition .....	Nov. 29, 1955	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00 22,000.00	142,000.00
					\$ 882,400.00 \$ 500,000.00 \$ 382,400.00	\$ 882,400.00
<b>YORK—SECONDARY</b>						
George Harvey Addition ..		4 & 8S	280	378,000.00	\$ 360,000.00 \$ 240,000.00 \$ 120,000.00	\$ 360,000.00

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Metro Share	Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>EAST YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
School "A" .....	12	420	308,700.00	\$ 308,700.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 68,700.00 \$ 100,000.00
<b>ETOBICOKE—PUBLIC</b>						
Administration Building & Warehouse 80% .....			n/a	407,200.00		407,200.00
Consolidated Land School. ....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
Elmlea Addition .....	4	140	102,900.00		80,000.00	22,900.00
Gale School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
Heathercrest School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
Lambton-Kgs. Renov. ....			100,000.00		100,000.00	180,000.00
Martin Gr. Manor School. ....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
Park Lawn Relief School. ....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
Peachy Sr. School .....	11	385	404,250.00		220,000.00	184,250.00
Stock Farm Est. School ..	12 & DK	480	352,800.00		272,000.00	80,800.00
Village Park School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
West Deane School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
West Humber School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00		180,000.00	47,850.00
Westway School .....	10 & K	380	279,300.00		220,000.00	59,300.00
				\$3,469,250.00	\$2,232,000.00	\$1,237,250.00 \$2,072,200.00
<b>ETOBICOKE—SECONDARY</b>						
Administration Building & Warehouse 20% .....			n/a	\$ 101,800.00		\$ 101,800.00
Thistletown School .....	20 & 4S	680	918,000.00	918,000.00	360,000.00	558,000.00
				\$1,019,800.00	\$ 360,000.00	\$ 659,800.00 \$ 351,800.00



SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Celling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured Total	Local Share	Est. Expending or Financing in 1956
<b>LAKESHORE—PUBLIC</b>						
John English School .....	18 & Anc.	630	483,770.00 \$	483,770.00 \$	360,000.00 \$	123,770.00 \$ 300,000.00
Second St. Addition .....	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00	102,900.00
West Long Branch School ...	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00	50,000.00
				\$ 689,570.00	\$ 520,000.00	\$ 169,570.00 \$ 452,900.00
<b>NORTH YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Ancaster School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00 \$	180,000.00 \$	47,850.00 \$	100,000.00
Belmar Park School .....	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00	59,300.00	50,000.00
Don Mills—Phase 4 School ..	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	70,750.00	100,000.00
Keele-Sheppard School .....	20 & 2K	760	558,600.00	400,000.00	120,000.00	250,000.00
(Part to be paid by Dom. Gov.)						
<b>Lillian St. Addition .....</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>154,350.00</b>	<b>120,000.00</b>	<b>34,350.00</b>	<b>120,000.00</b>
Page School .....	6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00	36,400.00	50,000.00
Pleasant Ave School .....	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	70,750.00	100,000.00
Sheppard-Bayview School ..	16 & 2K	620	455,700.00	360,000.00	95,700.00	100,000.00
Sliverview School .....	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	70,750.00	100,000.00
Wilmington Add. (Part) ....	3	105	77,175.00	60,000.00	17,175.00	77,175.00
Yorkview Addition .....	8	280	205,800.00	160,000.00	45,800.00	160,000.00
Austerity Schools Balance ..			n/a	39,000.00	50,000.00	89,000.00
Addition "A" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
Addition "B" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
Addition "C" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
Addition "D" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
School "A" .....	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	70,750.00	100,000.00
				\$4,005,975.00	\$3,079,000.00	\$ 926,975.00 \$1,876,175.00
<b>NORTH YORK—SECONDARY</b>						
Bathurst Heights Addition—						
Extra cost 1955 project :						
School "A" — Part of Cost				\$ 35,000.00	\$ 18,000.00	\$ 17,000.00 \$ 35,000.00
Only—Balance to be applied against 1954 Don Mills Approval .....	36 & 4S	1,160	1,566,000.00	566,000.00	220,000.00	346,000.00 50,000.00
				\$ 601,000.00	\$ 238,000.00	\$ 363,000.00 \$ 85,000.00

See  
Schedule "A"

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>SCARBOROUGH—PUBLIC</b>					
Anson Ave. School	6 & K	240	176,400.00	\$ 140,000.00 \$ 36,400.00	\$ 176,400.00
Bendale Park School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00 80,800.00	252,800.00
Blantyre Addition	2	70	51,450.00	40,000.00 11,450.00	30,500.00
Cedar Glen School	8 & DK	340	249,900.00	249,900.00	100,000.00
Churchill Heights School	10 & DK	410	301,350.00	232,000.00 69,350.00	50,000.00
C.K.E.Y. School	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00 47,850.00	75,000.00
Clarlea Addition	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00 22,900.00	75,000.00
Danforth Gardens School	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00 59,300.00	279,300.00
Edgewood School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00 80,800.00	250,000.00
Exford Drive School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00 80,800.00	100,000.00
Galloway Road School	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00 59,300.00	100,000.00
General Brock Addition	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00 22,900.00	102,900.00
Golf Road Addition	8	280	205,800.00	160,000.00 45,800.00	100,000.00
Gooderham School	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00 47,850.00	75,000.00
Gore Road School	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00 22,900.00	30,000.00
Guildwood School	8 & DK	340	249,900.00	192,000.00 57,900.00	100,000.00
Hunter's Glen School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00 80,800.00	352,800.00
Knob Hill Addition	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00 22,900.00	90,000.00
Latham School	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00 47,850.00	150,000.00
Manhattan Park School	10 & DK	410	301,350.00	232,000.00 69,350.00	301,350.00
McCowan Road Addition	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00 34,350.00	125,000.00
Sancroft School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00 80,800.00	175,000.00
St. Andrews School	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00 47,850.00	110,000.00
Thompson Farm School	8 & DK	340	249,900.00	192,000.00 57,900.00	249,900.00
Wanita	6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00 36,400.00	50,000.00
West Hill School	2S	...	40,000.00	.....	40,000.00
			\$5,802,400.00	\$4,480,000.00 \$1,322,400.00	\$3,540,950.00
<b>SCARBOROUGH—SECONDARY</b>					
Warden and St. Clair School.	18 & 6S	660	1,050,000.00	\$1,050,000.00 \$ 320,000.00 \$ 730,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
(plus 17%)					

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accum.	Celling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>TORONTO—PUBLIC</b>					
Essex Jr. & Sr. School	17 & 2S & G	665	632,100.00 \$	607,500.00 \$	467,500.00 \$ 220,000.00
Garden Jr. School	6 & K	240	176,400.00	174,000.00	34,000.00 87,000.00
Huron Jr. School	11 & 2DK & Ren	505	442,635.00	442,635.00	158,635.00 Nil
Jesse Ketchum Sr. Add.	2 & DG & Ren	130	294,495.00	294,495.00	254,495.00 150,000.00
Ogden—Extra cost 1955 project	See "A"	See Schedule	36,650.00	36,650.00	Nil
Old Orchard—Extra cost 1955 project	See "A"	See Schedule	10,125.00	10,125.00	10,125.00
Park Sr. Sch. Conversion	DG & Ren	60	241,920.00	241,920.00	241,920.00 150,000.00
Parkdale Sr. Add. & Con.	4 & DG & Ren	200	309,670.00	309,670.00	229,670.00 Nil
Regent Park Jr. School	22 & 2DK	890	654,150.00	654,150.00	150,150.00 150,000.00
Rosedale Jr. School	7 & K	275	202,125.00	202,125.00	42,125.00 50,000.00
Ryerson Jr. & Sr. School	23 & 4S & DK & DG & Ren	1,005	1,100,475.00	1,030,000.00	498,000.00 300,000.00
Sunny View	6 Ren	n/a	n/a	184,000.00	64,000.00 Nil
Wellesley School	16 & K	590	433,650.00	397,000.00	57,000.00 200,000.00
				\$4,584,270.00 \$2,340,000.00	\$2,244,270.00 \$1,317,125.00
<b>TORONTO—SECONDARY</b>					
Danforth Addition	13S & Ren	260	676,000.00 \$	676,000.00 \$	416,000.00 \$ 200,000.00
Northern Tech.	Ren	...	85,000.00	85,000.00	85,000.00 85,000.00
				\$ 761,000.00 \$ 260,000.00	\$ 501,000.00 \$ 285,000.00
NOTE: 1. Ceiling Costs shown in many of the above projects are approximate and may be revised when actual applications are received.					
<b>WESTON—PUBLIC</b>					
King St. Addition	1 & DK	95	69,825.00 \$	52,000.00 \$	..... 18,000.00

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Projects	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Total	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Metro Share	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>YORK—PUBLIC</b>							
Briar Hill—							
Extra Cost 1955 Project-							
Renov. & Anc. ....			85,360.00 \$	85,360.00	85,360.00	\$	85,360.00
D. B. Hood Addition .....	4	140	102,900.00	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00	80,000.00
Memorial Addition .....	4	140	102,900.00	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00	80,000.00
F. H. Miller Addition .....	5 & K	205	150,675.00	150,675.00	120,000.00	30,675.00	130,000.00
				\$ 441,835.00	\$ 280,000.00	\$ 161,835.00	\$ 375,360.00
<b>YORK—SECONDARY</b>							
Runnymede Addition .....	Anc.	240	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	\$	200,000.00
York Memorial .....	8 & Anc.		324,000.00	200,000.00	160,000.00	40,000.00	100,000.00
				\$ 700,000.00	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 540,000.00	\$ 300,000.00

## Appendix "B"

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD  
ON  
THE FUNCTION AND IMPORTANCE OF  
SWIMMING POOLS  
CONTENTS

1. Authority of Study.
2. Ontario Department of Education Regulations.
3. Educational Value of Swimming Pools.
4. Swimming Pools and School Administration.
5. Number of School Swimming Pools in Canada.
6. The Swimming Pool and its Effect on the Incidence of Drowning.
7. The Swimming Programme in Toronto Schools.
8. The School Swimming Pool as a Recreational Facility in the Community.
9. Cost of Construction and of Maintenance.
10. Distribution of Costs.
11. Observations.

1. Authority for Study.

The Finance Committee of the Metropolitan School Board at its meeting on September 8, 1955, requested the Advisory Council to undertake a comprehensive study of the function and importance of swimming pools and in its report to cover at least the following aspects of the problem:

- (a) the swimming pool as an instructional area serving the formal needs of the school curriculum;
- (b) the swimming pool as a recreational facility in the community;
- (c) the function of the swimming pool in developing water safety and its effect on the incidence of drowning;
- (d) a survey of the cost of construction and maintenance of pools.

The Advisory Council begs leave to submit its findings.

2. Ontario Department of Education Regulations.

Secondary Schools.

The following circulars of the Ontario Department of Education recognize swimming and water safety as desirable parts of the secondary school programme:

1. Curriculum I:5, 1952—Intermediate Division; Physical Education; Outline of Course for Experimental Use (Course for boys—page 27, for girls—page 64).

2. Curriculum S:29, 1955—Physical Education; Grades XI, XII and XIII. (Course for boys—page 23, for girls—page 41).

In each case the course in swimming and water safety is preceded by a general statement:

“The course in swimming must be adapted to local conditions. The primary objective is that every pupil may learn to swim and gain a complete knowledge of water safety procedure. In schools where there are no swimming facilities, lectures and films on life saving methods and water safety might be presented.”

Elementary Schools.

Swimming and water safety are not covered in Departmental circulars for Grade I to Grade VIII. The explanation seems to be found in the fact that pool facilities are practically non-existent in the elementary school of Ontario. However Curriculum: 3 (1950) made provision for the revision of courses for Grades VII to X within a local school system by a Co-ordinating Committee and Teachers' Committees and where facilities exist no impediment has been put in the way of introducing swimming and water safety in Grades VII and VIII. Since these skills are now being acquired by elementary school pupils at an even earlier age, provision of suitable courses for still younger children would seem to be a logical step that would meet with the approval of the Department.

Ontario's interest in swimming as a part of the school curriculum is shared by other parts of the British Commonwealth and Empire. The British Commonwealth and Empire Conference on physical education held in Vancouver, July 1954, investigated the extent to which swimming appeared on the curricula of the countries represented. The following tabulation indicates the countries which authorize swimming in their courses of study:

Country	Elementary Schools	Secondary Schools
Australia .....	X .....	X
Ceylon .....		X
New Zealand .....	X .....	X
Pakistan .....		X
Union of South Africa .....	X .....	X
Bermuda .....	X .....	X
Uganda .....		X
Southern Rhodesia .....	X .....	X
Western Region, Nigeria .....	X .....	X

England and Wales—a matter of local autonomy but quite general. The pattern is to transport children by buses to municipal pools once a week.

It is to be observed that this tabulation, except in the case of England and Wales, *gives no indication of the extent to which this phase of the school curriculum is implemented or the manner in which pools are provided.*

### 3. The Educational Value of Swimming Pools.

Sections 3, 4, 7 and 8 of the report are very largely the work of Mr. Speirs and Mr. Johns of the Toronto staff and express the point of view of specialists—enthusiastic about swimming as a part of the physical education programme.

Swimming is usually thought of as a survival skill. This attitude tends to obscure its other values. In the opinion of physical educators swimming has strong claims for a place in the curriculum altogether outside of its emergency value. When Wm. R. LaPorte, of the University of Southern California, was writing his book "The Physical Education Curriculum", he polled the state directors and

prominent city directors of physical education, inviting them to rate some twenty-nine physical activities according to the importance of their contribution to all-round physical development. Swimming was rated first. There are sound reasons for this choice. Some of these are given in the following excerpt from "Good Health" by Phair and Speirs, a book approved for use in Ontario schools.

"In a country such as ours, abounding with lakes and streams, the importance of learning to swim cannot be over-emphasized. It is one of the best all-round forms of exercise for boys and girls of all ages. Unlike many other forms of exercise, there is little likelihood of strain, and it lends itself well to the correction of physical defects. Swimming develops the smooth, rounded type of muscle rather than the bunched or knotted type and is thus a splendid exercise for those who wish to develop a graceful figure. The confidence acquired by learning to swim is a personality asset, and the assurance it gives one makes water-sports a real pleasure."

Swimming also has a "carry-over" value into later life. Schools are sometimes criticized for pre-occupation with the traditional school sports, rugby, football, baseball and basketball, to the exclusion of "carry-over" sports. Swimming cannot be criticized in this respect, for it provides recreation for both sexes and for all ages. Many of the "carry-over" sports are difficult to include in the school programme because they are individual sports such as golf, tennis or bowling, which require special facilities and serve small groups. But swimming lends itself to group activity in a small space. It is one way of providing a programme for schools with inadequate playground space.

Swimming is one of the best liked of the activities in the physical education programme so far as many pupils are concerned. This may prove of special significance in helping to reconcile the non-academic type of pupils to the school programme. Experience with non-academic pupils in Toronto schools supports this conclusion.

Swimming also caters to a wide variety of individual differences. Beginners find tremendous satisfaction in just



being able to keep on the surface and those who are able to swim find a continuous challenge in fancy diving, life-saving, ornamental swimming and long distance work. This also, is one area in which girls can excel and win recognition. The average secondary school girl, is only 70% as strong as a boy of the same age, height and weight, but she carries approximately 38% more fat in her body tissues. This gives her an advantage in buoyancy which enables her to excel in such activities as synchronized swimming and endurance swimming. To date no man has been able to equal Marilyn Bell's achievement.

The therapeutic value of swimming and other exercise in the water has been established in the case of many physically handicapped children. The coolness and soothing effect of water on the skin helps to relax tense individuals. Youngsters who cannot walk or support their bodies without braces can be taught to swim. Victims of infantile paralysis recover the use of their muscles and re-educate their co-ordinations by means of hydrotherapy and swimming.

A compulsory swimming programme exposes many stubborn cases of faulty mental hygiene. Frequently such pupils have had a bad previous experience. They may have been introduced to swimming by primitive methods of an over-zealous adult. Or their childhood training may have made them excessively timid about unfamiliar experiences. To such pupils the mere thought of being suspended in water without support requires an effort of supreme courage. Their mental instinct is to retreat and rationalize about it. The sympathy of an over-protective parent is easily enlisted and the family doctor may be induced to furnish a medical certification excusing the pupils from swimming classes.

This is a familiar pattern to swimming teachers and they embrace it as an educational opportunity. The school nurse renders valuable assistance in breaking down alibis and educating parents. It is of help to the mental hygienist because the malingerer is rendered conspicuous through swimming. Here success and failure are clearly defined. The pupil cannot persuade himself that poor performance is

the result of being under-rated or disliked by the teacher. The only avenue of retreat is in simulated illness. Thus swimming provides a valuable means of detecting incipient mental ill-health which might go unheeded in the classroom. The "courage factor" in swimming makes it a sort of Geiger counter for detecting behaviour problems before they would otherwise become apparent.

Swimming is the most hygienic form of exercise. In all other physical activities the wastes removed through perspiration are deposited on the skin and in the clothing. Immediate showering and a change of clothing is necessary if these wastes are to be removed. Otherwise they may be reabsorbed. In swimming, the wastes are removed from the skin continuously without offensive odour and are harmlessly diffused in the chemically treated water.

#### 4. Swimming Pools and School Administration.

As school programmes have expanded during recent years, the problems of administration have grown in complexity. The existence of a swimming pool in a school is attended not only by the usual administrative responsibilities such as those that relate to an auditorium, a gymnasium or a cafeteria but also by the ever-present possibility that in spite of all precautions a student or students may gain access to the pool outside of assigned periods and a fatality may result.

The number of periods per week in which the pool is in use will be governed to some degree by the attitude of the principal and the physical education teachers to the benefits arising from the use of the pool.

The day-by-day administrative problems are three-fold:

- (a) Non-participation. In girls' classes 25% are normally excused for menstruation.
- (b) Pseudo-medical excuses.
- (c) Parental objections.

But techniques which have been developed meet these problems satisfactorily.

(a) Non-participants are now spaced around the deck of the pool as monitors or assistant instructors. This identifies them with the class and ensures that they get the benefit of all instruction. Pupils are no longer excused and sent to the library or study room.

(b) Those suspected of malingering are required to dress in gymnasium uniform and take up positions around the pool in such a way that they cannot distract from the lesson.

(c) Owing to the increasing recognition of the values of swimming, parental objection is now limited to very few parents.

#### 5. Number of School Swimming Pools in Canada.

In 1953 the Canadian Education Association conducted a survey of swimming pools incorporated in elementary and secondary schools at public expense. No later survey is available. At that time all of the elementary school pools were in Ontario, namely, 6 pools built and maintained as part of regular elementary schools and 1 pool (Sunny View, Toronto) in a special school for physically handicapped children. Of secondary school pools, one is in Alberta, 24 in Ontario, 2 in Quebec and 2 in New Brunswick. The schools of the other six provinces are without pools. Of this number seven pools were built during the period from the close of the war, 1945, to 1953. **This makes a total of 36 pools in more than 30,000 elementary and secondary public schools in Canada.** The survey does not take into account any arrangements that a school board may have with municipally-owned pools or with organizations such as the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A.

All of the elementary school pools and 16 of the 29 secondary school pools reported in the survey are in Metropolitan Toronto. The other Ontario pools are at:

Fort Erie—1,  
Glebe C.I., Ottawa—1,

Technical School, London—1,  
Sarnia—1,  
Windsor—4.

Since the survey was made in 1953, pools in the Metropolitan area have been or are being constructed in two Toronto secondary schools.

6. The Swimming Pool and its Effect on the Incidence of Drowning.

In schools where facilities are available, a water safety programme will receive more attention than would otherwise be true. But it is impossible to determine the effect on the incidence of drowning of a school programme no matter how efficient. Many other factors may bear upon a drowning accident. For example, a limited amount of skill may induce a boy to attempt a swimming feat beyond his ability with tragic results or a boy may be drowned who, if he had not been given instruction in a pool, would not have entered the water. However the conviction is general that ability to swim is a helpful safeguard against drowning even though 80% of those who drown are able to swim. Beyond that one cannot go.

The Canadian Red Cross has had a very active programme in water safety since 1944. The Society offers to "train Water Safety Instructors for any group organization or community to enable them to carry out a Water Safety programme." Since its objective is primarily to reduce accidents by drowning, it places this aspect of its programme first and the promotion of a healthful form of exercise and physical development second. Prior to the intensification of the Society's water safety campaign in 1944 an average of 412 children drowned in Canada each year; during the next four years the average was reduced to 376 children. Here again it is impossible to prove that the Society's efforts have brought about this desirable result but the evidence supports this conclusion.

7. The Swimming Programme in Toronto Schools.

In Toronto swimming classes for public school pupils have been conducted during the month of June since 1945,

and at the present time are carried on in all Board of Education pools and five borrowed pools. The schedule is so arranged that every pupil is given the opportunity to receive swimming instruction at some time in his public school career. Some 7,000 pupils received an average of 9 lessons each in the month of June, 1955. Although these pupils were from Grades IV to VI, some could already swim. Of the others, 2,050 boys and 1,371 girls, a total of 3,421, swam the width of the pool for the first time.

The Board also conducts free swimming classes in all pools during the summer months. This service was instituted as early as 1925. The enrolment in the summer of 1955 was 7,390 boys and 10,162 girls, a total of 17,552. Of this number approximately 4,000 (3,918) learned to swim.

By the time elementary pupils enter the secondary schools 97.7% of the boys and 96.3% of the girls can swim. Nevertheless some 150 boys and 200 girls are taught to swim each year in secondary school classes. From this it follows that in the secondary school programme much of the emphasis will be on perfecting skills already partially mastered and on the value of swimming from the standpoints of physical development and recreation.

#### 8. The School Swimming Pool as a Recreational Facility in the Community.

The following observations are confined to experiences within the Toronto system.

During the school year the use of school pools is restricted to elementary and secondary school pupils during the day. But in the evenings they are used for night class instruction by the Board of Education or are operated by the City Council as community centres or are engaged by miscellaneous groups such as Boy and Girl Scouts. In Toronto the use of school pools approaches the saturation point on school days as far as the community use is concerned. This is demonstrated by the following figures furnished by the maintenance department of the Board of Education.

	Community Centres	Miscellaneous Scouts and other groups
Allenby .....	64	18
Fern .....	136	
Lord Dufferin .....	104	25
Bloor C.I. ....	56	
Harbord C.I. ....	49	45
Humberside C.I. ....	48	8
Jarvis C.I. ....	29	80
Lawrence Park C.I. ....	(just opened)	
Malvern C.I. ....	64	24
North Toronto C.I. ....	(no pool as yet)	
Oakwood C.I. ....		157
Parkdale C.I. ....	48	
Riverdale C.I. ....	(just opened)	
Eastern Commerce .....	46	
Central Technical .....	(night school)	
Danforth Technical .....	(night school)	
Northern Tech.-Comm. ...	(night school)	55
Western Tech.-Comm. ....	(night school)	32
Jarvis Jr. Vocational ....	(unsuitable)	
Sunny View .....	(legal agreement)	
Davenport .....	(unsuitable)	
Central Commerce .....	(night school)	

At the present time school pools are not open for community use on Sundays or holidays and only in a limited way on Saturdays. It may be said that the pools are in such continuous use during other days that it is difficult to find a time for repairs or improvements except at the week-end.

Co-educational swimming has never been encouraged in school pools, largely because dressing room accommodation for both sexes at the same time is lacking. But if a community wishes to make its pools available for mixed swimming, which is part of the cultural pattern at public beaches and outdoor swimming pools, provision should be made at the time of construction.

The Community Centre programme is not entirely recreational. The Director of Recreation reports that 2,209 per-

sons learned to swim in the evening classes conducted by Community Centres in school pools. Another 2,199 were taught to swim in the John Innes Community Centre pool and 365 in the Alex Duff pool.

#### 9. Cost of Construction and of Maintenance.

The Advisory Council is indebted to Mr. C. H. R. Fuller, Business Administrator and Secretary-Treasurer of the Toronto Board of Education, for the following breakdown of costs of construction and maintenance of pools in Toronto.

##### Cost of Construction.

The cost of construction of pools during a five-year period is as follows:

School	Size of Pool	Contract Cost	Year Built
Lord Dufferin .....	25 x 75	\$101,665.00	1951
Bloor C.I. ....	20 x 60	69,384.00	1952
Fern Ave. ....	25 x 60	62,852.00	1953
Malvern C.I. ....	30 x 60	83,350.00	1953
Riverdale C.I. ....	20 x 60	93,560.00	1955
Lawrence Park C.I. ....	25 x 75	88,000.00	1955
Queen Alexandra .....	20 x 60	86,000.00	(Not yet
North Toronto C.I. ....	30 x 50	55,000.00	(started

Average cost based on the above figures—\$79,976.00.

It should be observed that in the cases mentioned the swimming pools were constructed as part of a rehabilitation project or as part of a major addition. There has been no case where any addition to a school consisted solely of a swimming pool. The figures quoted in each case represent the part of the total cost of any given project apportioned to the swimming pool by the architect.

Mr. Brownlee, Business Administrator of the North York Board of Education, reports that the larger pools, 30 feet by 75 feet, projected for the secondary schools of that area are estimated to cost \$150,000.00

## Operating and Maintenance Costs:

Summary of Operating and Maintenance Cost of a  
Pool 20 feet by 60 feet:

Water consumption for pool and showers .....	\$ 231.00
Heating costs for pool water, shower water and rooms .....	1,130.00
Supplies .....	606.70
Caretaking and plant operation .....	3,226.37
Electric Power .....	252.00
Electric Light .....	113.40
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>5,559.47</b>
Repair and upkeep of plant and equipment .....5%	227.97
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>5,837.44</b>
Administration costs .....10% of above figure	583.74

Maintenance and Operating Costs per year of  
typical swimming pool ..... \$6,421.19

Each swimming pool will have operating and maintenance costs peculiar to the pool arising from size, construction, frequency of use, methods of heating, shower requirements, etc.

The estimates that follow are based on a pool with a 40,000 gallon capacity tank, measuring approximately 20 feet by 60 feet and used during regular school hours for 245 days in the year. Night use of the school is not taken into account since permit holders are charged on the basis of operating costs with the result that night operation does not involve out-of-pocket expenses to the Toronto Board.

## (a) General conditions.

The pool is enclosed and is of tile wall and floor construction.

The swimming pool room is heated, lighted and ventilated and associated with the pool are separate shower rooms for boys and girls.

The loading of the pool is 40 persons for a 40 minute period, except during the summer when double this number is accommodated.



The stationary engineering and the cleaning are done by the caretaking staff, but all work involving repairs and upkeep is done by a separate staff of mechanics. This is the policy of the Toronto Board.

The filter used is sand and gravel.

(b) Water Consumption.

The tank is emptied twice each year for cleaning. 2,000 gallons of water per day for 245 days are added to cover loss from splashing, evaporation, etc. 500 gallons of water per 40-minute period are used by 40 persons for 245 days for showers. 1,000 gallons per 40-minute period are required by 80 persons for 40 days for showers during the summer.

(c) Heating Costs.

A boiler efficiency of 55% is used. Coal costs \$9.50 a ton and the plant is stoker-fired. The heating requirements for the pool are as follows:

(i) 570,000 gallons pool water to be heated to 75 degrees and maintained at that temperature.

(ii) Allowance to be made for an average loss in water temperature of 10 degrees Fahrenheit per 24-hour period.

Heating requirements of showers will be the raising of 897,000 gallons of water to a temperature of 90 to 120 degrees for the year's use of the pool. The heating requirements of the rooms are taken as average cubic area.

(d) Costs of Supplies.

The yearly supplies used are—

300 gals. chlorine at 40 cents per gallon,  
3000 lbs. alum at \$25.32 per 1000 lbs.,  
36 cases soap at \$5.75 per case,  
24 cans of footbath disinfectant at \$3.56 per can.

General care-taking supplies are estimated at 10% of the care-taking supply budget, and the cost of toilet paper and towels is estimated at 5% of the school consumption of these articles.

## (e) Care-taking and Plant Operation Costs.

The following daily hours are required for cleaning and plant operation services:

(a) Cleaning 2 dressing room per day with allowance of $\frac{3}{4}$ -hour each. ....	1½ man hrs.
(b) Cleaning one pool deck per day with allowance of 1½ hours .....	1½ man hrs.
(c) Scrubbing 2 shower rooms with allowance of $\frac{3}{4}$ -hour each .....	1½ man hrs.
(d) Checking filters, alum tank, supplies and miscellaneous cleaning and testing, allowance 1 hour .....	1 man hr.
(e) Stationary engineering covering heating and ventilation, allowance 2 man hours per day .....	2 man hrs.
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>7½ man hrs.</b> per day

This total will be multiplied by the 245 days per year operation and the hourly rate of \$1.69 used to calculate cost.

In addition, 80 man hours per year, at \$1.51 per hour, are allowed for annual pool cleaning.

## (f) Electric Power.

A figure of 20% of the average annual power cost is apportioned to the pool. This takes into account percentage of use of all motors in the boiler room, such as stoker motors, condensate pump motors, boiler feed pump motors, etc., and also takes into account the cost of the several pump motors used exclusively in connection with the supply of water and heat to the pool.

## (g) Electric Light.

This cost is based on the use of 25 incandescent lamps of 150 watts each used for 245 days.

## (h) Repairs and Upkeep of Plant and Equipment.

5% of the operating costs is used to apportion this cost. This figure quoted represents the percentage of total

maintenance costs of any building apportioned to the swimming pool in the ratio that the initial capital cost of the pool bears to the initial capital cost of the total building. Maintenance of swimming pools in the Toronto system is considered a regular function of the schools' maintenance staff. There is no special staff hired for the maintenance of pools.

In the opinion of some members of the Advisory Council a 5% allotment makes provision for day to day maintenance but does not make adequate allowance for major over-haul.

(i) Administration.

Administration allowance of 10% of the previous totals is used in apportioning administration costs of the swimming pool. This figure has been used for some time by the Toronto Board in apportioning administration costs.

10. Distribution of Costs.

In the past the schools have led the way in providing facilities for better education programmes, such as general and specialized shops, home economics, auditoriums, gymnasias and stadia; and it has been a common practice for school boards to place these facilities at the service of the community, when they are not required by day classes, at little, if any cost. For example, night schools have operated on this basis in the cities for many years and are becoming more and more a recognized feature of programming in the new district high schools throughout the Province. This fostering of educational and recreational programmes for the community at large has found expression since the war in the Community Programmes Branch of the Department of Education which functions at the local level through municipal recreation departments and which leans heavily upon the schools to carry out its programme. With the steady reduction in the number of working hours, opportunities of an educational or recreational nature may be expected to make an ever-widening appeal.

It is this ever-growing use of school facilities by the community outside of regular school hours that supports re-examination of the division of costs between the school board and the municipal council. It may be argued that the division of cost makes little difference since in the final analysis it is the community that provides the money for all such services. But if the facilities required in the school programme also become the facilities required to meet the programme developed for adults, the distribution of costs should reflect that fact. Otherwise school costs are distorted by being made to appear higher than they are and this distortion appears in the form of an abnormally high school tax rate.

The construction and maintenance costs of swimming pools may well be a case in point. It is recognized by principals and physical education teachers that training in swimming and water safety is a desirable feature of the physical education programme as is training in football or in basketball. Each serves a useful purpose. But it is quite possible to have a strong, well-balanced physical education programme without the activities mentioned. However if a school board installs a pool as a result of a community demand and the pool serves not only the children but the citizen body as well, a fair share of the cost of construction and maintenance should be absorbed into the municipal budget.

Where costs are borne jointly there should be joint planning and if there is more than one pool, either in school buildings or entirely separate from schools, they should be placed strategically in order to give optimum service both to children and adults. Joint planning will also take into account the differing requirements of the two groups and lead to the study of such modern trends as pools with indoor-outdoor facilities, multiple pools, L-shaped and T-shaped pools and pools which permit simultaneous use by both sexes.

Permission for the distribution of costs between a municipality and a school board is found in *The Township of North York Act, 1955*, Section 2, which reads:

“(1) The council of the Corporation may pass by-laws,

(a) for granting aid to The Board of Education for the Township of North York to pay in whole or in part for the construction by the Board of indoor or outdoor swimming pools on the property of the Board, and the granting of such aid shall be deemed to be a purpose of the Corporation;

(b) for entering into agreements with the Board respecting the construction, control, operation, maintenance and repair of such pools, and in particular respecting the operation and use of such pools by the Corporation at other than school hours;

(c) prescribing fees or charges for the use of or admission to such pools while the operation and use of the pools is under the control of the Corporation.

(2) The Board of Education for the Township of North York may enter into and carry out any agreement made with the Corporation pursuant to subsection 1.”

#### 11. Observations.

In conclusion it may be observed that instruction in a school pool in swimming and water-safety is desirable but it is not a required part of the physical education programme in either secondary or elementary schools.

In view of the limitations set by the Canadian climate on the use of open pools in parks, it would seem proper to give priority to pools in school buildings but the location and design of pools should be the result of joint planning by the school board and the community in order that the interests of both may be served. Even if the school board and the municipal council were to build pools separately, it is desirable that there should be sufficient joint planning to avoid duplication of services. Where a pool is serving both the school and the community, a fair distribution of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance would seem to be on the basis of the extent to which the school and the community have access to the facilities provided, with the school having priority in the use of the pool.



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 3 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, March 20, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Bonham, Eve, Hartley, Lang, Martin and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. Your Committee submits for information of the Board a report of the Advisory Council dated March 16, 1956, being a clarification of its previous report on expansion of technical school facilities in the Metropolitan area. (For details of report, see below.)

MARGARET PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, March 27, 1956.

---

### REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.

March 16, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the School Accommodation Committee:

A meeting of the Secondary School Committee was held on February 22, 1956, with representatives of the Department of Education and of directors and principals active in technical and commercial education in the Metropolitan Area.

Present:

Representatives of the Department of Education: Dr. L. S. Beattie, Superintendent of Secondary Education; Mr. A. M. Moon, Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Educa-

tion; Mr. Ewart Davies, Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education.

Representatives of the Vocational Schools: T. Boone, Superintendent of Secondary Schools, Etobicoke; H. B. Dean, Danforth Technical School; J. Elliott, Northern Technical-Commercial School; J. Gillespie, Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Schools, Toronto; E. J. McGirr, New Toronto Secondary School; R. M. Sherk, George Harvey Vocational School; E. H. G. Wordon, Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

Members of the Secondary School Committee: Messrs. Morgan (Chairman), Emond, Gillespie, Graham, King, McCordic.

AIM: The aim of the meeting was to re-examine the basis on which technical education may be expanded to meet the changing needs within the Metropolitan Area.

During the past several months, as a result of conferences with officials of the Department of Education and of study by the Advisory Council, a pattern for the progressive expansion of technical education throughout the Metropolitan Area has been emerging. In the three municipalities of Scarborough, Etobicoke and North York the problem has become sufficiently pressing to call for action by the respective Boards of Education. It is recognized that the steps about to be taken will have an important bearing on the over-all development of technical training in the Metropolitan area for a period of many years.

At the present time the Metropolitan Board lacks a ceiling cost formula for technical schools. The Financial Committee, which has given considerable time to the study of the problem, requested on January 24, 1956, that the Secondary School Committee re-examine conclusions previously reached relative to the expansion of technical school facilities which have a direct bearing on the development of a ceiling cost formula for technical schools.

For this purpose the Secondary School Committee arranged the conference on February 22 with officials of the



---

Department and representative personnel with extensive experience in technical education.

The discussion brought out the following points:

1. Junior Vocational School Unit.

The Department of Education recognizes as a Junior Vocational School Unit one which provides for the commercial courses of grades 9 to 12 and the technical courses of grades 9 and 10 in at least four basic shops. The shop courses normally offered would be wood-working, machine shop, sheet metal and drafting. Special circumstances might make some modification of courses desirable but departure from normal practice would be a matter for negotiation between the Board of Education of a municipality and the Department of Education.

Such a unit would come within the purview of an Advisory Vocational Committee and the students in attendance would qualify for vocational school grants.

It is understood that teachers in a four-teacher Junior Vocational School Unit would be required to hold or to obtain a vocational teacher's certificate. Teachers of Industrial Arts already employed might be able to retain their positions in junior vocational shops by obtaining practical experience in the trade represented by the shop. This follows the agreement which the Department of Education has made with the Scarborough Board of Education as well as with several high school boards throughout the Province.

The possibility of equipping two shops in one school and two in another and providing transportation so that pupils might receive instruction in all four shops was discussed. Such an arrangement would depend on local conditions and each case would call for approval by the Department of Education. A cautionary comment was made to the effect that before such an arrangement be adopted a careful comparison should be made between the costs of transportation over a period of 20 years and debenture costs for the building of four shops in each school centre.

2. Number of students required for the economical operation of junior vocational shops.

It is estimated that 180 to 200 pupils would be required to keep four shops busy in a junior vocational unit.

3. Size of junior shops and cost of equipment.

Recommended areas and budget for shop equipment as provided by the Department of Education is as follows:—

Shop	Size	Cost of Equipment
Machine .....	12 to 1400 sq. ft.	12 to \$15,000.00
Sheet Metal .....	" " "	4 to 5,000.00
Electrical .....	" " "	6 to 8,000.00
Auto Mechanics .....	" " "	6 to 8,000.00
Building Trades .....	" " "	2 to 3,000.00
Wood Shop (apart from Bldg. trades)...	" " "	8 to 10,000.00

A sub-committee examined the foregoing figures against experience in various schools throughout the Province and concluded that on the whole the figures recommended by the Department of Education were realistic.

4. Senior Technical School.

In the discussion of the number of pupils which should be enrolled in technical education in an area before a senior technical school should be built, differences of opinion again appeared.

The building of technical schools was advocated for Metropolitan Toronto by the Departmental officials rather than the further development of composite schools. It was pointed out that the composite school pattern has been a natural development for geographical as well as other reasons in certain sections of Metropolitan Toronto and will continue to be the pattern in many of the smaller cities of Ontario. But with the change from several clearly defined and autonomous municipalities to a closely built Metropolitan area, the senior technical school is the type of school

that municipalities should consider in future building programmes.

It was advanced that students of grades 11 and 12 may be combined in certain courses if the enrolment in each does not justify two classes. This however should be looked upon as a cost-saving device and not as the most effective type of organization.

In an attempt to reach a firm figure as to the number of pupils required to justify the building of a senior school, it was generally agreed that, in order to get optimum results from the use of four senior shops, approximately 800 technical pupils would be required as a minimum in the area served. This total would include all students enrolled in grades 11 and 12 of the senior school, students of grades 9 and 10 living in the neighborhood of and receiving instruction in the senior school, and the students of the area enrolled in Junior Vocational School Units.

As a result of the discussion it was agreed that the Metropolitan Board was now in a position to act with respect to (a) the purchase of school sites in Scarborough and Etobicoke, (b) expenditures on junior shops.

The Secondary School Committee wishes to acknowledge its indebtedness to Departmental officials and school personnel for their assistance in the effort to resolve the complicated problem of technical instruction in Metropolitan Toronto.

C. C. GOLDRING,  
Chairman of Council.

---

REPORT No. 5 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART I.

Tuesday, March 20, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Ferguson, Grayson,

Lockhart, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendments to the Official Plan of the Etobicoke Planning Area:—

Amendment No. 98—

re-zoning of an area on the east side of Royal York Road north of Westmount Park Road from Residential to Greenbelt.

re-zoning of an area west of Scarlett Road, north of Chapman Road from Residential to Greenbelt.

re-zoning of an area on the north and south sides of Chapman Road, west of Scarlett Road from Greenbelt to Residential.

re-zoning of an area on the south side of Leggett Avenue midway between Royal York Road and Scarlett Road from Greenbelt to Residential.

Amendment No. 99—

re-zoning of an area on the east side of Highway No. 27, south of Evans Avenue, from Residential to Commercial.

The Etobicoke Board has indicated that it has no objection to the proposed amendment.

2. That the Board concur in the comments of area boards of education concerned with respect to the following subdivision plans and so advise the Department of Planning and Development and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board:—

Township of East York.

T-9343—35 lots.

Public school pupils, kindergarten to grade 6, will attend George Webster Public School. Grades 7 and 8 will attend St. Clair Junior High School. Secondary students will attend East York Collegiate.

---

**Township of Etobicoke.**

**T-7801 (2nd Revision)—425 lots.**

A public school site of 6 acres as indicated on the plan of subdivision will be required. Public school pupils will be temporarily accommodated at the new Westway School which it is proposed to build for September 1957. Secondary students will be accommodated at Burnhamthorpe C.I. until a new school is built in the area bounded by Martin Grove Road and Kipling Avenue.

**T-9156—51 lots.**

The Etobicoke Board is negotiating for purchase of the public school site of approximately 6 acres as indicated on the plan of subdivision. Until the new school is built, public school pupils will be accommodated at Eatonville Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Burnhamthorpe C.I.

**T-9376—16 lots.**

Public school pupils will attend Cloverdale Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Burnhamthorpe C.I.

**T-9485—16 lots.**

Public school pupils will attend Cloverdale Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Burnhamthorpe C.I.

**T-9453—19 lots.**

Public school pupils will attend Park Lawn Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Royal York C.I.

**T-9133 Revised—23 lots.**

Public school pupils will attend the new Castlebar Public School when it opens in September, 1956. Secondary students will be accommodated at Royal York C.I.

**T-7341 (3rd Revision)—496 lots.**

The Etobicoke Board has a signed Offer to Purchase for a public school site as indicated on the plan of subdivision. Secondary students will attend Thistletown C.I. when it is completed in September, 1957.

## Township of North York.

T-6981 Revised—17 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Gracefield Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Downsview C.I.

T-9180 Revised—9 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Churchill Avenue Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-9217—366 lots.

After examination, the North York Board of Education requests that these lands remain as presently zoned (Industrial), or if any of the lands are to be rezoned that they be rezoned so that all lands to the east of Main Street be industrial.

T-9337—7 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Yorkview Drive Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Northview Heights C.I.

T-9479—177 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend schools in the Don Mills area, eventually a school in the vicinity. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually York Mills C.I.

T-9502—59 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Rippleton Road Public School, eventually a public school in the vicinity. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually York Mills C.I.

T-9508—42 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Wilmington Avenue Public School, eventually a school in the vicinity. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I. eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-9524—10 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Maple Leaf Public School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

## Town of Weston.

T-9566—5 lots.

Public school pupils will attend King Street Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Weston Collegiate & Vocational School.

3. That consideration of the following application for capital funds be deferred pending approval of the capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for 1956:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Alderwood C.I. Site Extension:	
.34 acres .....	\$20,500.00
123 feet fronting on Valermo Drive.	

Your Committee further recommends that representatives of the Committee, to be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, visit the Alderwood C.I. Site to ascertain whether or not the extension is advisable and report thereon to the Committee at its next meeting.

4. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for erection of an administration building:—

## Administration Building.

Metro Share .....	Nil
Local Share .....	\$450,000.00
Total .....	\$450,000.00

## CAPITAL ESTIMATES.

5. Your Committee had before it for re-consideration the revised capital estimates of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956, copies of which were forwarded to all members of the Board.

Your Committee has requested the Chairman of the Board and the Executive Secretary to meet with the Chairmen and officials of the Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, Toronto and York Township Boards of Education to review

the building proposals of said boards in an effort to reduce the composite capital estimates.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Amended by adding the following as section 6:—

“6. That the revised capital estimates as shown in Appendix ‘A’ be approved.” (See Appendix p. 184.)

Adopted by the Board, as amended, March 27, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 5 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, March 22, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Might, Power and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 4 and 5 of Report No. 5 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. That Disbursement List No. 42, dated March 22, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$934,317.39 be approved. Appendix p. 183.

JOHN C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, March 27, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 3 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, March 20, 1955.

1. At a previous meeting of the School Board tentative approval was given to an application of the North York



Board of Education for erection of the Keele-Sheppard Public School. As this school will serve children of R.C.A.F. personnel from Downsview as well as some North York Township pupils, the Board's approval of the application was made contingent upon accommodation being vacated by R.C.A.F. children at Hughes Public School (Toronto) being adequately utilized by Toronto or York Township pupils. Your Committee has been advised that the York Township Board is prepared to send approximately 161 pupils to Hughes Public School to relieve overcrowded conditions at York Township schools. However, the York Township Board is not prepared to commit itself at this time unless assurance is given that the tuition fee to be paid by the York Township Board is not in excess of the York Township's own per pupil cost.

As the amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act which would permit the Metropolitan School Board to pay a portion of non-resident fees in excess of a sending boards per pupil costs is expected to receive Royal Assent in the near future, your Committee recommends that following approval of the amendment by the Legislative Assembly the Executive Secretary be requested to confer with the appropriate officials of the Toronto and York Township Boards regarding the establishment of an attendance area for York Township pupils who will attend Hughes Public School, and to report thereon to the (Advisory Council) School Accommodation Committee.

2. The Lakeshore District Board of Education has advised your Committee that the Metropolitan Separate School Board has decided to erect an eight room school on Tenth Street, New Toronto, which it is anticipated will be ready to receive pupils in the Fall of 1956. Heretofore no separate school existed in the Town of New Toronto and in an attempt to meet demands for education in the area the Lakeshore District Board has completed one addition and is in the process of completing other additions to public schools in the immediate vicinity of the proposed separate school. In the opinion of the Lakeshore District Board the erection of the separate school will remove approximately 8 classes from the public school system. In view of the fact that

the Lakeshore Board's building programme has been gauged to meet the needs of all elementary school pupils in that area, the Lakeshore Board has requested the Metropolitan School Board to support its request that the following section of The Public Schools Act be invoked by the Assessment Commissioner:—

“Nothing in this Act authorizing the levying or collecting of rates on taxable property for public school purposes shall apply to the supporters of Roman Catholic separate schools, except that all taxable property shall continue to be liable to taxation for the purpose of paying any liability incurred for public school purposes while the property was subject to taxation for such purposes.”

Your Committee recommends that the Board concur in the request of the Lakeshore District Board that section 3 of The Public Schools Act be invoked. The Committee has requested the Executive Secretary to secure any additional information for presentation to the Board relative to the foregoing situation and further requested the Metropolitan Solicitor to submit to the Board his interpretation of section 3 of The Public Schools Act.

3. That, as recommended by the Advisory Council, the Scarborough Board of Education be reimbursed the operating costs of the following special education class effective February 1, 1956:—

Opportunity Class	I.Q. Range	63-88
	Age Range	8-14

This class for slow learners with one exception (I.Q. 92) where progress is seriously retarded.

Estimated cost of equipment ..... \$500.00

Approved by the Department of Education as of January 30, 1956.

MARGARET PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, March 27, 1956.<sup>1</sup>

REPORT No. 5 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART II.

Tuesday, March 20, 1956.

1. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for the erection of public school accommodation:—

Memorial Public School, addition of 4 standard classrooms.

Estimated Cost .....	\$102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00
Date addition required—September 1956.	
Present enrolment—846.	
Anticipated increase—44.	

2. That the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education for capital funds for the erection of public school accommodation be referred back to the Lakeshore District Board for further consideration in the light of the possibility of a separate school being built in the area which would effect the school accommodation requirements in the Lakeshore District:—

Long Branch Memorial School, 7 standard classrooms, kindergarten.

Estimated Cost .....	\$202,125.00
Ceiling .....	202,125.00
Date school required—September 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—245.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—330.	

3. On November 22, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board gave final approval to the following application of the East York Board of Education:—

Plains Road Elementary School, 6 Standard Classrooms, kindergarten.

Metro Share .....	\$140,000.00
Local Share .....	Nil.
Total .....	140,000.00
Ceiling .....	176,400.00

The East York Board of Education has submitted an application for capital funds in the amount of \$176,400.00 as follows:—

Contract price (lowest tender) .....	\$158,278.00
Architect's fees .....	9,497.00
Equipment .....	8,625.00
Total .....	<u>\$176,400.00</u>

Your Committee recommends that the revised application for Plains Road Elementary School in the amount of \$176,400.00 be approved, subject of course, to approval of the local share by the Council for the Township of East York.

4. On January 31, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board gave final approval to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education:— (Deleted)

Old Orchard Project (Alexander Muir Satellite Junior School), 7 standard classrooms, kindergarten, Auditorium-Playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$160,000.00
Local Share .....	42,125.00
Total .....	202,125.00
Ceiling .....	<u>202,125.00</u>

The Toronto Board of Education has submitted an application for capital funds as follows:—

Contract price (lowest tender) .....	\$249,204.00
Architect's fees .....	15,700.00
Equipment .....	9,600.00
Contingency .....	12,500.00
	<u>\$287,004.00</u>

In addition, however, because of the nature of the site, the Toronto Board of Education is required to provide piling to support the building. The Toronto Board has accepted the tender of Franki Pile Corporation in the amount of \$12,570.00, being the lowest tender received. In view of the necessity of providing piling for this project the Toronto Board of Education has requested that consideration be given to an arrangement whereby the ceiling formula for

this project could be increased by the cost of piling work. The Toronto Board has also requested the Board to give consideration to the approval of a further amount to cover the cost of concrete footings for the building which will rest on the piles. It is estimated that the cost of the piling plus the cost of concrete footings will be \$30,000.00.

Funds required over and above the amount the Metropolitan School Board approves will be provided from current funds.

Your Committee recommends that the ceiling cost formula for the Old Orchard Project be raised by an amount of \$30,000.00 to a total of \$232,125.00 in view of the necessity of providing special piling and footings for the support of the building.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Amended by deleting Section 4 regarding an application of the Toronto Board of Education for additional capital funds for the Old Orchard Project.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, March 27, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 5 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, March 22, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 2 and 3 of Report No. 3 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, and sections 1, 3 and 4 of Report No. 5 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 42, dated March 22, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,965,327.60 be approved. Appendix p. 183.

3. Late in 1955 and early this year your Committee has had under consideration the question of assessment revision as it affects public school revenues of the Metropolitan School Board. In the Fall of 1955 the Executive Secretary was authorized to secure an opinion from area boards of

education with respect to the appointment of a co-ordinator of assessment revision. The majority of replies of area boards were to the effect that assessment revision was being adequately handled at the local level and that the appointment of an additional person at the Metropolitan level did not seem necessary at the present time.

The Committee is of the opinion, however, that interest of the Metropolitan School Board in the problem of assessment revision is of such importance that some means should be devised whereby provisions at the local level for assessment revision are made known to the School Board.

It is therefore recommended that area boards of education be requested to consent to the participation of at least one representative actively engaged in assessment revision on a Metropolitan Assessment Revision Committee and that the Assistant Secretary Finance officially represent the School Board on such Committee and that for this purpose a preliminary meeting be called for Wednesday, April 25th.

4. At a previous meeting your Committee had before it for consideration a list of equipment purchased by the Lakeshore District Board of Education for a speech correction class in the amount of \$468.75. As the maximum allowance for initial equipment for speech correction classes approved by the School Board is \$225.00, the Committee referred the matter to the Advisory Council for consideration.

The Advisory Council in reviewing the list of equipment purchased by the Lakeshore Board noted that an amount of \$242.00 was expended for nesting chairs. In the opinion of Council, schools normally would have a supply of chairs for pupils who receive instruction from an itinerant teacher. Therefore Council could not see its way clear to recommend any increase in the allowance for initial equipment for speech correction classes.

Your Committee recommends that the Board concur in the recommendation of the Advisory Council.

JOHN C. VAN ESTERIK,

Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, March 27, 1956.

## DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 42.

March 22, 1956.

## PART I.

1. Carswell Company Limited, Printing Minutes, January 31, 1956, \$442.00; February 14, 1956, \$289.50 .....	\$ 731.50
2. Maintenance Assistant Payments, due April, 1956, SECONDARY .....	930,674.25

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

3. Bell Telephone Company Limited, March Service .....	81.70
4. Dominion Maintenance Company, February Service .....	85.00
5. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, February Meeting Expenses .....	43.00
6. Mr. G. L. Gray, Edit. Assistance, January to March, 1956 .....	87.00
7. International Business Machines, Supplies .....	30.00
8. Ontario Towel Service Limited, February Service .....	10.00
9. Orange Crush Limited, Meeting Expense .....	4.80
10. Receiver General of Canada, Postage .....	48.00
11. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental, March 15 to April 14, 1956 .....	1,087.50
12. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, February Service .....	20.29
13. Walter Stewart, Insurance .....	8.62
14. Staff Salaries, February 24 to March 8, 1956 .....	1,405.73
	<hr/>
	\$ 934,317.39

## PART II.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due April, 1956, PUBLIC .....	\$1,965,327.60
---	----------------

APPENDIX "A"  
REVISED CAPITAL ESTIMATES—1956  
SUMMARY  
SCHEDULE "A"

PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR  
TO 1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955		Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
	Total	Local Share	
<b>PUBLIC</b>			
East York .....	\$ 382,150.00	\$ 382,150.00	\$ 382,150.00
Etobicoke .....	2,121,991.00	1,484,900.00	2,121,991.00
Lakeshore .....	69,030.00	40,000.00	69,030.00
North York .....	3,570,550.00	2,780,900.00	3,570,550.00
Scarborough .....	3,731,467.00	2,449,600.00	3,731,467.00
Toronto .....	4,429,578.00	2,472,000.00	3,175,026.00
Weston .....	120,000.00	120,000.00	120,000.00
York .....	882,400.00	500,000.00	882,400.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$15,307,166.00</b>	<b>\$10,229,550.00</b>	<b>\$14,052,614.00</b>
<b>SECONDARY</b>			
Etobicoke .....	\$ 486,000.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 486,000.00
Lakeshore .....	202,500.00	80,000.00	202,500.00
North York .....	3,962,000.00	1,777,000.00	2,027,000.00
Scarborough .....	2,033,444.00	940,000.00	2,033,444.00
Toronto .....	847,273.00	100,000.00	847,273.00
York .....	360,000.00	240,000.00	360,000.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$ 7,891,217.00</b>	<b>\$ 3,377,000.00</b>	<b>\$ 5,956,217.00</b>
<b>Grand Total .....</b>	<b>\$23,198,383.00</b>	<b>\$13,606,550.00</b>	<b>\$20,008,831.00</b>



SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

PUBLIC	Estimated Cost to be Debentured			Est. Expending or Financing in 1956
	Total	Metro Share	Local Share	
East York .....	\$ 180,075.00	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 40,075.00	\$ 70,000.00
Etobicoke .....	2,330,000.00	1,332,000.00	998,000.00	1,072,200.00
Lakeshore .....	586,670.00	440,000.00	146,670.00	402,900.00
North York .....	3,007,325.00	2,339,000.00	668,325.00	1,481,175.00
Scarborough .....	4,391,200.00	3,376,800.00	1,014,400.00	2,616,100.00
Toronto .....	2,801,965.00	1,444,000.00	1,357,965.00	1,017,125.00
Weston .....	52,000.00	52,000.00	.....	18,000.00
York .....	188,260.00	80,000.00	108,260.00	135,360.00
Sub-Total .....	\$13,537,495.00	\$ 9,203,800.00	\$ 4,333,695.00	\$ 6,812,860.00
1956 Site Purchases—Estimate .....	5,808,800.00	.....	5,808,800.00	5,808,800.00
Total .....	\$19,346,295.00	\$ 9,203,800.00	\$10,142,495.00	\$12,621,660.00
SECONDARY				
Etobicoke .....	\$ 1,019,800.00	\$ 360,000.00	\$ 659,800.00	\$ 351,800.00
North York .....	601,000.00	238,000.00	363,000.00	85,000.00
Scarborough .....	1,050,000.00	320,000.00	730,000.00	50,000.00
Toronto .....	761,000.00	260,000.00	501,000.00	286,000.00
York .....	500,000.00	.....	500,000.00	200,000.00
Sub-Total .....	\$ 3,931,800.00	\$ 1,178,000.00	\$ 2,753,800.00	\$ 971,800.00
1956 Site Purchases—Estimate .....	1,406,000.00	.....	1,406,000.00	1,406,000.00
Total .....	\$ 5,337,800.00	\$ 1,178,000.00	\$ 4,159,800.00	\$ 2,377,800.00
Grand Total—Buildings .....	\$17,469,295.00	\$10,381,800.00	\$ 7,087,495.00	\$ 7,784,660.00
—Sites .....	7,214,800.00	.....	7,214,800.00	7,214,800.00
Total .....	\$24,684,095.00	\$10,381,800.00	\$14,302,295.00	\$14,999,460.00

## SCHEDULE "A"

## PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO 1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955 Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>EAST YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Plains Road Addition ....	Oct. 28, 1955	6 & K	240	\$ 176,400.00	\$ 140,000.00	Nil \$ 140,000.00
Portables (4) .....	Nov. 8, 1955	4	140	n/a	24,000.00	Nil 24,000.00
Selwyn School .....		11	385	282,975.00	218,150.00	Nil 218,150.00
					\$ 382,150.00	\$ 382,150.00
<b>ETOBICOKE—PUBLIC</b>						
Albion Gardens School ....		8 & K	310	227,850.00	\$ 180,000.00	\$ 47,850.00 \$ 227,850.00
Castlebar School .....		8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	47,850.00 227,850.00
Douglas Park School .....	Nov. 29, 1955	8 & K	310	227,850.00	218,231.00	38,231.00 218,231.00
Eatonville Addition .....		4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00 102,900.00
Franklin Horner Addition ..	Oct. 7, 1955	3 & 2S & G-K	145	198,601.00	196,000.00	116,700.00 196,000.00
Gainsford School .....		10	350	272,685.00	200,000.00	72,685.00 272,685.00
Kingsview Village School ..	Oct. 28, 1955	8 & K	310	227,850.00	175,600.00	52,250.00 227,850.00
Portables (3) No. 27, 28, 29	Sept. 30, 1955	3	105	n/a	18,000.00	Nil 18,000.00
Queensway Rehabilitation ..	Nov. 29, 1955	Renov.	480	45,000.00	Nil	45,000.00 45,000.00
Rivercrest School .....	Oct. 7, 1955	12 & DK	210	352,800.00	272,000.00	80,800.00 352,800.00
Sir Adam Beck Addition ..	Oct. 28, 1955	6 & Ren.	210	172,770.00	120,000.00	52,770.00 172,770.00
Bulk Site Fund Advances:						
Gale .....				500.00	.....	500.00 500.00
Castlebar .....				59,555.00	.....	59,555.00 59,555.00
				\$2,121,991.00	\$1,484,900.00	\$ 637,091.00 \$2,121,991.00
<b>ETOBICOKE—SECONDARY</b>						
Royal York Addition .....		12	360	486,000.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 246,000.00 \$ 486,000.00
<b>LAKESHORE—PUBLIC</b>						
Seventh Street Addition ..	Dec. 7, 1955	2 & Ren.	70	58,104.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 13,800.00 \$ 53,800.00
Bulk Site Fund Advances:						
West Long Branch ....				15,230.00	.....	15,230.00 15,230.00
				\$ 69,030.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 29,030.00 \$ 69,030.00
<b>LAKESHORE—SECONDARY</b>						
Mimico Addition .....		4 & G	150	202,500.00	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 122,500.00 \$ 202,500.00

SCHEDULE "A"  
PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO  
1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955 Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expnd. or Financing in 1956
<b>NORTH YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Bunty Drive School .....		12 & K & (2S)	450	\$ 370,750.00	\$ 370,750.00	\$ 370,750.00
Champlain School .....		6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00	176,400.00
Downsview Addition .....		6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00
Highland Hill School .....		14 & DK	550	404,250.00	300,000.00	104,250.00
Highview Avenue School .....		6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00	36,400.00
Lawrence Heights School .....		16 & DK	620	455,700.00	352,000.00	103,700.00
Maple Road School .....		8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	47,850.00
Maple Leaf Addition .....	Nov. 29, 1955	10 & K	380	279,300.00	236,000.00	43,300.00
Rippleton Road School .....	Sept. 20, 1955	12 & K	450	330,750.00	296,000.00	34,750.00
Sloane School .....		12 & K	380	279,300.00	260,000.00	19,300.00
Wilkie Addition .....		12	420	308,700.00	240,000.00	68,700.00
Wilmington Addition .....		4 & K	170	124,950.00	100,000.00	24,950.00
(See Schedule "B" For Extra Cost)						
Yvonne School .....	July 26, 1955	12 & K	450	330,750.00	252,500.00	67,500.00
Bulk Site Fund Advances:						
Rippleton .....				3,000.00	.....	3,000.00
Highview .....				11,200.00	.....	11,200.00
Don River Heights .....				19,000.00	.....	19,000.00
Sloane .....				27,000.00	.....	27,000.00
				\$3,570,550.00	\$2,780,900.00	\$ 789,650.00
<b>NORTH YORK—SECONDARY</b>						
Bathurst Heights—Addition (See Schedule "B" For Extra Cost)		6 & 2S	220	297,000.00	\$ 142,000.00	Nil
Don Mills School .....		25 & 3S	810	1,093,500.00	1,000,000.00	\$ 540,000.00
Downsview Extra Costs .....		36 & 4S	1160	1,566,000.00	285,000.00	250,000.00
Northview Heights School .....		25 & 3S	810	1,093,500.00	1,535,000.00	855,000.00
York Mills School .....				1,000,000.00	460,000.00	540,000.00
				\$3,962,000.00	\$1,777,000.00	\$2,185,000.00
						\$2,027,000.00

SCHEDULE "A"									
PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO 1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED									
Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955	Total Metro Share	Local Share	Est. Expnd. or Financing in 1956	
<b>SCARBOROUGH—PUBLIC</b>									
Administration Bldg. . . . . 80%	Dec. 7, 1955	5	175	128,625.00	\$ 349,376.00	Nil.	\$ 349,376.00	\$ 349,376.00	
Birchcliffe Addition . . . . .	Feb. 3, 1956	10 & DK	410	301,350.00	128,625.00	100,000.00	28,625.00	128,625.00	
Chapman School . . . . .		5 & K	205	150,675.00	287,768.00	232,000.00	55,768.00	287,768.00	
China Dr. School . . . . .		2	70	51,450.00	150,675.00	120,000.00	30,675.00	150,675.00	
Cliffside Addition . . . . .					51,450.00	40,000.00	11,450.00	51,450.00	
Ellesmere Addition . . . . .	Sept. 30, 1955	10 & DK	410	361,920.00	361,920.00	232,000.00	129,709.00	361,920.00	
General Brock School . . . . .	Oct. 27, 1955	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	309,372.00	253,600.00	53,772.00	309,372.00	
Geo. B. Little School . . . . .		12 & DK	480	352,800.00	352,800.00	272,000.00	80,800.00	352,800.00	
Golf Road Addition . . . . .		6 & DK	270	198,450.00	198,450.00	152,000.00	46,450.00	198,450.00	
Lynwood School . . . . .		8 & K	310	227,850.00	227,850.00	180,000.00	47,850.00	227,850.00	
Portables (15) No.'s 65-79 . . . . .	Oct. 28, 1955	14	490	n/a	105,400.00	84,000.00	21,400.00	105,400.00	
Portables (24) No.'s 80-103 . . . . .	Oct. 28, 1955	24	840	n/a	164,520.00	144,000.00	20,520.00	164,520.00	
Regent Heights Addition . . . . .	Dec. 5, 1955	6	210	154,347.00	154,347.00	120,000.00	34,347.00	154,347.00	
Terraview Addition . . . . .	Nov. 29, 1955	8	280	233,960.00	157,550.00	126,000.00	31,550.00	157,550.00	
Vradenburgh School . . . . .		12 & DK	480	352,800.00	352,800.00	272,000.00	80,800.00	352,800.00	
Walter Perry Addition . . . . .	Jan. 6, 1956	6	210	202,970.00	179,525.00	120,000.00	59,525.00	179,525.00	
Bulk Site Fund Advances:									
Bennett Farm . . . . .				35,750.00	35,750.00	250.00	35,500.00	35,750.00	
Birchmount-St. Clair . . . . .				250.00	250.00	250.00	250.00	250.00	
Cedar Glen . . . . .				40,500.00	40,500.00	40,500.00	40,500.00	40,500.00	
Danforth Gardens . . . . .				43,500.00	43,500.00	43,500.00	43,500.00	43,500.00	
George Peck . . . . .				800.00	800.00	800.00	800.00	800.00	
Goodeham . . . . .				51,000.00	51,000.00	51,000.00	51,000.00	51,000.00	
Gore Road . . . . .				14,800.00	14,800.00	14,800.00	14,800.00	14,800.00	
Knob Hill . . . . .				4,100.00	4,100.00	4,100.00	4,100.00	4,100.00	
Lynwood . . . . .				400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	
Vradenburgh . . . . .				8,150.00	8,150.00	8,150.00	8,150.00	8,150.00	
				\$3,731,467.00	\$2,449,600.00	\$1,281,867.00	\$3,731,467.00	\$3,731,467.00	
<b>SCARBOROUGH—SECONDARY</b>									
Administration Bldg. . . . . 20%	Dec. 7, 1955	19	570	961,500.00	\$ 87,344.00	Nil.	\$ 87,344.00	\$ 87,344.00	
Agincourt Addition . . . . .	Sept. 30, 1955	16 & 3S	240	324,000.00	826,200.00	340,000.00	486,200.00	826,200.00	
R. H. King Addition . . . . .	Dec. 24, 1955	18 & 4S	620	837,000.00	324,000.00	180,000.00	144,000.00	324,000.00	
Winston Churchill Adn. . . . .	Nov. 29, 1955				795,900.00	420,000.00	375,900.00	795,900.00	
				\$2,033,444.00	\$ 940,000.00	\$1,093,444.00	\$2,033,444.00	\$2,033,444.00	

SCHEDULE "A"  
PROJECTS PRESENTED TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO  
1956 BUT NOT DEBENTURED

Project	Date of Final O.M.B.	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated or Actual Cost in 1955 Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>TORONTO—PUBLIC</b>						
Cotttingham School .....	Dec. 6, 1955	6 & K	240	\$ 176,400.00	\$ 176,400.00	\$ 176,400.00
Givins Sr. School .....		15 & 2S & G	595	624,750.00	300,000.00	324,750.00
King Edward School (Jr.-Sr.) .....		32 & K & 2S	1190	1,041,600.00	660,000.00	110,000.00
Ogden School (See Sched. "B" for extra cost) .....		16 & K	590	433,650.00	340,000.00	57,000.00
Old Orchard Jr. School (See Sched. "B" for extra cost) .....		7 & K	275	202,125.00	160,000.00	32,000.00
Palmerston School .....	Nov. 21, 1955	22	770	601,140.00	573,171.00	133,171.00
Queen Alexandra School (Jr.-Sr.) .....	Oct. 12, 1955	20 & DK	900	n/a	432,000.00	541,207.00
Bulk Site Purchase Advances:		4S 2G				
Alexander Muir .....					173,000.00	173,000.00
Essex .....					10,050.00	10,050.00
Fern .....					340,000.00	340,000.00
Wellesley .....					200,000.00	200,000.00
					\$4,429,578.00	\$2,472,000.00
					\$1,957,578.00	\$3,175,026.00
<b>TORONTO—SECONDARY</b>						
North Toronto C.I. Add. ..	Oct. 11, 1955	8 & G	270	n/a	\$ 847,273.00	\$ 747,273.00
<b>WESTON—PUBLIC</b>						
Memorial Addition .....		4 & DK	200	147,000.00	\$ 120,000.00	\$ Nil
<b>YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Briar Hill Addition .....		4 & K	170	124,950.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 24,950.00
C. E. Webster Addition ..	Oct. 11, 1955	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00
Lambton Park Addition ..		3	105	77,175.00	60,000.00	15,000.00
Rockcliffe School .....		5 & 6S	240	n/a	100,000.00	286,100.00
Roseland Addition .....	Nov. 29, 1955	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	22,000.00
					\$ 882,400.00	\$ 382,400.00
					\$ 360,000.00	\$ 120,000.00
<b>YORK—SECONDARY</b>						
George Harvey Addition ..		4 & 8S	280	378,000.00	\$ 240,000.00	\$ 120,000.00
					\$ 360,000.00	\$ 360,000.00

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Total Metro Share Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
EAST YORK—PUBLIC School "A" .....	7	245	180,075.00 \$	180,075.00 \$ 140,000.00 \$ 40,075.00 \$	70,000.00
ETOBICOKE—PUBLIC Administration Building & Warehouse 80% .....	4	140	n/a	407,200	237,200.00
Elmlea Addition .....	8 & K	310	102,900.00	102,900.00	100,000.00
Gale School .....			227,850.00	22,900.00	80,000.00
Lambton-Kgs. Renov. ..			100,000.00	180,000.00	100,000.00
Park Lawn Relief School ..	8 & K	310	227,850.00	100,000.00	180,000.00
Peachy Sr. School .....	11	385	404,250.00	180,000.00	25,000.00
Stock Farm Est. School ..	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	220,000.00	200,000.00
West Humber School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	50,000.00
Westway School .....	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00	100,000.00
ETOBICOKE—SECONDARY Administration Building & Warehouse 20% .....	20 & 4S	680	n/a	\$2,330,000.00 \$1,332,000.00 \$ 998,000.00	\$1,072,200.00
Thistletown School .....			918,000.00	\$ 101,800.00	\$ 101,800.00
			918,000.00	360,000.00	250,000.00
			\$1,019,800.00 \$ 360,000.00 \$ 659,800.00		\$ 351,800.00

SCHEDULE "B"						
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL IN 1956						
Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Celling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Metro Share	Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing In 1956
<b>LAKESHORE—PUBLIC</b>						
John English School .....	18 & Anc.	630	483,770.00	\$ 483,770.00	\$ 123,770.00	\$ 300,000.00
Second St. Addition .....	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	22,900.00	102,900.00
				\$ 586,670.00	\$ 146,670.00	\$ 402,900.00
<b>NORTH YORK—PUBLIC</b>						
Ancaster School .....	8 & K	310	227,850.00	\$ 227,850.00	\$ 47,850.00	\$ 100,000.00
Belmar Park School .....	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00	59,300.00	50,000.00
Don Mills—Phase 4 School ..	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	70,750.00	100,000.00
Keele-Sheppard School .....	20 & 2K	760	558,600.00	352,800.00	72,800.00	200,000.00
(Part to be paid by Dom. Gov.)						
Lillian St. Addition .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
Sheppard-Bayview School ..	12	450	455,700.00	330,750.00	70,750.00	75,000.00
Silverview School .....	12 & K	450	330,750.00	260,000.00	70,750.00	100,000.00
Wilmington Add. (Part) ....	3	105	77,175.00	60,000.00	17,175.00	77,175.00
Yorkview Addition .....	8	280	205,800.00	160,000.00	35,150.00	160,000.00
Austerity Schools Balance ..	n/a		89,000.00	39,000.00	50,000.00	89,000.00
Addition "A" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
Addition "B" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
Addition "C" .....	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	34,350.00	120,000.00
School "A" (Brian Drive) ...	6 & K	240	176,400.00	140,000.00	36,400.00	50,000.00
				\$3,007,325.00	\$2,339,000.00	\$ 668,325.00
<b>NORTH YORK—SECONDARY</b>						
Bathurst Heights Addition—						
Extra cost 1955 project ..						
School "A" — Part of Cost						
Only—Balance to be ap-						
plied against 1954 Don						
Mills Approval .....	36 & 4S	1,160	1,566,000.00	566,000.00	220,000.00	346,000.00
				\$ 601,000.00	\$ 238,000.00	\$ 363,000.00
						\$ 85,000.00
						\$ 35,000.00

SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing	Est. Expend. or Financing
				Total Metro Share Local Share	In 1956
<b>SCARBOROUGH—PUBLIC</b>					
Bendale Park School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	352,800.00	252,800.00
Biantyre Addition	2	70	51,450.00	40,000.00	30,500.00
Cedar Glen School	8 & DK	340	249,900.00	192,000.00	100,000.00
Churchill Heights School	10 & DK	410	301,350.00	232,000.00	50,000.00
C.K.E.Y. School	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	75,000.00
Clairlea Addition	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	75,000.00
Danforth Gardens School	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00	250,000.00
Thompson Farm School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00	279,300.00
Exford Drive School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00	250,000.00
Galloway Road School	10 & K	380	279,300.00	220,000.00	100,000.00
General Brock Addition	6	210	154,350.00	120,000.00	100,000.00
Golf Road Addition No. 2	8	280	205,800.00	160,000.00	154,350.00
Gore Road School	4	140	102,900.00	80,000.00	100,000.00
Hunter's Glen School	12 & DK	480	352,800.00	272,000.00	30,000.00
Latham School	8 & K	310	227,850.00	180,000.00	352,800.00
Manhattan Park School	10 & DK	410	301,350.00	232,000.00	150,000.00
St. Andrews School	16 & DK	620	455,700.00	352,800.00	301,350.00
West Hill School	2S	...	40,000.00	.....	175,000.00
				40,000.00	40,000.00
				\$4,391,200.00	\$2,616,100.00
<b>SCARBOROUGH—SECONDARY</b>					
Warden and St. Clair School	18 & 6S	660	1,050,000.00	\$3,376,800.00 \$ 320,000.00 \$	\$ 730,000.00 \$ 50,000.00



SCHEDULE "B"  
NEW PROJECTS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR  
APPROVAL IN 1956

Project	Teaching Areas	Total Accom.	Ceiling Cost	Estimated Cost to be Debentured or Financing Local Share	Est. Expend. or Financing in 1956
<b>TORONTO—PUBLIC</b>					
Essex Jr. & Sr. School .....	17 & 2S & G	665	632,100.00 \$	607,500.00 \$	220,000.00 \$
Garden Jr. School .....	6 & K	240	176,400.00	174,000.00	87,000.00
Jesse Ketchum Sr. Add. ....	2 & DG & Ren	130	294,495.00	294,495.00	150,000.00
Ogden—Extra cost 1955 project .....		See Schedule "A"			Nil
Old Orchard—Extra cost 1955 project .....		See Schedule "A"			10,125.00
Park Sr. Sch. Conversion ...	DG & Ren	60	241,920.00	241,920.00	150,000.00
Regent Park Jr. School .....	22 & 2DK	890	654,150.00	504,000.00	150,000.00
Rosedale Jr. School .....	7 & K	275	202,125.00	160,000.00	50,000.00
Sunnyview Addition .....	6	n/a	n/a	120,000.00	Nil
Wellesley School .....	16 & K	590	433,650.00	397,000.00	200,000.00
				\$2,801,965.00	\$1,017,125.00
<b>TORONTO—SECONDARY</b>					
Danforth Addition .....	13S & Ren	260	676,000.00 \$	676,000.00 \$	200,000.00 \$
Northern Tech. ....	Ren	...	85,000.00	85,000.00	85,000.00
				\$ 761,000.00	\$ 285,000.00
NOTE: 1. Ceiling Costs shown in many of the above projects are approximate and may be revised when actual applications are received.					
<b>WESTON—PUBLIC</b>					
King St. Addition .....	1 & DK	95	69,825.00 \$	52,000.00	18,000.00
<b>YORK—PUBLIC</b>					
Briar Hill—Extra Cost 1955 Project-Renov. & Anc. ....					
Memorial Addition .....	4	140	85,360.00 \$	80,000.00	85,360.00 \$
			102,900.00	22,900.00	50,000.00
				\$ 188,260.00	\$ 135,360.00
<b>YORK—SECONDARY</b>					
Runnymede Addition .....	Anc.	...	500,000.00	500,000.00	200,000.00



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 6 OF BUILDING AND SITES COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, April 3, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Campbell, Ferguson, Lockhart, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. Your Committee had before it a request of the North York Board of Education for withdrawal of its application for Don Mills High School and cancellation of the tentative approval previously given by the Ontario Municipal Board.

Your Committee recommends that the application for Don Mills High School be withdrawn and that the Ontario Municipal Board be requested to cancel the tentative approval previously given to the application.

2. Your Committee had before it for consideration various subdivision plans and comments of area boards of education.

In view of the discussions relative to the 1956 capital programme your Committee recommends that the comments of the area boards of education be referred back for further consideration and that the area boards concerned be requested to indicate instances where pupils may be accommodated in existing facilities; instances where development of an area has progressed to the stage where school accommodation should be provided; and instances where subdivision plans should be held until the question of the total amount of the School Board's composite capital estimates is clarified.

3. That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of secondary school accommodation:—

Warden-St. Clair, 16 standard classrooms, Art, Music, 3  
Science Labs, Library-Classrooms, Industrial Arts, Home  
Economics, Typing Room, Double Gymnasium, Cafeteria.

Metro Share .....	\$460,000.00
Local Share .....	606,500.00
Total .....	1,066,500.00
Ceiling .....	1,066,500.00

Date School required—September 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—572.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—790.

GEORGE PECK,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, April 10, 1956.

---

#### REPORT No. 6 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, April 10, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Peck, Power, Van Esterik and Miss Perney, it was decided to recommend as follows:

1. In favour of section 3 of Report No. 6 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,

Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, April 10, 1956.

---

#### REPORT No. 6 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE —PART II.

Tuesday, April 3, 1956.

1. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

West Hill Public School, addition of Industrial Arts and Home Economics.

Estimated Cost .....	\$ 40,000.00
Ceiling .....	40,000.00
Date addition required—September 1, 1956.	
Present enrolment—358.	
Anticipated increase—10.	

2. That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Park Lawn Relief School, 8 standard classrooms, Kindergarten, Auditorium-Playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$180,000.00
Local Share .....	47,850.00
Total .....	227,850.00
Ceiling .....	227,850.00
Date school required—January 1, 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—275.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—280.	

3. That FINAL approval be given to the following applications for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

#### Etobicoke Board.

Elmlea Public School, addition of 4 standard classrooms.

Metro Share .....	\$ 80,000.00
Local Share .....	22,900.00
Total .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00
Date addition required—September 1956.	
Present enrolment—413.	
Anticipated increase—18.	

#### North York Board.

Ancaster Street Public School, 10 standard classrooms, Kindergarten, Auditorium-Playroom, Principal's Office, Staff Room, Library, Health Room.

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	59,300 00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—350.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—520.

Brian Drive Public School, 6 standard classrooms, Kindergarten, Library, Principal's Office, Staff Room, Health Room.

Metro Share .....	140,000.00
Local Share .....	36,400.00
Total .....	176,400.00
Ceiling .....	176,400.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—160.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—240.

Yorkview Drive Public School, addition of 8 standard classrooms, Convert 1 existing classroom to Kindergarten.

Metro Share .....	\$160,000.00
Local Share .....	35,150.00
Total .....	195,150.00
Ceiling .....	\$202,125.00
Less .....	6,975.00*
	195,150.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1957.

Present enrolment—school not completed.

Anticipated increase—95.

\* Amount by which original building exceeded the formula.

4. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following applications of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for site purchases:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Castlebar Public School Site:	
1.87 acres (balance of site) .....	\$ 24,000.00
276 feet frontage on Chartwell Road.	
Date school required—September 1956.	

## Gainsford Senior Public School:

9.472 acres .....	72,000.00
-------------------	-----------

Approximately 500 foot frontage on Lloyd  
Manor Road.

Date school required—September 1957.

In view of the fact that no maximum acreage has been established for a senior public school site, your Committee has requested that the Advisory Council comment with respect to the maximum size of sites for senior public schools or intermediate schools.

Your Committee recommends that the application with respect to Castlebar Public School Site Extension be approved and that the application for Gainsford Senior Public School Site be approved, provided however the area does not exceed the maximum size suggested by the Advisory Council.

GEORGE PECK,

Chairman of Committee.

Amended by adding the following as section 5:—

5. That approval be given to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of a public school site:—

Estimated  
Total Cost

## Megan Road Site:

6.8 acres .....	\$ 35,800.00
-----------------	--------------

East of Manse Road, north of Lawrence  
Avenue and west of Megan Road, with  
66 foot frontage on Lawrence Avenue,  
being part of Lot No. 8, Con. 1.

Date school required—September, 1959.

No. of classrooms proposed—8.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, April 10, 1956.

## REPORT No. 6 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, April 10, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Report No. 6 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, April 10, 1956.

## DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 43.

April 5, 1956.

## PART I.

1. Carswell Company Limited, Printing minutes,  
February 28, 1956 ..... \$ 133.00

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

2. The Advertiser, Annual Subscription .....	3.00
2. Commercial Office Appliances, Supplies .....	19.10
4. The Enterprise, Annual Subscription .....	2.00
5. The Etobicoke Press, Annual Subscription .....	2.50
6. Gestetner (Canada) Limited, Supplies .....	57.24
7. Receiver General of Canada, Postage .....	56.00
8. Scarborough Mail, Annual Subscription .....	2.50
9. T. Sanderson & Sons, Supplies .....	11.88
10. Staff Salaries, Pay Period March 9 to March 22, 1956 .....	1,405.73
11. Underwood Limited, Repairs to Equipment ...	4.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,696.95

## PART II.

1. Auxiliary Class Costs, Final 1955 Payment—  
Etobicoke—PUBLIC ..... \$8,664.19



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 7 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE PART I.

Tuesday, April 17, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Mesdames McBrien and Norman, Messrs. Campbell, Lockhart and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. Your Committee had before it for consideration comments of area boards of education with respect to various subdivision plan referrals. In view of the uncertainty with respect to the amount of capital financing which will be allowed by the Metropolitan Council for 1956, the Committee has deferred consideration of the subdivision plans until the situation is clarified.

2. That, in the event the Department of Planning and Development requests comments with respect to subdivision plan referrals the Executive Secretary be authorized to advise the Department that the School Board has deferred consideration of subdivision plans until such time as the Metropolitan Council makes a decision with respect to the Board's 1956 capital budget.

3. That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds:

#### Administration Building.

Metro Share .....	nil
Local Share .....	\$450,000.00
Total .....	\$450,000.00
Ceiling .....	n/a

ALAN R. CAMPBELL,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, April 24, 1956.

## REPORT No. 7 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, April 19, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Might, Peck, Morton, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik and Mrs. Temple, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. In favour of section 3 of Report No. 7 of Buildings and Sites Committee Part I.

2. That Disbursement List No. 44, dated April 19, containing Part I accounts totalling \$934,203.03 be approved. Appendix p. 211.

3. On February 14, the Metropolitan School Board approved the 1956 current estimates of the Board and requested the Metropolitan Council to raise by tax levy the following amounts:

For Public School Purposes .....	\$17,508,540.00
For Secondary School Purposes .....	8,915,858.00

Following approval by the Board of its current estimates the Treasury Department advised that two changes should be made in the estimates as a result of receipt of more accurate information being made available in regard to supplementary tax revenues and estimated interest charges on 1956 debenture issues. Accordingly, the Board on March 13 revised its request as follows:

For Public School Purposes .....	\$17,561,220.00
For Secondary School Purposes .....	8,952,788.00

Before approval of the Board's current estimates by the Metropolitan Council the Treasury Department decided to include a number of additional projects in the spring debenture sale and suggested that the current budget of the Board as originally submitted should stand.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends that the change approved on March 13 be rescinded and that the

original current estimate request be reaffirmed in the following amounts:

For Public School Purposes .....	\$17,508,540.00
For Secondary School Purposes .....	8,915,858.00

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, April 24, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 1 OF THE CHAIRMEN'S COMMITTEE.

April 19, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

A meeting of the Chairmen's Committee was held this day to consider action which may be taken with respect to the delay in approval of the Board's 1956 Capital Programme by the Metropolitan Council. The following were present:

Members of the Chairmen's Committee:

Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Morton, Peck, Stinson, and Van Esterik.

Members of the Finance Committee:

Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Might and Power.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. That the Board endorse the five suggestions shown on pages 205 and 206 following as being possible methods of easing the burden on the property owner and of making the sale of debentures less difficult. (Amended)

2. That since suggestions 1 and 2 are included in Metropolitan Council Chairman's list of steps that might be taken to relieve the present situation regarding debenture financing, the Metropolitan School Board should indicate to the Metropolitan Executive Committee in a letter that the Board supports both of these suggestions and would be agreeable to having Mr. Gardiner use such a letter in his presentation

to the Provincial Government Officials if he deems it expedient.

3. That suggestions 3 and 5 be considered for implementation in 1957. It is likely that both would require legislation before they could be effected. (Amended)

4. That consideration be given to approaching the Dominion Government regarding Item 4 probably in conjunction with the Metropolitan Corporation. It was recommended also that support be given to the trustees organizations who are at present negotiating with the Dominion Government on two other issues that would assist in keeping down school costs:

- (a) Exemption from sales tax on purchases for school purposes.
- (b) Payment of municipal taxes for school purposes or grants in lieu of same on crown properties.

5. That the Chairmen's Committee be authorized to take such steps as it deems necessary to expedite the approval of the 1956 capital programme should the Metropolitan Council not find itself in a position to approve at its next meeting the 1956 school projects now before it. In this connection the Committee authorized the Chairman of the Board to forward a letter to the Metropolitan Council for consideration of the Executive Committee at its meeting of April 24 indicating:

- (a) The unanimous judgment of the trustees of the Metropolitan School Board that the vast majority of the citizens to whom the trustees are responsible would be thoroughly opposed to the elimination of any of the accommodation in new schools considered as standard by the School Board under the Metropolitan Ceiling Cost Formula.
- (b) The importance of avoiding further delays in the 1956 school building programme in view of the approach of ideal building weather.

GORDON F. FERGUSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

Amend as follows:

By deleting the word "endorse" in the first line of section 1 and substituting therefor the word "receive".

Suggestion Nos. 3 and 5 contained in the Appendix to the Report of the Chairmen's Committee, as referred to in section 3 were referred to the Legislation and By-laws Committee for consideration and report.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, April 24, 1956.

---

1. Debentures backed by Provincial Credit.

The province has already, in a number of instances, backed the bonds of various municipalities unable to sell debentures on the open market successfully, viz., Town of Mat-tawa et al., re water and sanitary services; Township of Scarborough (pre-Metro), re sundry municipal works.

2. Provincial Support for school construction for a stated period in lieu of Grants towards Debt Repayment.

Precedent for this action has never been set in the large amounts required for this area. However, a number of municipalities in the province who went into default during the depression years, i.e. Townships of Sandwich East and Sandwich West, Essex County, received capital support in cash for schools by a programme of advanced grants.

In 1955 it would have required approximately 6 million dollars to finance the province's share of school building. This would have reduced the debenture requirements to approximately 14 million dollars.

3. A Local Levy against new buildings for school purposes.

It has been proposed that a modest building permit might be imposed on new construction, ear-marked for school purposes. For instance, in a 1,200 home subdivision, a building permit of \$50.00 would raise \$60,000.00 toward the estimated cost of a public school to serve the area of

\$441,000.00. To do this for public schools, however, creates a problem that a share of such revenue should be made available for separate schools. The whole amount, however, could be used for secondary schools without any obligation to the separate school authority.

#### 4. Income Tax Free Debentures.

In many areas of United States where this crisis has already been faced, it has been met through arrangements with the federal authority that certain select municipal bonds shall be income tax free. This would release for school purposes investment funds of individuals whose income is subject to a high rate of taxation. The American experience has been that such bonds can be sold at interest rates as low as 2% or 2¼% and still be very attractive to certain investors.

#### 5. Capital Costs from Current Funds.

The estimates of the Finance Commissioner would indicate that increased salaries and mounting debt payments will result in a tax levy in the various areas considerably higher than at present, yet we have no assurance that at the time when these levies are anticipated that we will be enjoying any greater prosperity than at the present time. If ultimately North York, for instance, can expect a tax increase of 10 mills, serious consideration might be given to imposing an increase immediately and applying any surplus current revenues against the capital programme. A 10-mill increase across the Metropolitan area ear-marked for schools would yield 30 million dollars and would permit during the current crisis a pay as you go policy. This of course, is quite contrary to modern financing methods which are based on the principle that persons using a service shall continue to pay for it during the period of use.

A well conducted publicity campaign in favour of ceiling formula schools as opposed to a Department of Education classroom school might get majority public support for a modest tax increase of 2 or 3 mills ear-marked for school building purposes. Such an increase would yield 7 or 8

million dollars. This would leave the bulk of the programme to be debentured but would ease the shock for the next 4 or 5 years of the heavy volume building made necessary through a backlog of new construction and rehabilitation.

---

REPORT No. 4 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, April 17, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Ferguson, Lang, and Martin, it was decided to recommend as follows:

1. Earlier this year, the School Board approved an application of the North York Board of Education for erection of the Keele-Sheppard Public School to accommodate public school pupils from the Township and children of R.C.A.F. personnel resident at Downsview Airport. The School Board's approval was made contingent upon accommodation presently used by children of R.C.A.F. personnel at Hughes Public School (Toronto) being used adequately by the Toronto or York Township Boards of Education. The York Township Board previously indicated that it was prepared to send approximately 160 pupils to Hughes School to relieve overcrowding at York Township schools, provided that the York Township Board was not required to pay a per pupil fee in excess of its own per pupil cost.

At the last session of the Legislative Assembly an amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act as approved permitting the Metropolitan School Board to pay a portion of the non-resident fees for pupils transferred across municipal boundaries and thereby overcoming the problem of a sending board paying a per pupil fee to a receiving board in excess of its own per pupil costs.

Your Committee recommends that the following attendance area, approved by the York Township Board be

included in the attendance area for Hughes Public School, effective September 1, 1956:

- (1) the north side of Rogers Road (from the east side of Kane Avenue to the C.N.R. tracks.)
- (2) The east side of Kane Avenue between Rogers Road and Kersdale Avenue.
- (3) both sides of Kersdale Avenue, between the east side of Kane Avenue and where it joins Silverthorn Avenue.
- (4) Silverthorn Avenue to the north side of Aileen Avenue from Kersdale Avenue northerly to No. 405.
- (5) Both sides of Aileen Avenue between Silverthorn Avenue and Blackthorn Avenue.
- (6) Blackthorn Avenue north (almost to Dunraven Road) No. 432.
- (7) The area on the south side of Rogers Road and south to the city limits, east from the C.N.R. tracks to No. 189 Rogers Road.

The attendance area defined above will involve the transfer of approximately 160 pupils to Hughes Public School.

2. Your Committee had before it for consideration a request that Richard Jaques be permitted to attend the deaf classes at Sunny View School. The father of Richard Jaques is a resident of Pickering Township and a separate school supporter. However, Mr. Jaques has property in the Township of Scarborough the assessment of which is somewhat less than the average assessment for the Township and which is directed to the support of the public schools. It has been ascertained that the Pickering Township schools offer no facilities for the training of deaf pupils.

The Committee recommends that Richard Jaques be admitted to the deaf classes at Sunny View School upon payment of the non-resident fee by the parents.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, April 24, 1956.



---

REPORT No. 7 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

---

Tuesday, April 17, 1956.

1. On May 25, 1955, the School Board gave FINAL approval to an application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$272,685.00 for erection of Gainsford Public School consisting of 10 standard classrooms and a general purpose room. The Etobicoke Board has advised that it now proposes to construct 8 standard classrooms, double kindergarten and general purpose room. As the ceiling formula for the revised project will be \$249,900.00 the Committee recommends that the application be processed to the Ontario Municipal Board for final approval without change in the amount tentatively approved by the Municipal Board, i.e., \$272,685.00 in order to obviate unnecessary delay. It is assumed, of course, that the final costs of the revised project will not exceed the ceiling formula for the revised project.

At its last meeting the School Board approved an application of the Etobicoke Board for capital funds for purchase of the Gainsford Public School site consisting of 9.472 acres on the understanding that the site was for a senior public school. With the change in plans of the Etobicoke Board it would appear that the Gainsford Public School will be utilized as a regular elementary school.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends that the approval previously given by the School Board for capital funds for the Gainsford Public School site be withdrawn and that the Etobicoke Board be requested to indicate the long term use of the Gainsford Public School and further, that if the Etobicoke Board proposes an elementary school rather than a senior public school the Etobicoke Board be requested to submit evidence to support the need for a double kindergarten in a school unit consisting of 8 standard classrooms.

2. The Etobicoke Board of Education has indicated that the Etobicoke Council has approved release of the Highbury Development Limited plan of subdivision of Lots 19 and 20, Con. 1, fronting on the Humber River, subject to completion of arrangements with the Etobicoke Board with respect to

purchase of three school sites required in the development. Since June, 1955, the Etobicoke Board has been endeavouring to secure the sites at prices of \$6,000.00 per acre for immediately serviceable land and \$4,000.00 per acre for the remainder. However, the owners of the development have indicated that the offer of the Etobicoke Board is not acceptable and an appeal will probably be made to the Ontario Municipal Board. Should this action be taken, the Etobicoke Board Solicitor will prepare a case for presentation to the Municipal Board.

As other area boards of education have been endeavouring to maintain a measure of restraint on prices demanded for school sites and as the implications of an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board are of importance to the entire Metropolitan area, the Etobicoke Board feels that the School Board should lend whatever support it can. The Etobicoke Board points out that its justification for keeping school site costs to a reasonable amount stems from the interpretation that sites are municipal services in the same sense as roads, sewers and sidewalks and, as subdividers are required to provide these services, school boards should be permitted to buy sites at a reasonable price rather than at exorbitant prices often demanded.

Your Committee recommends that, in the event that the Highbury Development Limited appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board in connection with approval of its plan of subdivision the Metropolitan School Board be represented at the Hearing to support the claim of the Etobicoke Board.

ALAN R. CAMPBELL,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, April 24, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 7 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, April 19, 1956.

1. In favour of section 1 of Report No. 4 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, and section 1 of Report No. 7 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 44, dated April 19, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,965,327.60 be approved. Appendix p. 212.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, April 24, 1956.

---

DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 44.

April 19, 1956.

PART I.

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due May, 1956—SECONDARY .....     | \$ 930,674.25 |
| 2. International Business Machines Limited, Electric Typewriter ..... | 555.00        |

ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| 3. Bell Telephone Company of Canada Limited, April Service .....                                 | 84.00  |
| 4. H. E. Dean and Son, Flowers re Mr. Charlesworth .....   | 15.00  |
| 5. Wm. Dawson Subscription Service Limited, Subscription, Financial Post .....                   | 6.00   |
| 6. Dominion Maintenance Company, March Service \$85.00; Cleaning and Waxing Floors \$60.00 ..... | 145.00 |
| 7. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, March Meeting Expense .....                                    | 47.50  |
| 8. J. Jacobson, G. Lipson, E. I. Richmond, April Parking .....                                   | 50.00  |
| 9. New York Window Cleaning Company Limited, March Service .....                                 | 12.00  |
| 10. Ontario Towel Service Limited, March Service .....   | 10.00  |
| 11. Orange Crush Limited, Meeting Expense .....  | 2.40   |
| 12. Remington Rand Limited, Supplies .....   | 1.50   |

---

13. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental, March 15 to April 14, 1956 .....	1,087.50
14. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, March Ser- vice .....	20.10
15. Tough Publicity and Publishing Company, Map of Metropolitan Toronto .....	17.05
16. Staff Salaries, Pay Period, March 23 to April 5, 1956 .....	1,405.73
17. Staff Expense Allowances, March .....	70.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 934,203.03

## PART II.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due May, 1956—PUBLIC .....	\$1,965,327.60
---	----------------

## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 5 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, May 8, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Bonham, Eve, Hartley, Lang, and Long, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. Your Committee has been apprised of an application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for erection of an addition to Runnymede C.I. consisting of 6 standard classrooms, auditorium, cafeteria, industrial arts, home economics, ancillary space and rehabilitation work. In a review of the application the Buildings and Sites Committee noted that the projection of enrolment substantiating the need for additional classrooms assumed the continued attendance of a large number of secondary school students from the Village of Swansea. Accordingly, the Buildings and Sites Committee requested the School Accommodation Committee to review the situation with respect to secondary school accommodation for Swansea students. At the present time 94 students from Swansea are accommodated in Runnymede C.I. while 104 students are accommodated at Humberside C.I. Since the existing enrolment at Humberside C.I. indicates the availability of spaces for Swansea students, your Committee has requested the Advisory Council to report regarding the number of student spaces which it is anticipated will be available at Humberside C.I. for long-term use by secondary school students from Swansea.

Pending receipt of the information requested above your Committee suggests that the Buildings and Sites Committee advise the York Township Board that in all likelihood accommodation for Swansea secondary school students can be provided in Humberside C.I. and request them to review the present application in the light of the gradual withdrawal of all Swansea students from Runnymede C.I.

2. In its review of secondary school attendance areas particularly as it affects secondary school students from Bennington Heights area (Township of East York) it was noted that the majority of students attend Leaside High School. However, 12 students from this area attended North Toronto C.I. and 2 attend Jarvis C.I. As the Toronto Board of Education has just completed a re-organization of its attendance areas for Oakwood, Lawrence Park and North Toronto Collegiates and as pupils residing in the City of Toronto adjacent to the Bennington Heights area must now attend Oakwood C.I. rather than North Toronto C.I., your Committee recommends that the Executive Secretary be authorized to communicate with the East York and Leaside Boards of Education to ascertain their reaction to the inclusion of the Bennington Heights area in the attendance area of Leaside High School. In the opinion of your Committee the inclusion of the Bennington Heights area in the attendance area of Leaside High School is a logical development.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, May 15, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 8 OF BUILDING AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART I.

Tuesday, May 8, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Grayson, Lockhart, Milgram, Van Esterik and Mrs. Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. Your Committee received and forwarded to the Board for information a statement indicating approvals of the Metropolitan School Board and Metropolitan Council of projects included in the 1956 Capital Estimates and a further statement indicating approvals to April 30, 1956, for pur-

chase of sites. (For details of statements, see Appendix pages 224 and 225.

2. Your Committee had before it for consideration a report of the Advisory Council submitting as requested a ceiling formula for construction of junior vocational units attached to academic secondary schools. (For detailed calculation of per pupil ceiling costs for junior vocational shop units, see Appendix, page 225.).

Your Committee recommends that the ceiling formula as shown on page 225 be adopted.

3. Previously your Committee requested the Advisory Council to comment with respect to site size for intermediate schools. The Advisory Council following consideration of the matter recommended that the maximum site size for intermediate schools which should be financed from debenture financing be 10 acres. It is the opinion of Council that a site of 10 acres provides sufficient space for athletic purposes, parking and such other areas as are required for an intermediate school of from 800 to 1,000 pupils.

Your Committee recommends that the Board concur in the recommendation of the Advisory Council.

4. That the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education in connection with the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the Etobicoke Planning Area:—

Amendment No. 100—re-zoning of an area on the west side of Islington Avenue south of Ulster Avenue from Industrial to Commercial.

The Etobicoke Board of Education has no objection to the amendment.

5. At its last meeting the Building and Sites Committee considered the following application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for creation of secondary school accommodation:—

Estimated  
Cost

Runnymede Collegiate Institute:—

Addition of 6 standard classrooms, auditorium, cafeteria, 1 industrial arts, 1 home economics, (to be located in present auditorium space), staff rooms, health room and guidance rooms. Rehabilitation work in basement .....	\$495,000.00
--	--------------

As the projection of enrolment substantiating the need for additional classrooms assumed the continued attendance of a large number of students from the Village of Swansea the Committee requested the School Accommodation Committee to review the situation with respect to secondary school accommodation for Swansea students. The School Accommodation Committee has indicated that in all likelihood sufficient accommodation can be provided in Humberside C.I. on a permanent basis and has suggested that the York Township Board review its application for the addition to Runnymede C.I. in the light of the gradual withdrawal of all Swansea students.

Your Committee concurs in the recommendation of the School Accommodation Committee.

6. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for renovation of vocational school accommodation:—

	Metro Share	Local Share	Total	Ceiling
Northern Technical School ... Nil		\$85,000.00	\$85,000.00	N/A

Renovations to shops to provide proper accommodation for printing, welding, tinsmith and plumbing instruction, music and drama instruction adjacent to assembly hall.

7. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following subdivision plans and comments of area boards of education concerned:—

1. Subdivisions where children will be accommodated in existing schools:—



---

Township of Etobicoke.

## T-9585—19 Lots.

The Etobicoke Board has indicated that public school pupils will be accommodated at Norseman Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Royal York C.I. (The maximum accommodation at Norseman Public School is 480 pupils. The January 1956 enrolment is 546 pupils. The Etobicoke Board has indicated that it is intended to transfer some of the Norseman pupils to Castlebar Public School upon completion of the latter school.).

## T-6737 Revised—62 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Wedgewood Public School. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I.

## T-9577—15 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Cloverdale Public School. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I.

## T-9667—26 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Rivercrest Public School when it opens in September, 1956. Secondary students will be accommodated at Burnhamthorpe C.I. (Grade 9) and Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until Thistletown C.I. opens in September, 1957.

## T-9702—6 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Norseman Public School. Secondary students will be accommodated at Royal York C.I.

## T-9729—18 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Kingsview Village Public School when it opens in September, 1956. Secondary students will be accommodated at Burnhamthorpe C.I. (Gr. 9) and Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until Thistletown C.I. opens in September, 1957.

## T-9751—11 Lots.

Public school pupils, grades Kindergarten to 6, will attend Lanor Junior School. Gr. 7 and 8 pupils will attend Franklin Horner Senior School. Secondary students will attend Alderwood C.I.

---

Township of North York.

T-9555—8 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend George Anderson Drive Public School. Secondary students will attend Bathurst Heights C.I. or Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

T-9605—28 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Lillian Street Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9628—8 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Cummer Avenue Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9640—6 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Maple Leaf Public School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-9661—11 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Hollywood Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9676—21 Lots.

Public school students will attend Hardington Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

T-9679—311 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Sloane Avenue Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend York Mills C.I., later Don Mills C.I. and eventually a collegiate in the vicinity.

T-9685—7 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Armour Heights Public School. Secondary students will attend Bathurst Heights C.I.

## Township of Scarborough.

T-9246—61 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ionview Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9252 Revised—66 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Golf Road Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I. (Previously reported Masaryktown Public School.).

T-9298—43 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend McCowan Road Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9476—4 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ionview Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9505—23 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend George Peck Public school. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9507—38 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Golf Road Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I. (Previously reported Masaryktown Public School.)

T-9516—116 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Meadowvale Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-9519—8 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ellesmere Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-9537—49 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Geo. P. Mackie Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-9644—18 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Meadowvale Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-9653—15 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend George Peck Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

## Township of York.

## T-9633—62 Lots.

Public school pupils will be accommodated at Lambton Park Public School. The January 1956 enrolment at this school is 429. With the addition of three classrooms which have received tentative approval of the Ontario Municipal Board, the capacity of this school will be 520 pupils. Secondary students will attend Runnymede C.I.

## T-7511 Revised—52 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Roseland Public School. Secondary students will attend Runnymede C.I.

Your Committee recommends concurrence in the above comments of area boards of education.

2. Subdivisions where children will be accommodated in new schools where the purchase of the site and cost of construction of the new school are included in the 1956 capital estimates.

## Township of North York.

## T-9641—61 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Brian Drive Public School. Pupils from this subdivision south of the Lansing Road will attend Brian Drive on a temporary arrangement and later a school south of Lansing Road. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., later York Mills C.I. and eventually a secondary school in the north-east of the Township.

## T-9561—391 Lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately 5 acres on the east side of Brian Drive as indicated on the plan. The proposed public school site of 5.57 acres, Block B, is unsatisfactory. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., later York Mills C.I. and eventually a collegiate in the north-east of the Township. Development within the area of this subdivision has progressed to the stage where school accommodation should be provided. Brian Drive Public School will accommodate the children in this area.

## T-9586—234 Lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend schools in the Don Mills area, eventually a school immediately north

of this subdivision. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually York Mills C.I.

The capital programme of the Metropolitan School Board for the year 1956 includes provision for purchase of sites and construction of schools to serve these areas. Permanent accommodation however cannot be expected to be ready before September 1st, 1957.

3. Subdivisions where children will be accommodated in new schools where the 1956 programme includes provision for site purchase only.

#### Township of North York.

##### T-9631—269 Lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately 5 acres completely within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision and more specifically on the east side of Page Avenue between Cummer Avenue and Blairhampton Drive. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually a collegiate in the north-east of the Township.

##### T-8641—156 Lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Finch Avenue Public School, eventually a public school north of the Hydro in subdivision T-6537. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually a collegiate in the north-east of the Township.

##### T-9539—98 Lots.

The North York Board will require part of a public school site within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. Proposed Block A (2.62 acres) is geographically acceptable to the Board as part of the required public school site. Public school pupils will temporarily attend Harrison Road Public School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually York Mills C.I.

##### T-9560

##### T-9560 Revised—227 Lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately 5 acres, partially within this subdivision

and partially within subdivision T-9437; the proposed Block A (2.67 acres) is geographically acceptable to the Board as part of the required site provided the western boundary is straightened as indicated on the plan. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually York Mills C.I.

The 1956 capital programme of the Metropolitan School Board includes funds for the purchase of sites but no provision is made for capital funds for construction of schools. Permanent facilities therefore cannot be expected to be available earlier than September, 1958.

4. Subdivisions where new school facilities will be required but where neither the funds required to purchase a site nor to construct a school are included in the 1956 programme.

#### Township of Etobicoke.

##### T-9665—75 Lots.

The Etobicoke Board requests that this plan not be released because (a) the board does not have a school site on which to build a school to serve the proposed development; (b) a site within the limits of the plan under consideration would not be satisfactory from a geographical point of view to serve Township Lots B and C, which is primarily the area a public school would be expected to serve. Therefore until the land to the north of this is proposed for development from which the board can acquire a school site which it is able to service, the Rochman plan of subdivision is considered premature by the Etobicoke Board. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I.

##### T-9688—22 Lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Valley Village Public School until a new school can be built on a site to be acquired north of the subject subdivision. Secondary students will attend Etobicoke C.I.

#### Township of North York.

##### T-9594—374 Lots.

The North York Board will require a public school site of approximately 4 acres within the boundaries of the

proposed subdivision adjoining vacant lands to the north. Secondary school students will attend a collegiate in the north-east of the Township.

T-6782 Revised—856 Lots.

The North York Board of Education will require two public school sites completely within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision. The proposed sites of 3.15 acres Block G, and 5.0 acres Block L, are geographically acceptable to the Board.

The 1956 capital programme makes no provision for site purchase or school construction to serve these areas. It is unlikely therefore that a permanent school could become available before 1959.

#### Township of Scarborough.

T-9022—131 Lots.

The Scarborough Board of Education has indicated that public school pupils will be accommodated at Corvette Public School. The January 1956 enrolment at Corvette is 391. The maximum capacity of the school is 655. Secondary students will be accommodated at R.H. King C.I. The Scarborough Board has indicated to its planning board that release of this subdivision is subject to the following condition:

That an underpass be constructed under the railway at no cost to the Board of Education to provide access to Corvette School for the pupils from this plan.

Your Committee concurs that the Corvette Public School offers the only permanent public school facilities for this area. It is therefore recommended that approval of the subdivision be deferred until arrangements can be completed for the construction of an underpass or overpass providing safe access to the school for the pupils of the proposed subdivision.

GEORGE PECK,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, May 15, 1956.

COMPARISON OF 1956 CAPITAL ESTIMATES WITH ACTUAL  
AT APRIL 30, 1956.

(Buildings)

	A 1956 Estimates	B Final M.S.B. Approval	C Metro Council Approval	D A-B
<b>Public:</b>				
East York .....	\$ 180,075.00	\$ 36,400.00	\$ 36,400.00	\$ 143,675.00
Etobicoke .....	2,330,000.00	690,750.00		1,639,250.00
Lakeshore .....	586,670.00	586,670.00	586,670.00	Nil
North York .....	3,007,325.00	728,025.00	77,175.00	2,279,300.00
Scarborough .....	4,391,200.00	650,770.00	650,770.00	3,740,430.00
Toronto .....	2,801,965.00	1,225,275.00	617,775.00	1,576,690.00
Weston .....	52,000.00			52,000.00
York .....	188,260.00	188,260.00		Nil
	<u>\$13,537,495.00</u>	<u>\$ 4,106,150.00</u>	<u>\$ 1,968,790.00</u>	<u>\$ 9,431,345.00</u>
<b>Secondary:</b>				
Etobicoke .....	\$ 1,019,800.00	\$ 1,036,000.00	\$ 28,000.00	\$ 16,200.00
North York .....	601,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	566,000.00
Scarborough .....	1,050,000.00	1,066,500.00		16,500.00
Toronto .....	761,000.00			761,000.00
York .....	500,000.00			500,000.00
	<u>\$ 3,931,800.00</u>	<u>\$ 2,137,500.00</u>	<u>\$ 63,000.00</u>	<u>\$1,859,700.00</u>



1956 BULK SITE ORDER No. 5102—\$4,000,000.00.

Summary of Bulk Site Approvals to April 30, 1956.

	Public	Secondary
Etobicoke .....	\$ 373,242.00	\$ .....
Lakeshore .....	9,770.00	.....
North York .....	213,000.00	63,784.31
Scarborough .....	237,320.00	.....
Toronto .....	250,000.00	.....
York .....	25,000.00	70,000.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 1,108,332.00	\$ 133,784.31
	<hr/>	<hr/>
		1,108,332.00
		<hr/>
Total .....		\$ 1,242,116.31
		<hr/>

#### DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS

1956.

E. Junior Shop Units constructed as part of or as an addition to an academic secondary school.

1. Optimum Capacity—4 shops at 20 pupils=80 pupil spaces.

2. Optimum Areas.

(a) Instructional—4 shops at 1,400 sq. ft. each		5,600
(b) Administrative and Ancillary space 80/1140 of 20,250	=	1,421
(c) Service Areas 80/1140 of 32,840	=	2,305
	<hr/>	<hr/>
(d) Double Gymnasium—Net Cost		
Contract Cost 8000×\$13.50	=	\$108,000.00
Less Pupil Allowance 60×\$1,350	=	81,000.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
		\$ 27,000.00

## 3. Calculation of Contract Price.

Instructional 5,600 sq. ft. at \$14.50	=	81,200.00	
Administration, Ancillary, and Service areas 3726 sq. ft. at \$13.50	=	50,300.00	
Double Gymnasium— Net Cost 80/1140 of \$27,000.00	=	1,900.00	\$133,400.00

## 4. Total Cost.

Contract .....	\$133,400.00
Architect's Fees .....	8,000.00
Equipment .....	40,000.00
Contingencies .....	4,600.00
	<u>\$186,000.00</u>

5. Cost per pupil space  $186,000/80 = \$2,325.00$ .

## REPORT No. 8 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, May 10, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Miss Perney, Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Might, Power and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 2 and 6 of Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. That the report on the audit of the books and accounts of the School Board for the year ended December 31, 1955, be received.

3. That the attached pages outlining (a) method of calculating payments to area boards for pupils enrolled in classes operated under the auxiliary class section of The Schools Administration Act, and (b) method of calculating per pupil costs of regular class pupils for use as a basis for the establishment of non-resident fees, be approved. (See pages 227 to 238.).

4. That non-resident fees for regular class pupils be charged on a per diem basis (i.e. the total cost for 1955 divided by the aggregate attendance in 1955 resulting in a cost per pupil day).

5. That billings for non-resident pupils be on a per diem basis for all areas. It is recognized that at the present time in the Toronto public schools information to make billing on this basis is not available, but it is recommended that negotiations be carried on with the Toronto Board to enable such information to be obtained.

6. That Disbursement List No. 45, dated May 10, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$8,438.16 be approved. Appendix p. 249.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, May 15, 1956.

---

#### AUXILIARY CLASSES.

Calculation of 1955 Per Pupil Cost of Instruction  
for all ..... Classes operated by  
The ..... Board of Education under the Authority  
of Part V of the Schools Administration Act, 1954.

(Figures used should be in agreement with Annual Financial  
Report Form S41B or capable of reconciliation therewith  
wherever possible)

##### A. Direct and Semi-Direct Expenditure

(Only that portion applicable to classes for which the cal-  
culation is being made)

- 
- (a) Salaries paid in 1955 to teachers of special classes and to lunch room staff in health classes \$.....
- (b) Special instructional supplies .....
- (c) Transportation of pupils and teachers .....
- (d) Furniture, equipment and special improvements to accommodation not made in other parts of the school.
- Give details: 1. \$.....
2. ....
3. ....
4. ....
- 
- (e) Salaries and travelling allowances of supervisory personnel concerned exclusively with auxiliary education .....
- (f) Milk (where this cost is determined separately for Auxiliary Class pupils) .....
- (g) Cost of operating "direct schools" (e.g. Sunnyview)
- Details: 1. Instructional Salaries \$.....
2. General school supplies, furniture and equipment .....
3. Caretaking and Maintenance .....
4. Miscellaneous expense .....
- 
- Total Direct and Semi-Direct Expenditures \$.....

## B. Indirect Expenditure

## 1. Instructional and Administrative Costs:

- (a) Salaries of principals, inspectors, supervisors (not included in A.) and school secretaries \$.....
- (b) Salaries of home economics and shop teachers where these classes use the service .....
- (c) Common instructional and school office supplies (excluding text books subject to 100% grant.) .....
- (d) Transportation allowance to inspectors, supervisors (not included in A.) and secretaries. ....
- (e) Common new furniture and equipment for general pupil use. ....
- (f) Cost of central administration .....
- Total Instructional and administrative costs .....
- 1955 average daily attendance of class(es) for which the calculation is being made .....
- Instructional and Administrative Costs = \$.....
- 1955 average daily attendance of all classes using the items to be apportioned .....

## 2. Operating and Maintenance Costs:

- (a) Caretaking salaries, expenses and equipment \$.....

- (b) Utilities (hydro, gas,  
water, telephone, fuel,  
etc.) .....
- (c) Repairs to and mainten-  
ance of buildings and  
equipment (salaries and  
expense) .....
- (d) Insurance and taxes .....
- (e) Local share of debt  
charges for 1955 .....
- (f) Rentals of classroom  
accommodation paid .....
- Total Operating and  
maintenance costs .....

1955 average number of class-  
rooms for which the calculation  
is being made

\_\_\_\_\_ x Total Operating  
and Maintenance =  
total average number of instruc- Costs \_\_\_\_\_  
tional areas using the items to be  
apportioned in 1955

Total Indirect Expenses \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Total Expenses \$ \_\_\_\_\_

### C. Revenue

- (a) Special provincial grant re milk \$ .....
- (b) Special provincial grant of \$4.00 per  
pupil .....
- (c) Payment receivable from Metropoli-  
tan School Board re initial equip-  
ment (Cost to be included under  
item (d) of Section A.) .....
- (d) Miscellaneous revenue (accommoda-  
tion, rentals, sales of equipment,  
etc.)

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 & \text{1955 average daily attend-} & \\
 & \text{ance for class(es) for} & \\
 & \text{which the calculation is} & \\
 & \text{being made} & \\
 \$ \dots\dots\dots & \times \frac{\text{1955 average daily attend-}}{\text{ance of all classes shar-}} & = \dots\dots\dots \\
 & \text{ing in the benefit of the} & \\
 & \text{revenue} & \\
 & \text{Total Revenue} & \$ \dots\dots\dots \\
 & \text{Total Net Expenses} & \dots\dots\dots \\
 \text{Cost per pupil day} & = \frac{\text{Total Expenses}}{\text{Actual aggregate attendance in}} & = \$ \dots\dots\dots \\
 & \text{1955 for the} & \\
 & \text{class(es) for} & \\
 & \text{which the calcu-} & \\
 & \text{lation is being} & \\
 & \text{made} & 
 \end{array}$$

## Notes:

- (a) It is understood that no item of revenue or expenditure may appear in more than one place in the calculation.
- (b) Calculations are to be made from figures developed on a revenue and expenditure basis.
- (c) Item A.(c) should include only transportation costs incurred as a regular expense by the pupils and teachers involved and not such things as shared trips to museums, art galleries, etc.
- (d) Do not include salaries of vice-principals under B.1(a).
- (e) Item B. 1.(e) includes such items as furniture for the the school office, gym and auditorium equipment, etc., but does *not* include caretakers' equipment or regular classroom equipment.

- (f) The average number of classrooms used in the apportionment of operating and maintenance costs should be arrived at by dividing the number of "room months" by 10. Instructional areas include any rooms occupied by a class without leaving another room vacant. In a public school industrial arts and home economics rooms would *not* be instructional areas.
- (g) Items (a), (b) and (c) under Revenue should include only that portion of revenue applicable to the classes for which the calculation is being made. Item (d) includes revenue for all classes.

---

Signature of Business Administrator.

#### General Instructions and Regulations re Auxiliary Classes.

##### 1. Qualification of classes for reimbursement.

In a memorandum to area boards of education dated February 7, 1956, the regulations regarding eligibility for reimbursement of certain types of auxiliary classes are set out. A few of the pertinent items are quoted below:

- (a) "That effective January 1, 1956, reimbursement of operating costs of approved special education classes commence from the first of the month in which the application is received or from the opening date of the class, which ever is the later."
- (b) "That the policy of reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board of the full cost of operation be continued for the following classes, admission to which is based on a physical handicap of some kind:
- |                           |                      |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Aphasic Classes           | Othopaedic Classes   |
| Braille Classes for Blind | Sanatorium Classes   |
| Hard-of-Hearing Classes   | Sight-Saving Classes |
| Hospital Classes          | Speech Correction    |
| Oral Classes for Deaf     | Home Instruction     |
| Institutional Classes     |                      |
- (c) "That area boards of education be reimbursed the full cost of operation of opportunity, academic vocational and special vocational classes and special vocational schools



as defined, provided that 75% of the pupils admitted shall have I.Q.'s of not more than 80. It is understood that the normal tolerance of 5 points shall be accepted in calculation of I.Q. The Committee believes that the provision for 25% of the class on other than mental ability will give the classes sufficient flexibility to meet the needs of all schools in the Metropolitan area."

- (d) "That reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board shall also be conditional upon an area board's willingness to conform to the enrolment standard set forth below:

- (i) Opportunity classes, *16* plus or minus 4 pupils
- (ii) Academic Vocational classes, *20* plus or minus 4 pupils
- (iii) Special Vocational classes, *20* plus or minus 4 pupils

The enrolment of less than the number italicized above will be approved where there is a concentration of special problem cases or where the geography of the area makes it impossible to support the larger class."

- (e) "That the appropriate education officer be required annually to submit a statement verifying the eligibility of the classes under his jurisdiction (in sections I and II above) for reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board."

In this connection it is requested that the submission of the per pupil costs for 1955 be accompanied by a statement from such official that certain specified classes operated by his board January to June 1956 do qualify for reimbursement. A similar statement for all classes operating September to December 1956 will be required in the fall.

2. Method of reimbursement of cost of operating classes.

It is intended that reimbursement will be made for Metropolitan Toronto residents in July on the basis of reported aggregate attendance January to June, in December

to cover the period September to November, and the balance after the close of the year. All payments made would be subject to the report of the Metropolitan Auditor concerning both cost and attendance figures.

3. Other items of cost pertaining to Metropolitan Toronto auxiliary class pupils.

Reimbursement for the items listed below will be made following the end of the year on submission of the necessary information:

(a) Home instruction and speech correction costs.

These will be paid on a direct cost basis and will include teachers' salaries, direct expenses, and special supplies.

(b) Special transportation costs.

These costs are for pupils attending schools outside their own areas where such transportation costs are paid by the sending board or on the sending board's behalf.

(c) Initial equipment costs.

Initial equipment expenditures, not covered by debentures, made by an area board for auxiliary classes which were approved for reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board in 1956 will fall under this heading. This is intended to involve only large items of special equipment whose inclusion in the per pupil cost in one year would increase such cost unduly. The following maximum payments that will be made are listed below.

Junior Opportunity Class .....	\$1,000.
Girls' Academic Vocational Class .....	2,000.*
Boys' Academic Vocational Class .....	2,000.*
Health Classes .....	2,500.
Sight Saving Classes .....	2,300.
Hard of Hearing Classes .....	3,900.
Deaf .....	4,700.
Speech Correction and Lip Reading .....	225.

\*One class of 16 pupils—allowance of \$2,000. and for each additional class in the same unit a further allowance of \$1,000.

Payment will be made on the basis of copies of invoices covering such expenditures (typed, several on a sheet if desired) which should be submitted after the end of the year.

4. Method of submitting per pupil costs.

One copy of the calculation for each type of class is to be submitted to the Metropolitan School Board over the signature of the Business Administrator. Such classes may be listed as Deaf, Handicraft, Hard of Hearing, Health, Hospital and Institutional, Open Air, Opportunity, Othopaedic, and Sight Saving.

A separate calculation may be submitted for each of three types of public school opportunity class commonly designated as (i) Junior Opportunity (ii) Senior girls' academic vocational (iii) Senior boys' academic vocational. Secondary schools may designate such classes as handicraft or academic vocational. Where such separate calculations are submitted, the schools involved must be requested to designate their classes in the same manner on the monthly reports forwarded to the Metropolitan School Board and to show separate attendance figures where more than one type of class is operated in a school.

---

FORMULA FOR DETERMINING OPERATING COSTS  
RE: ESTABLISHMENT OF 1956 NON-RESIDENT FEE  
SCHEDULE

---

NAME OF BOARD OF EDUCATION

- ☐ Public Elementary
- ☐ Academic Secondary
- ☐ Commercial Secondary
- ☐ Technical Secondary

A. Total Expenditure Re Schools for 1955 \$.....

*Deduct* (If Included in Total Expenditure):

1. Amount paid or owing to other school boards re education of pupils for 1955 \$.....

- 
2. Debenture debt charges—Metro  
Share only .....
  3. Deficit (if any) from 1954  
operations .....
  4. Expenditures on night school  
operations (salaries, supplies, &  
appropriate proportion of all  
other costs) .....
  - 5 Any other outlay not made for  
the purpose of educating day  
school pupils in the area (e.g.  
bus transport for pupils sent to  
other areas) ..... 

---
- Net Expenditure \$.....
- B. Total Revenue Re Schools for 1955 \$.....
- Deduct (If Included in Total Revenue):*
1. Revenue from or on behalf of  
all non-resident pupils in 1955  
whether within the Metro Area  
or outside of it (not including  
amounts received from Metro  
School Board or grants from  
the Department of Education \$.....
  2. Proceeds from sale of land and  
buildings .....
  3. Bequests, large gifts, etc. ....
  4. Any revenue, the expenses of  
obtaining which have been  
deleted in A. (e.g. fees and Pro-  
vincial grants re night schools) .....
  5. Surplus (if any) from 1954  
operations .....
  6. Educational tax levies and reve-  
nues from Metropolitan School  
Board ..... 

---

Net Revenue	
Net Cost of Educating Pupils in the Area	\$
Cost Per Pupil Day = Net Cost as Calculated Above	
	= \$
1955 Actual Aggregate Attendance for All* Pupils attending your Schools	

\* "All" means all pupils of the type for whom the calculation is being made (public or academic secondary or commercial secondary or technical secondary).

## NOTES:

- (a) The \$4.00 per pupil grant from the Department of Education should be part of the 1955 Net Revenue.
- (b) Total Expenditure should not include the costs of operating classes or services subject to reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board as Classes Operated under the Auxiliary Classes Section of the Schools Administration Act. The aggregate attendance figure used as the divisor in calculating Cost Per Pupil Day should not include the attendance of such special class pupils.
- (c) The grouping "Public Elementary" includes all pupils K to Grade 8, inclusive, in the system.
- (d) The form attempts to provide as accurate a per pupil cost figure as possible and should be filled with this in mind. It is understood that any revenue pertaining to an expenditure which has been included as part of Net Expenditure should be included as part of the Net Revenue tending to reduce that expenditure.
- (e) Billings should be made on the basis of average daily attendance e.g. A pupil with a total actual attendance in 1956 at a school in a municipality other than his own of 75 school days would be billed at 75 x Cost Per Pupil Day. Should an area be unable to obtain actual attend-

ance figures, the following formula may be used to arrive at an Average Daily Attendance.

$$\text{Non-Resident Fees as Established by M.S.B.} \times \frac{\text{Actual Aggregate Attendance in 1955 for All Pupils in the Board's Schools for Whom Cost was Calculated}}{\text{Perfect Aggregate Attendance in 1955}} \times \text{1956 Enrolment Calculated on a Basis Consistent with Previous Practice}$$

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Business Administrator.

#### REPORT No. 2 OF CHAIRMEN'S COMMITTEE.

Thursday, May 10, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

The following members of the Chairmen's Committee met this day with Mr. F. G. Gardiner, Chairman, Metropolitan Council, viz.: Messrs. Ferguson (Chairman), Morton, Van Esterik, Long and Miss Perney. Also in attendance, the following members of the Finance Committee, viz.: Messrs. Might and Power. For the information of the Committee, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council reported that insofar as the Board's 1956 capital estimates are concerned, the Executive Committee approved the estimates without amendment.

During the meeting the Chairman of Metropolitan Council indicated that the Metropolitan Corporation was not successful in securing, at the present time, additional financial assistance from the Provincial Government and that as far as can be ascertained the Corporation will be faced with difficulties in 1957 in regard to issuance of debentures to cover the cost of the various Metropolitan projects.

Arising from the discussions, the Committee recommends as follows:—

1. That consideration be given to seeking a levy of \$5.00 per foot frontage in new subdivisions and \$500.00 per

acre for industrial lands, such revenue to be used for the purchase of necessary school sites and that arrangements be made to place this proposal before the Reeves of the Townships of Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough. (Amended.).

2. That the Metropolitan School Board request the Provincial Government to consider payment of legislative grants for capital construction in the form of cash payments instead of the present method of contributing towards annual debt charges.

3. That a meeting be arranged between representatives of the School Board and architects recently and currently employed in school construction in the Metropolitan area to discuss the possibility of economies in school construction.

G. F. FERGUSON,

Chairman of Committee.

Section 1 amended to read:—

"1. That consideration be given to seeking a per foot frontage levy in new subdivisions and a levy per acre for industrial lands, such revenue to be used for the purchase of necessary school sites and that arrangements be made to place this proposal before the Reeves and boards of education of the Townships of Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough."

Adopted by the Board, as amended, May 15, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 5 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, May 8, 1956.

1. Your Committee had before it for consideration an application for the admission of Charles Fallon to Jarvis Junior Vocational School in Toronto without payment of the non-resident fee. While the guardian of Charles Fallon lives outside the Metropolitan area, he owns property in the Town-

ship of Scarborough which is assessed for public school purposes. The assessment on the property is \$3,580.00, while the average assessment of the Township is approximately \$4,500.00-\$5,000.00.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends:—

- (a) That the School Board, recognize Charles Fallon as a resident pupil for the period January to June 1956 by reason of his guardian's assessment in Scarborough being approximately 80% of the reported average assessment.
- (b) That the Scarborough Board be notified that the cost of tuition for Charles Fallon will be borne by the Metropolitan School Board to the end of June, 1956, and that it is understood that Scarborough has not incurred any special transportation costs by reason of his attendance at Jarvis Jr. Vocational School.
- (c) That the Toronto Board of Education and the Scarborough Board of Education be notified that the Metropolitan School Board will cease to be responsible for the cost of education of Charles Fallon after June 1956 and that if he continues at Jarvis Junior Vocational School after that date he will be treated as a non-resident pupil from outside Metropolitan Toronto.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, May 15, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 8 OF BUILDING AND SITES COMMITTEE—  
PART II.

Tuesday, May 8, 1956.

1. At a previous meeting the Committee had before it for consideration the following application of the Lakeshore District Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—



## Long Branch Memorial Public School:

	Estimated Cost	Ceiling
7 standard classrooms, kindergarten .....	\$202,125.00	\$202,125.00

Date school required—September 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—245.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—330.

As the Committee had been advised of a proposal to erect a separate school in the Lakeshore area, the Committee referred the foregoing application back to the Lakeshore District Board for further consideration. Your Committee begs to report that the Lakeshore District Board has given further consideration to its application for the Long Branch Memorial Public School and has directed that the application be withheld for further review until September, 1956.

2. At a previous meeting the Committee had before it for consideration an application of the Weston Board of Education for capital funds for erection of an addition to King Street Public School consisting of one standard classroom and a double kindergarten. Based on a study of existing and projected enrolments it was felt that the Board could only justify erection of the standard classroom and single kindergarten unit. The Committee deferred consideration of the application on April 17 and requested the Executive Secretary to confer with the Weston Board of Education regarding accommodation requirements. Your Committee begs to report that the conference with representatives of the Weston Board confirmed the fact that only one standard classroom and a single kindergarten unit are required for the foreseeable future. However, your Committee questions the wisdom of adding to a school which was erected in 1892.

It is recommended that the Weston Board of Education be requested to re-consider its application in the light of a possible early replacement of the King Street Public School.

3. On July 24, 1955, the Board gave FINAL approval to the following application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for new school accommodation:

	Metro Share	Local Share	Total	Ceil- ing
Rockcliffe School (handicraft) .....	\$100,000.00	\$286,100.00	\$386,100.00	N/A

5 standard classrooms, 6 shops, gymnasium-auditorium, counselling, room, lunchroom facilities, and ancillary accommodation.

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

Anticipated enrolment at school opening—176.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—200.

The York Township Board has now submitted an application for debenture issue in the amount of \$585,000.00 for the above project, as follows:—

Contract price .....	\$500,523.00
Architect's fee .....	30,031.00
Equipment .....	47,800.00
Contingencies .....	6,646.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$585,000.00</b>

Since the York Township Board has provided ancillary features for an ultimate enrolment of 500 pupils which has increased the cost of this project substantially, your Committee has referred the application to the Advisory Council for comment with respect to anticipated maximum enrolments. (Amended.).

4. On January 31, 1956, the Board approved the sale of approximately 2,531 acres of the Lillian Street Public School site to the Corporation of the Township of North York at the "current market value", subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor and in compliance with section 131 of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. The North York Board of Education has requested clarification of "current market value". It is recommended that the Board engage a competent real estate firm to appraise the land in question and report thereon to the Board. It is understood that the cost of this service is to be applied against the proceeds of the sale which will accrue to the Metropolitan School Board.

5. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation, subject to further review of the Churchill Heights application prior to the calling of tenders:—

	Estimated Cost	Ceiling
Galloway Road Public School .....	\$279,300.00	\$279,300.00
10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.		
Date school required—January 1, 1957.		
Anticipated opening enrolment—390.		
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.		
Bendale Public School .....	279,300.00	279,300.00
10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.		
Date school required—January 1, 1957.		
Anticipated opening enrolment—410.		
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.		
Churchill Heights Public School .....	319,300.00	319,300.00
10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, industrial arts, home economics, auditorium-playroom.		
Date school required—January 1, 1957.		
Anticipated opening enrolment—410.		
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.		

6. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for replacement of public school accommodation:—

	Metro Share	Local Share	Total	Ceiling
Rosedale Public School	\$160,000.00	\$ 42,125.00	\$202,125.00	\$202,125.00

Replacement of existing school of 9 classrooms and kindergarten with 7 classrooms and kindergarten.

Date school required—September, 1957.

7. On February 29, the School Board had before it for consideration an application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds in the amount of \$30,000.00 for purchase of an additional 5 acres for the Park Lawn Public School site. As the existing site consists of 6.2 acres the School Board indicated that it was prepared to approve capital funds from the bulk site purchase fund for the purchase of 1.8 acres in order to bring the Park Lawn Public School site up to the maximum size of 8 acres.

Your Committee has been advised that the Etobicoke Board does not wish to pursue its application to acquire additional land until such time as the Park Lawn Public School is converted to senior public school use. Accordingly your Committee recommends that the application be withdrawn.

GEORGE PECK,

Chairman of Committee.

Section 3 amended by substituting the following in place of paragraph 3:—

“It is recommended that the Board re-affirm its original approval of the application in the amount of \$386,100.00 and that the York Township Board of Education be requested to revise its plans accordingly.”

Adopted by the Board, as amended, May 15, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 8 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, May 10, 1956.

1. In favour of section 1 of Report No. 5 of School Accommodation Committee, Part II, and sections 4, 5 and 6 of Report No. 8 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 45 dated May 10, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,570.19 be approved. Appendix p. 249.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,

Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, May 15, 1956.

---

REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.

May 11, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members of the Metropolitan School Board:

The Advisory Council at its meeting on April 27 appointed a committee to prepare a preliminary report, as requested by the Metropolitan School Board, on a plan for a "study of school financing and the ability of the Metropolitan area to finance education".

The Committee met on May 2.

Present:—Dr. Goldring (Chairman), Messrs. Brownlee, Emond, Graham, Morrison, Phimister, McCordic.

The Committee recognizes that the study has unusually wide ramifications, each of which will probably require extensive investigation. In its preliminary stages the study may well be attended by the compilation of a substantial body of data related to the general problem of school finance. If this is done, the approach will be sufficiently broad-based to enable conclusions to be reached which will have a direct

bearing on the problem of school finance as it relates to the Metropolitan Area. In other words it is the opinion of the Committee that, when the study is initiated, it should be wide enough to include all topics which give promise of contributing to a full understanding of so involved a problem. It is very important that all findings that are reached by the Board should be supported by authoritative and comprehensive data.

It is therefore proposed that the study should be carried out in the four general areas indicated below.

I. Current financing of education in Metropolitan Toronto.

- (a) Revenues—the three sources, namely, legislative grants, metropolitan rates, and local rates; the ratio of each to the total revenue.
- (b) Analysis of expenditures—instructional costs, operating costs, maintenance, administration costs, debt repayment.
- (c) Capital expenditure—ratio of educational capital expenditures to general capital expenditures; debt per capita; debt trends.
- (d) Probable future expenditures—forecast of expenditures having regard for anticipated increases arising from a greater number of schools, increased salaries and other causes.
- (e) Some fundamental comparisons:
  - (i) Cost of living and rise in income versus increased cost of education. In this aspect of the study, education costs may need to be presented in a variety of ways, as cost per pupil, cost per capita, cost per \$1,000 of assessment.
  - (ii) Relation of educational costs to total municipal costs.
  - (iii) Proportion of school costs supported by provincial grants over a period of time.
  - (iv) Ratio of Ontario's legislative grants to education to the total provincial revenue as

compared with corresponding ratios in other provinces.

(v) Ratio of school taxes to income tax at various income levels.

(vi) Relationship of municipal taxes to average earning power for sample periods.

(vii) Ratio of net debt to assessment.

## II. Other problems of school finance.

(a) Enquiry of Royal Commission in Nova Scotia; study in New Brunswick; Dominion-wide study by Professor LaZerte; study by the Canadian Teachers' Federation; studies on other countries.

(b) Examination of methods of financing education, other than by taxation of property, such as increased taxation in the case of multiple housing, nuisance taxes, tax on profits of subdividers, etc.

## III. Problems of school finance peculiar to Metropolitan Toronto.

(a) Analysis of the assessment and tax trends in the Metropolitan Area.

(b) Examination of the validity of the terms of Bill 80 in the light of changing conditions.

## IV. Our sense of values.

A comparison of national expenditures on a wide range of luxuries (tobacco, cosmetics, liquor, etc.) with expenditures on education.

## V. Conclusions.

(It is suggested that the next phase of the study will be the determination of the methods to be used in compiling and collating the above data.)

C. C. GOLDRING,  
Chairman.

## PART II.

## REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.

May 11, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members of the Metropolitan School Board:

At the last meeting of the Buildings and Sites Committee, the Committee had before it for consideration an application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for erection of the Rockcliffe Handicraft School in the amount of \$585,000., being approximately \$200,000. in excess of the amount originally approved by the School Board for the project. Since part of the increased cost is due to the fact that the York Township Board is to provide ancillary accommodation for an ultimate enrolment of 500 pupils as against classroom and shop accommodation for 200-220 pupils, the Buildings and Sites Committee referred the application to the Advisory Council for comment with respect to the anticipated maximum enrolment of 500 pupils.

During preliminary discussions regarding the relocation of the Warren Park School, the Advisory Council reported to the Board under date of November 25, 1954, as follows with respect to "Optimum Size of School" and "Specific Question of Warren Park School";

Optimum Size of School

"With respect to the optimum (or maximum) size of handicraft school if such be established there was not general agreement. An opinion was expressed that up to 600 boys could be handled in such a school with the assistance of a vice-principal and other special service personnel and still maintain the individual contacts with pupils. Another opinion was expressed that the maximum number of pupils should be from 250 to 300 pupils. If the smaller unit was proposed the number of administrative personnel would be reduced accordingly. A further opinion was expressed that it might be more advantageous to establish smaller units and place them in strategic locations throughout the Metropolitan Area rather than erect, say, 2 or 3 large units which would



require pupils to travel considerable distances to and from school."

Specific Question of Warren Park School.

"Members of Council were not unanimously agreed as to the validity of segregation. However, as the York Township Board of Education has a handicraft school for boys in operation and desires to continue the operation of such a unit, the Council recommends that a school of the handicraft type to meet existing requirements in the Township of York and capable of expansion to accommodate 250 pupils should be constructed somewhere in the general area proposed by the York Township Board. The school could accommodate pupils not only from York Township but neighbouring municipalities, including the western portion of Toronto. The type of accommodation to be supplied in the school would be a matter for further study and the final responsibility of the York Township Board of Education."

In reviewing its previous comments with respects to the foregoing aspects of the problem, the Council indicated that it had no further comment to add.

C. C. GOLDRING,  
Chairman of Council.

---

DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 45.

May 10, 1956.

PART I.—Items Paid Pursuant to Motion January 31, 1956.

1. Advisory Council — March and April/56— travelling allowances \$480.00; honorariums \$1,920.00 .....	\$ 2,400.00
2 Carswell Company Limited, printing minutes, March 13/56 .....	367.50
3. Dominion Maintenance Company, April service .....	85.00
4. Gestetner (Canada) Limited, supplies .....	35.00
5. Jacobson, Lipson, Richmond, parking lot rental, May .....	50.00

---

6. International Business Machines Co., quarterly inspection, 3 machines .....	19.50
7. Ontario Towel Service Limited, April service .....	10.00
8. Receiver General of Canada, postage .....	55.00
9. Staff expense allowances, April .....	70.00
10. Staff salaries, April 6 to April 19, 1956— \$1,405.73; April 20 to May 3, 1956— \$1,405.73 .....	2,811.46
11. Stainton & Evis Limited, supplies .....	14.00
12. Treasurer of Ontario, general expense, \$3.00; general expense \$12.50 .....	15.50
13. Trustees' Allowances, January 1 to April 30, 1956, expense \$2,200.00; mileage \$305.20 .....	2,505.20
	<hr/>
	\$ 8,438.16
	<hr/>

## PART II.

1. North York Board of Education, moving of portables from Blythwood P.S., Toronto, to North York .....	\$ 1,570.19
	<hr/>

## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 9 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE —PART I.

Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Mesdames McBrien and Norman, Messrs. Boland, Campbell, Grayson, Lockhart, Milgram and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendments to the Official Plan of the Township of North York. The North York Board has no objection to the amendments.

Amendment No. 50—

re-zoning of two areas south of Finch Avenue, east of Bayview Avenue from Greenbelt to Residential.

re-zoning of an area at the north-east corner of York Mills Road and Yonge Street from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area at the north-west corner of Wilson Avenue and Pleasant Avenue, west of Keele Street from Residential to Commercial.

Amendment No. 51—

re-zoning of an area on the west side of Main Street, north of Sheppard Avenue from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area on the east bank of the Humber River west of Main Street, south of Finch Avenue from Residential to Greenbelt.

Amendment No. 52—

re-zoning of an area on the south side of York Mills Road midway between Victoria Park Avenue and Woodbine from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area on the west side of Woodbine Avenue south of York Mills Road from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of scattered areas south of York Mills Road, between Victoria Park Avenue and the Don River from Residential to Open Space and Greenbelt.

re-zoning of various areas south of York Mills Road, between Victoria Park Avenue and the Don River from Greenbelt to Residential.

2. That the Board concur in the comments of area boards of education with respect to the following subdivision plans:

Town of Leaside.

T-8521.

The Leaside Board of Education has indicated that the sites shown on the plan of subdivision are satisfactory but requests that release of the plan be subject to acquisition of Blocks S and V by the school board. Since the 1956 capital estimates of the School Board do not provide for sites or schools no accommodation could be provided for this area until at least September, 1958.

Township of North York.

T-9217—366 lots.

Earlier this year the North York Board requested that this subdivision remain as at present zoned, i.e. industrial, or if any of the lands are to be re-zoned that they be re-zoned so that all lands to the east of Main Street be industrial. The North York Board has not changed its position with respect to this subdivision but wishes to indicate that if the area is re-zoned for residential purposes no lands are required for public or secondary school purposes. Public school pupils will attend Rivermede Public School and secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate.

Since the 1956 estimates do not provide for erection of the Rivermede School, no school accommodation could be provided for this area until at least September, 1958.

T-9714—16 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Harrison Road School. Secondary school students will attend Earl Haig C.I. and later York Mills C.I.

T-9590—6 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Cornelius Parkway School. Secondary students will attend Downsview Collegiate.

T-9682—16 lots.

Public school pupils will attend McKee Public School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-9718—8 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Borden Avenue School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate.

#### Township of Scarborough.

T-9565—46 lots.

Public school pupils will attend the W. Treadway Public School under construction at the present time. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

3. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for erection of secondary school accommodation:

Danforth Technical School addition of 8 drafting rooms and renovations to motor mechanics, building construction shops, dressing rooms, showers, corridors, etc.

Metro Share .....	\$160,000.00
Local Share .....	516,000.00
Total .....	676,000.00
Ceiling .....	n/a

Date addition required—September, 1957.

4. On January 27, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board considered an application of the North York Board of Education for approval of a capital expenditure of \$60,000. from current revenues for the purchase of 10 acres of land northwest of the intersection of Bathurst Street and Finch

Avenue West to form part of the Northview Heights School Site. Previously the Metropolitan School Board approved capital funds in the amount of \$89,400.00 for the purchase of 15 acres of the site being the maximum size of secondary school sites approved for debenture financing.

At the Ontario Municipal Board hearing the Chairman reserved judgment on the application of the North York Board to pay the balance of the cost of the Northview Heights Site from current funds. He did so to permit the North York Board to re-submit its application through the Metropolitan School Board and Council to secure a debenture issue for this purpose.

Your Committee had before it for consideration an application of the North York Board for capital funds for the purchase of an additional 10 acres of land to form part of the Northview Heights School Site at an estimated cost of \$60,000.00.

Your Committee recommends that the application of the North York Board be not approved for debenture financing and that the Executive Secretary be authorized to forward to the Ontario Municipal Board a letter containing the opinion of the Metropolitan School Board regarding the use of current funds for the purchase of lands for school sites in excess of the maximum size of school sites approved by the Metropolitan School Board for debenture financing. (Referred back)

5. That approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of a secondary school site extension:

	Estimated Total Cost
North Toronto Collegiate Institute Site:	
Frontage—50 feet on Roehampton	
required for play area .....	\$50,000.00
Date School required—1956.	

6. At a previous meeting your Committee had before it for consideration an application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for erection of an addition to

and rehabilitation of Runnymede Collegiate Institute consisting of 6 standard classrooms, auditorium, conversion of the existing assembly area into an industrial arts and home economics unit, cafeteria, staff rooms, health room, guidance offices and rehabilitation work.

In its consideration of the application the Committee noted that the classroom requirements for this school were based upon projected enrolments which included some 94 secondary school students from the Village of Swansea. Since the School Accommodation Committee has been assured that there is sufficient accommodation available at Humberside C.I. (Toronto) for all Swansea secondary school students for the foreseeable future, the Committee requested the York Township Board to revise its application in the light of the gradual withdrawal of Swansea secondary school students.

Following re-consideration of the application for Runnymede C.I. the York Township Board decided to request approval for erection of 3 additional standard classrooms rather than 6. An analysis by your Committee confirmed the fact that only 3 classrooms will be required for the foreseeable future.

Accordingly your Committee recommends that TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the York Township Board of Education:

Runnymede C.I., Addition of 3 standard classrooms, auditorium, Conversion of existing assembly area to Industrial Arts and Home Economics, cafeteria, staff rooms, health room, guidance offices and rehabilitation.

Estimated Total Cost .....	\$416,020.00	
Ceiling .....		121,500.00
Rehabilitation .....		294,520.00
Total .....		416,020.00

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman Pro Tem.

Section 4 having reference to an application of the North York Board of Education for purchase of an additional 10

acres of land adjacent to the Northview Heights secondary school site was referred back.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, May 29, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 9 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, May 24, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Stinson (Chairman), Ferguson, Long, Might, Power, Van Esterik and Miss Perney, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. In favour of sections 3, 5 and 6 of Report No. 9 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

In connection with section 4 having reference to an application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of an additional 10 acres of land adjacent to the Northview Heights secondary school site, the Committee recommends that section 4 be referred back since the Committee has received information to the effect that the North York Board is considering the erection thereon of an intermediate school.

2. That Disbursement List No. 46 containing Part I accounts totalling \$933,664.37 be approved. Appendix p. 279.

3. That the following be delegated to attend the conventions indicated and that their expenses be paid:

(a) Ontario Association of School Business Officials

Bigwin Inn—June 27-29  
Assistant Secretary Finance  
Assistant Secretary Records

(b) Canadian Education Association

Royal Alexandra Hotel, Winnipeg—September 26-28  
Executive Secretary



(c) Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada

Sheraton Hotel, Washington—October 7-11

Executive Secretary

Assistant Secretary Finance

F. C. STINSON,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, May 29, 1956.

REPORT No. 9 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE—  
PART II.

Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

1. That approval be given to the following applications for capital funds for the purchase of public school sites or extensions thereof:

Scarborough Board of Education

	Estimated Total Cost
Poplar Road Public School Site:	
6 acres plus 27 feet entrance to Poplar Road .....	\$27,500.00
East of Galloway Road, west of Poplar Road, south of C.N.R.	
Date School Required—September, 1957.	
No. of classrooms proposed—6.	
Mason Road Public School Site:	
5 acres plus 19 feet right of way to Bellamy Road .....	27,750.00
West of Mason Road, east of Bellamy, north of Kingston Road and south of Eglinton.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
No. of classrooms proposed—6.	

## Manhattan Park Public School Site:

2 acres .....	10,955.00
---------------	-----------

Part of Lots 31 and 32, Concession 1, east of Warden Avenue on Manhattan Crescent, south of Ellesmere and north of Lawrence.

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

No. of classrooms proposed—10.

## Warden-Finch Public School Site:

8 acres plus 33 feet Road to Warden Avenue .....	38,550.00
--	-----------

Part Lot 31, Concession 3, West of Warden Avenue, south of 4th Concession Road.

Date school required—September 1, 1958.

No. of classrooms proposed—8.

## Toronto Board of Education

## King Edward Public School Site:

43,405 square feet .....	283,000.00
--------------------------	------------

Lippincott Street—16 lots.

Date school required—earliest possible date.

No. of classrooms proposed—35.

## Queen Alexandra Public School Site:

Bolton Avenue—11 lots .....	117,000.00
-----------------------------	------------

Date school required—1956.

## Queen Victoria Public School Site:

46 feet 8 inches by 150 feet .....	35,000.00
------------------------------------	-----------

Close Avenue—2 lots.

Required for playground purposes.

## Rosedale Public School Site:

South Drive—4 lots .....	267,000.00
--------------------------	------------

Date school required—1956.

No. of classrooms proposed—8.

## Ryerson Public School Site:

Dennison—18 lots, Grange—3 lots .....	360,000.00
---------------------------------------	------------

Dundas West—1 lot.

Date school required—1957.

No. of classrooms proposed—31.

---

 North York Board of Education.

## Gulf Stream Road Public School Site:

5 acres .....	45,000.00
---------------	-----------

Frontage on Gulf Stream Road Site is west of Main Street and north of junction with Sheppard Avenue in loop of Humber River.

Date school required—Indefinite.

No. of classrooms proposed—Indefinite.

2. The Committee had before it for consideration an application of the Weston Board of Education for erection of a new school consisting of 11 standard classrooms, kindergarten and general purpose room to replace the existing King Street Public School at an estimated cost of \$285,000.00 (Ceiling—\$305,025.00).

It is the opinion of your Committee following a review of present and projected enrolments for the Weston public schools that only 10 standard classrooms and kindergarten would be required for the foreseeable future. The Committee also begs to point out that there is an amount of only \$52,000.00 included in the 1956 capital programme for the Weston Board of Education.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends:

(a) That approval be given to the erection of a new school to replace the King Street Public School consisting of 10 standard classrooms, kindergarten and general purpose room at an estimated cost of \$265,000.00. (The ceiling formula for this project would be \$279,300.00).

(b) That since funds are not included in the 1956 capital estimates for the project referred to in (a) above, the application be processed to secure tentative approval of the Department of Education and approval of the local council and that should capital funds become available later this year due to deferrment of a project included in the 1956 estimates of another area board, such available funds be transferred to the credit of Weston Board of Education, and

that approval of the Metropolitan Council for the application be sought at that time.

(c) That, in the event that capital funds are not available for the project referred to in (a) above, the application be held for consideration of the Metropolitan Council early in 1957.

3. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education:

Westway Public School, 12 standard classrooms, single kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$330,750.00
Ceiling .....	330,750.00
Date school required—Easter, 1957.	
Anticipated enrolment at school opening—450.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—450.	

4. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following applications of the Toronto Board of Education:

A.

Regent Park Public School, 22 standard classrooms, double kindergarten.

Estimated Cost .....	\$683,000.00
Ceiling .....	610,050.00
1956 Estimates .....	654,150.00

It is recommended:

(i) that the foregoing application for Regent Park Public School be given TENTATIVE approval at the ceiling formula, i.e. \$610,050.00.

(ii) that since the application for the Regent Park Public School included provision of 2 junior kindergartens and since the ceiling formula provides no allowance for such facilities, the Advisory Council be requested to submit an opinion with respect to provision of junior kindergartens in the Metropolitan area.

## B.

Jesse Ketchum Public School, Addition of 2 classrooms and double gymnasium-playroom, rehabilitation of 12 classrooms.

Estimated Cost .....	\$463,000.00
Ceiling .....	345,230.00
1956 Estimates .....	294,495.00

Since the 1956 capital estimates of the School Board only included an amount of \$294,495.00 for the Jesse Ketchum Public School project, your Committee recommends that the application be given TENTATIVE approval in the amount shown as included in the 1956 estimates, i.e. \$294,495.00 plus an amount of \$44,100.00 being the excess amount over the ceiling formula included in the 1956 estimates for the Regent Park Public School. (The total amount approved for the Jesse Ketchum Public School project will be \$338,595.00).

## C.

Park Public School, Addition of double gymnasium-playroom and rehabilitation of 12 classrooms.

Estimated Cost .....	\$415,000.00
Ceiling .....	313,777.00
1956 Estimates .....	241,920.00

It is recommended that the application for Park Public School be given TENTATIVE approval in the amount shown as included in the 1956 estimates, i.e., \$241,920.00.

5. Your Committee begs to report receipt of the following application of the Toronto Board of Education: (Amended).

Sunny View School, addition of 6 classrooms, therapeutic tank.

Estimated Cost .....	\$184,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A
1956 Estimates .....	184,000.00

The Committee is not opposed to the foregoing application. In view of the fact that this school now serves the entire Metropolitan area and the cost of construction of the

addition will be borne by the Metropolitan area the application is forwarded to the Board for its consideration.

6. That the following application for capital funds for purchase of a school site be approved:—

Etobicoke Board of Education:

	Estimated Total Cost
Gainsford Public School Site:	
8 acres .....	\$ 63,000.00
(Approximately 500 feet frontage on Lloyd Manor Road.)	

7. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the North York Board of Education:—

Excess cost of

Anthony Road School .....	\$ 7,746.00
Almore Avenue School .....	36,186.00
Baycrest Avenue School .....	28,098.00
Roding Street School .....	14,885.00
Metro Share .....	\$ 86,915.00
Local Share .....	Nil.
Total .....	86,915.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

(For details of financial arrangements regarding this application see Appendix "A" attached.)

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman Pro Tem.

Section 5 amended to read as follows:—

5." That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds:—

Sunnyview School, addition of 6 classrooms, therapeutic tank.

Estimated Cost .....	\$184,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A
1956 Estimates .....	184,000.00"

Adopted by the Board, as amended, May 29, 1956.

April 27, 1956.

MEMORANDUM RE  
ADJUSTMENT OF CAPITAL FINANCING BETWEEN THE  
BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF  
NORTH YORK AND THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL  
BOARD.

To: The Metropolitan School Board.  
The Board of Education for the Township of North  
York.  
The Commissioner of Finance.

In June, 1953, the Board of Township School Area No. 1, North York, received approval for \$880,000.00 for four projects. Actual expenditures on these projects and the final approval applicable to each are tabled below:

	Cost	Final Approval Dept. of Education
Anthony Road Public School .....	\$225,915.72	\$220,000.00
Almore Avenue Public School .....	237,631.62	220,000.00
Baycrest Avenue Public School .....	229,543.31	220,000.00
Roding Street Public School .....	216,330.79	216,330.79
	<u>\$909,421.44</u>	<u>\$876,330.79</u>

To finance these projects the following revenues were used:

Debentures, North York By-law No. 8029 (Part)

Proceeds by Cash .....	\$569,682.76
Cost of Issue .....	9,391.76
Sundry Funds .....	252,823.62

The above Sundry Funds were derived as follows:

1. Donations from owners of land intended for subdivision .....	\$136,100.00
2. Transfers from current funds made in 1953 .....	100,000.00
3. Excess capital funds remaining from other projects (with consent of the Ontario Municipal Board) .....	16,723.62
	<u>\$252,823.62</u>

Additional funds to make final payments on the above projects were used from the capital account, but in order to reimburse this account with respect to the aforementioned schools, on June 17, 1955, the North York Board of Education made application for a further debenture issue of \$86,915.06.

If the present application is approved, the complete financing of the above projects will be as set forth below:

	Revenue	Approved For Leg. Grant Purposes
North York By-law No. 8029 Proceeds .....	\$569,682.76	\$569,682.76
		9,391.76*
Sundry Funds .....	252,823.62	210,341.21
Metropolitan By-law (application pending) .....	86,915.06	86,915.06**
	<u>\$909,421.44</u>	<u>\$876,330.79</u>

\*This amount represents cost of issue which is not deductible for legislative grant purposes.

\*\*Approval of the pending debenture application is the subject of a recommendation given later in the memorandum.

In its study of this application, the Metropolitan School Board made enquiries with respect to the amount of the new debenture which might be approved for Legislative Grant purposes by the Department of Education. The Department of Education in turn informed both the Metropolitan School Board and the North York Board of Education that consideration of this problem should be deferred pending study of Legislative Grants paid to the Township School Area No. 1, North York, in 1953 on the substantial advance payments of capital made by North York in 1953, which in the judgment of the Department were recoverable.

There is set forth below, therefore, in considerable detail circumstances which gave rise to this claim for grant recovery. The claim for grant recovery is related to the debenture issues described below:



## By-law No. 7339.

## Collegiate:

Amount .....	\$1,540,000.00
Percentage to Total Issue .....	37.211712
Amount Approved for Grant .....	\$1,200,000.00
Percentage of Approval to Issue .....	77.922077

## Area 1:

Amount .....	\$2,540,000.00
Percentage to Total Issue .....	61.375161
Amount Approved for Grant .....	\$2,340,000.00
Percentage of Approval to Issue .....	92.125984

## Area 2:

Amount .....	\$ 58,482.00
Percentage to Total Issue .....	1.413127
Amount Approved for Grant .....	50,000.00
Percentage of Approval to Issue .....	85.496392

## Total:

Amount .....	\$4,138,482.00
Percentage of Approval to Issue .....	100.

## By-law No. 7485.

Amount .....	\$ 251,482.72
Amount Approved for Grant .....	\$ 194,000.00
Percentage of Approval to Issue .....	77.142477

Average percentage for By-laws Nos. 7339 and 7485 .....	78.718636
--	-----------

Because of the favourable exchange rate at the time of sale these issues yielded a premium and other credits which can be apportioned among the three boards concerned as set forth in the following table:

## Premium on U.S. Funds plus Interest Earned.

	Total	Commission	Net
Collegiate .....	\$103,518.85	\$ 30,790.00	\$ 72,728.85
Area 1 .....	170,622.61	50,785.00	119,837.61
Area 2 .....	15,280.94	6,165.00	9,115.94
	<u>\$289,422.40</u>	<u>\$ 87,740.00</u>	<u>\$201,682.40</u>

It was agreed at the time of sale that in view of the fluctuation in the relative position of Canadian and American currencies, that this premium be set aside as reserve to be applied against any additional costs above those indicated in the schedule of repayment which might occur during the term of repayment as a result of currency fluctuation unfavourable to North York.

Debenture By-law No. 7339 provided for very modest principal payments in the first two years, a large payment in the third year and normal payments beginning in the fourth year as shown in the table below:

Schedule of Repayment	Principal	Interest	Total
1952 .....	\$ 482.00	\$175,885.49	\$176,367.49
1953 .....	1,000.00	175,865.00	176,865.00
1954 .....	422,000.00	175,822.50	597,822.50
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$423,482.00	\$527,572.99	\$951,054.99
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
1955 .....	\$153,000.00	\$157,887.50	\$310,887.50

Toward the end of 1953 the Township of North York decided to purchase bonds in the amount of \$275,000.00, a year in advance. For this purpose they used the net premium and other credits shown above (i.e. \$201,682.40) together with funds secured by pre-levy on the taxpayers of the municipality (i.e. assumed to be \$75,046.70).

It was impossible for the Township of North York to know at that time that in the normal course of events this principal would have been assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation under the terms of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953. In actual fact, therefore, when the Metropolitan Corporation undertook its debt liability in connection with this issue there was recorded to be only \$147,000.00, being the balance of principal due in 1954. In connection with the above, the actual payments made are tabled below:

## Appendix

267

Actual Payments Made	Principal	Interest	Total
1952 .....	\$ 482.00	\$175,885.49	\$176,367.49
1953 .....	1,000.00	175,865.00	176,865.00
1953 Purchased	275,000.00	1,729.10	276,729.10
		June 1/July 24	
1954 Metro .....	147,000.00	164,135.00	311,135.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$423,482.00	\$517,614.59	\$941,096.59
		Interest Saved	9,958.40

Prepayment in late 1953 of debt liability assumed by Metropolitan Authority, January 1st, 1954, is the fact on which the recommendations to be presented below are based. It is important to emphasize that in making this prepayment North York used local revenues over and above the premium funds held in reserve which legally should have been transferred to the Metropolitan Corporation January 1st, 1954.

In its review of the transaction, the Department of Education reports that by letter August 1st, 1952 (copy attached) it was agreed that "one-third of the first debenture repayment to be made in 1954, be eligible for inclusion in the boards' approved cost and therefore, eligible for grant in 1952-1954, inclusive." On this basis the schedule was revised for legislative grant purposes as follows:

	1952	1953	1954	Total
Total Debt				
Charges .....	\$310,367.48	\$314,865.00	\$325,822.50	\$951,054.98
Debt Charges				
Approved for				
Grant Pur-				
poses .....	271,666.45	275,776.84	284,904.28	832,347.57

The Department now observes, quite properly, that no grant should have been paid on premium or other sundry credits earned on the debenture. It is claimed, therefore, that there should be a recovery of Legislative Grants with respect to the use of premium funds in debt prepayment and with respect to interest saved by virtue of such prepayment. Calculation of the recovery claimed for each is given below:

## Metropolitan School Board

## Adjustment of Grant re Net Premium.

	Net	Percentage of Approval to Issue	Rate of Grant 1953	Net Adjustment
Collegiate .....	\$ 72,728.85	77.922077	30	\$ 17,001.55
Area 1 .....	119,837.61	92.125984	48	52,992.75
Area 2 .....	9,115.94	78.718636	40	2,870.37
	<u>\$201,682.40</u>			<u>\$ 72,864.67</u>

As a result of the prepayment in 1953 of debt charges due in 1954 there was a saving in interest as shown below. The actual grants paid, however, were as provided in the attached letter dated August 1st, 1952. The grants were, therefore paid on the interest saved and the Department of Education properly claims recovery of this overpayment.

## Adjustment of 1954 Grant re Interest.

	Interest Saved by Board	Basis of Grant Allowed	Rate of Grant	Net Adjustment
Collegiate .....	\$ 3,705.69	77.922077	30%	\$ 866.27
Area 1 .....	6,111.98	91.976777	52	2,923.23
Area 2 .....	140.73	85.496392	40	48.12
	<u>\$ 9,958.40</u>		Total	<u>\$ 3,837.63</u>

## Summary.

Grant recoverable re U.S. Premium .....	\$ 72,864.67
Grant recoverable re Interest .....	3,837.63
	<u>\$ 76,702.30</u>

On January 1st, 1954, general legislative grants began to accrue to the Metropolitan School Board. Since only special grants accrue to the North York Board, recovery of the overpayment of grant could only be achieved by a cash payment of \$76,702.30 by the North York Board of Education to the Department of Education. Since, however, by prepayment of what later became a Metropolitan obligation, the North York Board had in effect used local funds in the amount of \$75,046.70 together with the premium funds previously described to make this payment, it is now pro-

posed that the grant recovery be made in 1956 by a reduction in the grants due to the Metropolitan School Board on the payments from current funds made in 1953 by North York with respect to the four schools referred to in the opening paragraphs of this memorandum. It is recommended, therefore, that the Metropolitan School Board approve the application of the North York Board of Education for a debenture issue of \$86,915.06 and the Department of Education be requested to consider this issue part of the amount approved for legislative grant purposes in connection with Anthony Road, Almore Avenue, Baycrest Avenue and Rodding Street Public Schools. This would leave the balance of the current fund payments within the total approval of \$210,341.21. It is assumed that the grant percentage for North York for the year 1956 is 48%. It is assumed that the grant percentage will not be larger than 48%, and if it is subsequently determined that this percentage is higher for 1956, the proper increase in grant will be calculated at that time. --

For illustrative purposes, the payment has been worked out on the basis of 48%, and on this basis a grant will accrue to the Metropolitan School Board with respect to this approved current expenditure in the amount of \$100,963.78. The deduction of the grant recovery of \$76,702.30 will leave a balance payable to the Metropolitan School Board of \$24,261.48.

For concise review of the respective obligations comprising this adjustment the following summary is presented:

North York:

Owed Metro (January 1, 1954 (net premium and other credits re Debenture By-law North York No. 7339) .....	\$201,682.40
Paid on behalf of Metro (1953) (using above premium and credits together with pre-levy) .....	276,729.10
	<hr/>
Paid by pre-levy debt which should have been assumed by the Metropolitan School Board .....	\$ 75,046.70
	<hr/>

## Department of Education:

Legislative grant due Metropolitan School Board 1956 on sundry funds (i.e. \$210,341.21) expended in the erection of four public schools by the North York Board of Education in 1954 and 1955 (assume 48%) .....	\$100,963.78
Legislative grant recoverable from North York .....	76,702.30
	<hr/>
Payable to the Metropolitan School Board (based on 48%) .....	\$ 24,261.48
	<hr/>

Respectfully submitted,

H. M. BROWNLEE,  
Business Administrator,  
The Board of Education for the  
Township of North York.

W. J. McCORDIC,  
Executive Secretary,  
The Metropolitan School Board.

## REPORT No. 9 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, May 24, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of Report No. 9 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.
2. That Disbursement List No. 46, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,965,327.60 be approved. Appendix p. 279.
3. Your Committee begs to report receipt of a cheque from the North York Board of Education in the amount of \$2,630.88 being the School Board's share of proceeds from

the sale of a 4-acre school site on the south side of Steele's Avenue, between Bathurst and Dufferin Streets arrived at as follows:—

Sale Price—Irving Investments Limited	—————	\$23,700.00
Less: Advertising Cost .....	\$143.45	
Legal Fees .....	200.00	
	—————	343.45
		—————
		\$23,356.55

Metropolitan Share — .11264 of \$23,356.55 = \$2,630.88

(On March 27, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board approved the acceptance of the tender of Irving Investments Limited, being the highest received.)

4. The Committee recommends approval of the recommendations contained in the Report of the Metropolitan Assessment Revision Committee (see pages 273 to 279 and that the Assistant Secretary Finance be delegated to negotiate with the Assessment Commissioner with respect to the furnishing by his Department of the separate school rolls referred to in section (a) of the report, page 272.

It is further recommended (i) that the communication to the area boards of education proposed in the report be supported by a covering letter in which there would be set forth the appreciation of the School Board with respect to the co-operation of area boards in this matter; a brief account of the study of Statutes relative to the problem of assessment and certain basic questions; (ii) that the procedures re assessment revision (see page 276) be forwarded as presented with the request that area boards of education indicate within a reasonable time whether or not they are willing to implement the proposed procedure.

F. C. STINSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, May 29, 1956.

REPORT OF THE METROPOLITAN ASSESSMENT  
REVISION COMMITTEE.

May 23, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the Finance Committee:

At its meeting on May 2nd, 1956, the Assessment Revision Committee decided to request the Metropolitan School Board to consider the appointment of a small committee to approach Mr. A. J. B. Gray, the Metropolitan Assessment Commissioner, for the purpose of

(a) Obtaining from the Assessment Department annually when the rolls are being completed a listing of all separate school supporters such as is taken off by hand in many of the areas now by the Assessment Revisors. It is realized that some expense would likely be involved, approval for which would have to be obtained from the Metropolitan School Board.

(b) Promoting an even greater degree of co-operation between the Assessment Department and the local school boards than exists at present, with a long range view towards elimination of duplication of work.

At a second meeting on May 16th, the Committee, at the suggestion of Mr. Gray who was present, decided to recommend as follows:

"That the Metropolitan School Board recommend to area boards of education that they authorize a representative to attend a meeting to be convened by the Assessment Commissioner between representatives of the Metropolitan Separate School Board, the area boards of education and the Assessment Department for the purpose of determining procedures for dealing with appeals and dates for the filing of appeals."

The following recommendations also were adopted by the Committee at the meeting on May 16th and pertain to the report on the following pages:

1. (a) That Part 2 of the Report, i.e., Suggested Procedure for Persons Handling School Assessment Revision



Work, be submitted to the Finance Committee of the Metropolitan School Board together with a recommendation that area boards be requested to consider the procedure set out therein.

(b) That Part 1 and 3 of the Report referred to in Recommendation 1 be presented to the Finance Committee for its information.

2. That a system of reports be set up to ensure that all boards are following these procedures.

3. That the area boards adopt, as nearly as possible, a uniform policy for the enrolment of Roman Catholic children in the public schools to simplify the problem of school assessment throughout the Metropolitan Area.

Respectfully submitted,

T. P. TOPPING,  
Chairman of Committee.

---

#### REPORT OF THE ASSESSMENT REVISION COMMITTEE RE PROCEDURES.

##### 1. Main Sections of the Acts Governing School Assessments.

The work of assessment revision should be placed in charge of a person or persons, who have a good general knowledge of the Public Schools Act, the Separate Schools Act and the Assessment Act.

Although a general knowledge of these Acts is desirable to meet various problems that will arise from time to time, it could be stated that the main basis of school assessment is governed by comparatively few sections of the Act.

##### Public Schools Act—Section 5(1).

This section defines a Public School, and opens its doors for free tuition to all children between the ages of five and twenty-one years, in the municipality, irrespective of race or creed, providing their parents or guardians are not supporters of a separate school.

Separate Schools Act—Section 63.

Assessment Act—Section 23.

Assessment Act—Section 24.

These three sections tie in together and while contradictory in some respects, define a Separate School Supporter and outline the authority of the assessor in placing a person on the roll as a Separate School Supporter.

Section 63 of the Separate Schools Act indicates that a person must notify the clerk of the municipality in writing that he is a Roman Catholic before he can become a separate school supporter.

Section 23 of the assessment act confirms this fact and further states that the written notice is required by law in order to entitle supporters of Roman Catholic separate schools to exemption from the Public School tax.

Section 24 of the assessment act is the controversial section which causes so much confusion. The first portion of this section denies the assessor the authority to place a ratepayer on the roll as a separate school supporter unless he has the "statement of the ratepayer, or a statement made on his behalf and by his authority, and not otherwise, that he is a Roman Catholic.

The latter portion of the same section drops the barrier completely, and grants the assessor the authority to place the ratepayer on the roll as a Separate School Supporter if he knows the ratepayer to be a Roman Catholic.

Separate Schools Act—Section 57.

This section states that "no person shall be deemed to be a supporter of a separate school unless he resides within three miles in a direct line of the site of the schoolhouse."

Assessment Act—Section 6

This section outlines in detail the method of assessing various types of business.

---

Separate Schools Act—Section 67.

This section defines the regulations controlling the allotment of all or a portion of the assessment of business corporations for the support of the Separate Schools.

The section points out two significant facts:—

(1) "Unless all the stock or shares are held by Roman Catholics the share or portion of such land and business or other assessments to be so rated and assessed shall not bear a greater proportion to the whole of such assessments than the amount of stock or shares so held, bears to the whole amount of the stock or shares."

(2) Before all or any part of the assessment of a corporation may be listed for the support of the separate schools, a resolution proving the percentage of shares held by Roman Catholics, must be passed by the directors of the corporation and filed with the clerk of the municipality before the date set for the return of the rolls.

In other words, the onus of proof is on the corporation and if such proof is not given through the filing of a proper resolution, then the whole assessment shall remain for the support of the Public Schools.

Assessment Act—Section 69 (re Appeals).

This section gives any person assessed the right to appeal any assessment in respect to himself or any other person he feels has been incorrectly listed on the assessment roll.

The time for filing such appeals is also covered in this section.

Assessment Act—Section 25.

Although section 69 of the assessment act states that appeals shall be filed within fourteen days after the date set by law for the return of the assessment roll, section 25 states that any ratepayer may appeal an assessment at any time on or before October 14th or the last day for appealing to the Court of Revision, whichever is the later.

2. Suggested Procedure for Persons Handling School Assessment Revision Work.

(1) Secure from the assessment roll, the names and addresses of all persons, limited companies or any assessment which is listed for the support of the Separate School. Also included in this list should be all those marked R.C.P. (Roman Catholic assessed Public).

(2) Secure from all public schools by the end of September each year (to be supplemented periodically during the year) a list of all pupils enrolled whose parents are Roman Catholic, and submit a copy to the Assessment Department.

(3) Compare these school lists with the list as compiled in paragraph one, to ascertain whether any of these families are assessed as Separate School Supporters.

(4) Secure from the school at the time of enrolment of any pupil whose parents or guardians are Roman Catholic, a form giving complete information as to name, address, previous address and school, in order that a complete investigation may be carried out to determine the eligibility of the pupil to attend a Public School.

(5) Receive immediately, the name and address of any Roman Catholic pupil leaving the public school, giving the destination and the reason for leaving.

(6) Check by a personal contact, all those persons or companies, listed as separate school supporters, to determine whether any are assessed incorrectly, or are desirous of changing to the support of the Public Schools. In the case of companies, a check should be made with the municipality to see if a proper resolution is on file.

(7) File appeals with the Assessment Commissioner against any property which is assessed incorrectly in-so-far as school support is concerned and give the reason for such appeal.

(8) Appeals to the Court of Revision should be set up as follows:—

---

Tax Ledger No.	Name (Person Assessed)	Address	Reason for Appeal
"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"
"	"	"	"

Signed,  
Agent for Appellants.

(9) Secure authority to act as agent for the appellants concerned in the Court of Revision.

(10) Exchange appeals with Separate Schools agent, and investigate by personal interview, all appeals against properties which are being changed from Public to Separate School support.

(11) Attend the Court of Revision in person to prosecute the Public School appeals and to contest any separate school appeals that do not appear to be justified. The person who appears should be a ratepayer of the municipality involved or should have authority from the board to act on its behalf.

(12) Enter appeals to the County Judge in the case of any assessment, not settled satisfactorily in the Court of Revision. Such appeals shall be filed within ten days after the notice of the decision of the Court of Revision has been given.

### 3. Questions and Answers

1. Q. Has a Roman Catholic the privilege of being assessed as either a Separate School or Public School supporter ?  
A. Yes.
2. Q. Where the husband is a Protestant and the wife a Roman Catholic, how must the taxes be directed?  
A. To Public School, the husband being a Protestant and head of the household is the one who directs the taxes; he therefore must be assessed as a Public School Supporter. A Protestant cannot be a Separate School Supporter.

3. Q. When is a person entitled to have his name inserted on the assessment roll?
  - A. When that person occupies two or more self contained rooms, which are regularly used for sleeping, preparing and serving of meals.
4. Q. Who is a Separate School Supporter?
  - A. A Separate School Supporter is one, who is a Roman Catholic and directs his portion of taxes towards the support of the Separate Schools, according to the last revised assessment roll for any municipality.
5. Q. Can the wife being the owner of the house direct the school taxes if her husband occupies the house with her?
  - A. No. The husband is classified as the tenant and it is he who directs and governs the taxes.
6. Q. Can a house be taxed for both Separate and Public School?
  - A. Yes. Provided the house is occupied by two tenants, one a Roman Catholic and a Separate School Supporter, the other tenant a Protestant or Roman Catholic who is a Public School Supporter. The assessment would then be divided on the basis of the space occupied by each.
7. Q. If a Separate School Supporter has children attending a Separate School can he enroll a child in Public School?
  - A. No. The child should not be admitted until approved by the School Board or Assessment Revisor whether or not the Separate School Supporter has children attending a Separate School.
8. Q. Under what conditions may a limited company be assessed for Separate School purposes?
  - A. Only when that company files a resolution with the clerk of the municipality, which has been duly

passed by the directors of the company, declaring the percentage of shares held by Roman Catholics.

9. Q. When must a person file an appeal to have his assessments changed for the following year?
  - A. On or before the 14th of October, or the last day for filing appeals, whichever is the later.
10. Q. Is a Public School Board required to accept children whose parents are assessed as Separate School Supporters in another municipality?
  - A. No.
11. Q. Can any ratepayer take legal action against a Protestant who insists on being a Separate School Supporter?
  - A. Yes, by law a person must be a Roman Catholic in order to be a Separate School Supporter regardless of the school his children attend, and that person may be summoned to court.

#### DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 46.

May 24, 1956.

#### PART I.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments: due  
June, 1956, SECONDARY ..... \$ 930,674.25

#### ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

2. Carswell Company Limited, Printing Minutes, March 27 \$168.50, April 10, \$71.00 239.50
3. H. E. Dean & Son, Flowers re Mr. Phillips 15.00
4. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, April Meeting Expense ..... 78.60
5. Gestetner (Canada) Limited: Paper \$28.20, Ink \$54.00 ..... 82.20
6. Orange Crush Limited, Meeting Expense ..... 4.56
7. Receiver General of Canada, Postage ..... 58.00
8. Staff Salaries, May 4 to May 17, 1956 ..... 1,405.73

9. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental May 15 to June 14 .....	1,087.50
10. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, April Service .....	·19.03
	<hr/>
	\$933,664.37

## PART II.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due June 1956, PUBLIC .....	\$1,965,327.60
--	----------------



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 10 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, June 12, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee, held this day, the following members being present, viz.: Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Lockhart, Milgram, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the Toronto Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the City of Toronto Planning Area:—

Amendment No. 39—re-zoning of an area on the north side of Gerrard Street, east of Parliament Street, from Residential to Commercial.

The Toronto Board of Education has no objection to the proposed amendment.

2. That the Board concur in the comments of area boards of education with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

#### Township of Etobicoke.

T-9775—5 lots

Public school pupils will attend Eatonville Public School. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I. when it opens in September, 1956.

T-9795—22 lots

Public school pupils will attend Norseman Public School. Secondary students will attend Royal York C.I.

T-9807—77 lots

Public school pupils will attend Rivercrest Public School (to open in September, 1956). Secondary students will at-

tend Thistletown C.I. when it opens in September, 1957; Burnhamthorpe C.I. in 1956-57.

T-9829—186 lots

Public school pupils will attend Eatonville Public School. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I. Although the Eatonville School is now filled to capacity, present plans provide for construction of a senior school which will remove pupils of grades 7 and 8 and leave sufficient space for pupils from this subdivision. These permanent arrangements will not be concluded until September, 1957.

T-9830—4 lots

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until accommodation is available in a school in Etobicoke Township.

Township of North York.

T-9771—4 lots

Public school pupils will attend Gorman Park Temporary Public School. Secondary students will attend temporarily Downsview C.I. and eventually Northview Heights C.I.

Township of Scarborough.

T-9532—830 lots

The Scarborough Board of Education has indicated that a public school site of 7 acres, Block B, will be required and requests that release of the plan be made conditional upon the Scarborough Board obtaining the required site.

T-9720—9 lots

Public school pupils will attend Buchanan Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill Collegiate Institute.

T-9785—97 lots

Public school pupils will attend Wm. Treadway Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill Collegiate Institute.

3. That the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of an intermediate school site be approved:

	Estimated Total Cost
Bathurst-Finch Site:	
10 acres .....	\$ 60,000.00
Northwest corner of intersection of Bathurst Street and Finch Avenue West	
Date school required—indefinite.	
No. of Classrooms proposed—indefinite.	
Approximate boundaries:—As potential Intermediate School Site, Drewry Avenue, Senlac Street, Park Home Avenue, Combe Avenue, Old Dufferin Street and extensions thereof.	

4. That the Chairman's Committee be authorized to process urgent applications for new school accommodation and site purchases during the summer recess of the Board on the understanding that the action of the Committee will be reported to the Board in September for confirmation.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board June 19, 1956.

#### REPORT No. 10 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, June 14, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs, Ferguson, Long, Power, Stinson, Van Esterik and Miss Perney, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of section 3 of Report No. 10 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. That Disbursement List No. 47, dated June 14, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$2,321.04 be approved. (Appendix p. 298).

3. In 1954 a petty cash fund in the amount of \$200.00 was established. At that time, purchases of postage in substantial amounts were made through the fund. As the office

has recently adopted the practice of purchasing postage stamps by cheque, the Committee recommends that the petty cash fund be reduced to \$100.00.

4. In 1955 the School Board requested an amendment to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act which would permit the School Board to pay that portion of non-resident fees which was in excess of the sending board's per pupil cost. At the time the request was made it was suggested to the provincial government that this privilege could be achieved through an extension of Section 126(1) (e) of The Metropolitan Act.

The Provincial Government however elected to achieve the same result by increasing the powers of the School Board with respect to the payment of maintenance assistance payments as referred to in Section 125 of the Act, by adding the following as sub-section (6):

- “(6) The School Board may increase the maintenance payments provided for in this section in respect of,
- (a) pupils who reside in a public school division and attend a public school in another public school division as determined by the School Board; and
  - (b) pupils who reside in a high school district and attend a secondary school in another high school district as determined by the School Board.”

When the request was made it was intended that the School Board would absorb its portion of the non-resident fee in the current year. At the request of the Committee the Metropolitan Solicitor submitted an opinion that the amended provision of the Metropolitan Act requires the School Board to make additional payments on behalf of non-resident pupils on the basis of “the average daily attendance during the preceding year”.

Accordingly, your Committee has requested the Legislation and By-laws Committee to consider a suitable amendment to the Metropolitan Act for presentation to the Provincial Government which would enable the School Board

to pay a portion of the non-resident fees on the basis of the current year's average daily attendance.

5. In connection with the establishment of non-resident fees for the year 1956 your Committee recommends as follows:—

- (i) That the 1956 non-resident fees on a per pupil day basis as shown on page 287, be adopted for the calendar year 1956 subject to audit and that area boards of education be so notified.
- (ii) That billings based on these fees be made by the receiving board to the sending board at the lower of the sending board or receiving boards' fee multiplied by the actual aggregate attendance of the pupils concerned for the period covered by the billing and that the Metropolitan School Board be billed by the receiving board for the excess of the receiving board's fee over the sending board's fee where such excess exists.
- (iii) That the weighted average per pupil fee as shown on page 287 be established as the sending board's per per pupil fee where such board does not offer the service (academic, commercial, or technical).
- (iv) That, in view of the difficulty in dividing expenditures between academic, commercial and technical school pupils in certain areas, the Executive Secretary be requested to arrange for a study to be made as soon as possible of the various methods for making such a division and that upon receipt of such report the Committee will decide whether or not the recommendations proposed should apply to the 1956 fees or should be applicable starting in 1957.

6. In connection with the reimbursement of the operating costs of special education classes throughout the Metropolitan area for the year 1956 the Committee recommends as follows:—

- (i) that 1955 costs per pupil as shown on page 289 be used as the basis for payments to area boards in 1956 for auxiliary class pupils, subject to audit;

- (ii) that payments be made to area boards in
  - (a) July 1956 up to the end of June 1956
  - (b) December 1956 up to the end of November 1956
  - (c) January 1957 for the month of December 1956, based on the attendance figures submitted monthly by area boards;;
- (iii) that payments for home instruction, speech correction, transportation, and initial equipment be made in January 1957 for the year 1956;
- (iv) that proper certification be obtained from area boards regarding the eligibility of classes for reimbursement before any payments are made.

7. That the following be appointed as a Special Committee to transact necessary business during the summer adjournment of the School Board, viz., Chairman of the Board, Vice-Chairman of the Board, Chairman of the School Accommodation Committee, Chairman of the Building and Sites Committee, Chairman of the Finance Committee, Chairman of the Legislation and By-laws Committee and Chairman of the Toronto Board of Education, and that any three of the foregoing persons be a quorum. It is understood that any action taken by the Special Committee will be reported to the first meeting of the School Board in September.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board June 19, 1956.

## NON-RESIDENT FEES PER PUPIL DAY FOR 1955 and 1956

	Public		Academic		Commercial		*Technical	
	1956 Non- Res. Fee	1955 Non- Res. Fee	1956 Non- Res. Fee	1955 Non- Res. Fee	1956 Non- Res. Fee	1955 Non- Res. Fee	1956 Non- Res. Fee	1955 Non- Res. Fee
East York .....	.37780	.25	.57831	.45	.32321			
Etobicoke .....	.31566	.21	.44454	.28	.36004			
Forest Hill .....	.76681	.60	.91885	.67			.49870	.88
Lakeshore .....	.34468	.29	1.07707	.84	.56141	.40		
Leaside .....	.61208	.57	.74589	.56	.49079	.29	.07116	.29
North York .....	.51135	.30	.82030	.60	.58137		nil	
Scarborough .....	.40025	.16	.60820	.19	.16075			
Swansea .....	.60888	.48					1.32838	1.73
Toronto .....	.64495	.52	1.32027	1.06	1.10026	1.01	.77664	.66
Weston .....	.29834	.20	.18087	.11	.34278	.66	.35546	.46
York .....	.36534	.34	.74533	.72	.54246	.46		
Weighted Average			.92740		.83793		1.15351	

\*Maintenance Assistance Payments in Technical Secondary 1955—\$300.00  
1956—\$400.00

## COST PER PUPIL DAY OF EDUCATING PUPILS IN 1954 and 1955

	Elementary Public		Academic Secondary		Commercial Secondary		Technical Secondary	
	1955 Per Diem Cost	1954 Per Diem Cost	1955 Per Diem Cost	1954 Per Diem Cost	1955 Per Diem Cost	1954 Per Diem Cost	1955 Per Diem Cost	1954 Per Diem Cost
East York .....	1.13922	1.03	1.85382	1.73	1.85382			
Etobicoke .....	1.07902	.98	1.72005	1.56	1.89065			
Forest Hill .....	1.53212	1.37	2.20127	1.95	2.20127	1.95		
Lakeshore .....	1.10610	1.06	2.35258	2.12	2.09202	1.94	2.53952	2.42
Leaside .....	1.37739	1.34	2.02140	1.84	2.02140			
North York .....	1.27277	1.07	2.09581	1.88	2.11198	1.83	2.11198	1.83
Scarborough .....	1.16556	.93	1.88371	1.47	1.69136		1.48885	
Swansea .....	1.37419	1.25						
Toronto .....	1.40831	1.29	2.58931	2.34	2.62310	2.55	3.35884	3.27
Weston .....	1.06365	.97	1.45638	1.39	1.87339	2.20	2.81746	2.20
York .....	1.13065	1.11	2.02084	2.00	2.07307	2.00	2.39628	2.00
Weighted Average ..			2.19966		2.36077		3.18397	



1955 Costs per Pupil Day  
to be used as the basis for 1956 payments re  
Auxiliary Class Pupils

	Public	
	1955 Per Diem Cost	1954 Per Diem Cost
East York—		
Opportunity .....	2.72892	2.74
Academic Vocational .....	2.91484	2.85
Hard of Hearing .....	5.10227	5.71
Etobicoke—		
Opportunity .....	2.97309	2.73
Forest Hill—		
Opportunity .....	3.08583	2.68
Lakeshore—		
Jr. Opportunity .....	2.24085	1.98
Sr. Boys' Acad. Voc. ....	1.85391	1.82
Sr. Girls' Acad. Voc. ....	2.68548	2.07
Leaside—		
Opportunity .....	2.92242	2.98
North York—		
Opportunity .....	4.48100	2.85
Hard of Hearing .....	4.48715	5.65
Scarborough—		
Opportunity .....	2.42447	1.93
Toronto—		
Academic Vocational .....	2.03232	1.86
Aphasic .....	8.36590	—
Hard of Hearing .....	4.61440	4.27
Open Air and Health .....	2.13328	1.95
Opportunity .....	2.27817	2.07
Oral—Deaf .....	8.94255	9.22
Orthopaedic .....	6.96234	7.11
Sight Saving .....	4.44392	3.65
Church St. Boys .....	2.87822	2.63
High Park Forest .....	3.31954	2.79
Hospitals and Inst. ....	1.66433	1.65
Weston—		
Opportunity .....	2.23271	1.87

	Public	
	1955 Per Diem Cost	1954 Per Diem Cost
York—		
Opportunity .....	2.31348	2.54
Academic Vocational .....	2.85503	2.79
Boys' Handicraft .....	3.42194	2.38
Hard of Hearing .....	4.66076	3.75
	Secondary	
North York—		
Senior Academic Vocational .....	4.13450	—
Toronto—		
Handicraft .....	3.66010	3.70
Academic Vocational .....	3.35884	—

REPORT No. 10 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, June 12, 1956.

1. The Metropolitan School Board at its meeting held on May 15 authorized the Executive Secretary to engage a competent real estate firm to appraise a parcel of land of approximately 2.531 acres being part of the Lillian Street Public School Site which the North York Board proposes to sell to the Corporation of the Township of North York. The School Board on January 31 approved the sale of this land to the Township of North York at the "current market value", subject to arrangements satisfactory to the Metropolitan Solicitor and in accordance with Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Accordingly, the firm of W. H. Bosley and Company was commissioned to estimate the current market value of the lands in question. Your Committee had before it for consideration a communication from W. H. Bosley and Company reporting that in their opinion \$18,000.00 would be the current market value of the property and enclosing an account in the amount of \$150.00 for this valuation.

Your Committee recommends:—

(1) That the Board approve payment of the account of W. H. Bosley and Company in the amount of \$150.00;

(2) That the North York Board of Education be advised that the Metropolitan School Board will approve the sale of 2.531 acres of the Lillian Street Public School Site to the Corporation of the Township of North York at a price of \$18,000.00 in accordance with Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

2. On November 22, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board gave final approval to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for new school accommodation subject to further review of the application prior to the calling of tenders:—

George B. Little Public School, 12 standard classrooms, double kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$272,000.00
Local Share .....	80,800.00
Total .....	352,800.00
Ceiling .....	352,800.00

The Scarborough Board now wishes to call for tenders and presented further information in support of the application.

In view of the further supporting data regarding George B. Little Public School, the Committee recommends that the application be approved.

3. Your Committee had before it for consideration a request of the Etobicoke Board of Education that the application for Gainsford Public School, previously approved by the School Board, be revised to provide for a single kindergarten, 10 standard classrooms and a general purpose room. The modification in the application will entail a revision in the amount of the ceiling to \$279,300.00.

The Committee recommends that TENTATIVE approval be given to the revised application of the Etobicoke Board of Education.

4. That the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of public school sites be approved:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Dorset Park Public School Site:	
8 acres .....	\$ 62,950.00
North of Lawrence Avenue East, between Kennedy and Birchmount Roads being Part of Lot 29, Concession I.	
Date school required—September, 1956.	
No. of classrooms proposed—8.	

Ionson Farm Public School Site:	
7.561 acres .....	\$ 39,875.00
Lot 35, Concession 3, west side of Pharmacy Avenue, south of 4th Concession, north of Attair Avenue.	
Date school required—January 1, 1958.	
No. of classrooms proposed—8.	

5. That the following applications of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation be given FINAL approval subject to the application for Churchill Heights Public School receiving further review prior to the calling of tenders:—

Bendale Park Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	\$ 59,300.00
Total .....	\$279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00
Date school required—January 1, 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—410.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.	

Galloway Road Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00
Date school required—January 1, 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—390.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.	

Churchill Heights Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, industrial arts, home economics, auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	99,300.00
Total .....	319,300.00
Ceiling .....	319,300.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—410.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.

6. Your Committee had before it for consideration an enquiry from the Scarborough Board of Education as to whether it would be possible to obtain a minimum of six portable units from other municipalities in the Metropolitan area to meet its requirements for additional portable accommodation for September, 1956.

Your Committee recommends that the Executive Secretary be authorized to enquire of area boards of education as to whether or not they have any portable classroom units which they do not require for the 1956-57 school term. It was understood that if any portable units can be made available to the Scarborough Board of Education the portable units will be transported at the expense of the Metropolitan School Board.

7. That the following applications for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation be given TENTATIVE approval:—

#### Etobicoke Board of Education.

Bloorlea Senior Public School, 7 standard classrooms, Library, Music, Art, Science, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$446,250.00
Ceiling .....	446,250.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—375.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—450.

## Scarborough Board of Education.

C.K.E.Y. Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00
Date school required—January 1, 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—410.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.	

Clairlea Public School (2nd Addition), 4 standard classrooms.

Estimated Cost .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00
Date addition required—September 1, 1957.	
Present enrolment—774.	
Anticipated increase—125.	

Dorset Park Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00
Date school required—Jan. 1, 1957.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—410.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.	

Gooderham Public School, 7 standard classrooms, kindergarten, special education, Auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$227,850.00
Ceiling .....	227,850.00
Date school required—September 1, 1956.	
Anticipated opening enrolment—310.	
Anticipated maximum enrolment—320.	

Watford Heights Public School, 9 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

Estimated Cost .....	\$253,575.00
Ceiling .....	253,575.00
Date school required—January 1, 1957.	

Anticipated opening enrolment—338.  
Anticipated maximum enrolment—375.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, June 19, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 10 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, June 14, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 of Report No. 10 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 47 dated June 14, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$150.00, be approved. (Appendix p. 299).

3. That Ruth Carruthers (known as Ruth Wylie) a ward of the Children's Aid and Infants Home be permitted to continue in attendance at the opportunity class at Bannockburn Avenue Public School for the school year 1956-57 on compassionate grounds without payment of the non-resident fee.

In 1955 the Board endorsed a recommendation of the Advisory Council that fee payment in cases such as this should be decided on the merits of each individual case. The Committee was advised that Ruth's placement at Woodbridge is particularly happy for her and that the opportunity class programme she is receiving has been very helpful for her. It is conceivable that the Toronto Children's Aid Society might be forced in view of the educational advantages to arrange placement within the Metropolitan area. The above recommendation is based upon the fact that Ruth's original residence was within the Metropolitan area.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, June 19, 1956.

## APPENDIX

## REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.

June 15, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the Metropolitan School Board:

At the meeting of the Advisory Council held on April 27 the Council requested a sub-committee composed of Messrs. Emond (Chairman), Brownlee, and Fuller, to prepare a list of comments with respect to building codes as they now effect school construction and submit same to the Council for consideration.

It will be recalled that the basis for the action was the belief that the cost of school construction was higher than it needed to be because of unnecessarily stringent building codes. An interim report was submitted following the meeting of the committee held on May 16 in which the wording of the building code adopted by the City of Toronto and generally followed by other municipalities in the Metropolitan area was outlined. Another meeting of the committee was held on May 30 and the Committee is pleased to report as follows:

In addition to the members of the committee present, viz., Messrs. Emond and Brownlee, the following representatives were in attendance to assist the Committee in its deliberations:—Mr. F. Gibson, Building Commissioner, Township of Etobicoke; Mr. F. Mulliss, Superintendent of Buildings, Etobicoke Board of Education; Mr. J. Walsh, Superintendent of Construction, North York Board of Education; and Mr. W. Prentice, Superintendent of Plant, Scarborough Board of Education.

The Committee considered a number of building requirements which tended to increase the cost of construction of schools such as the following:— (a) enclosed stairwells; (b) wired glass (where exposed to corridors); (c) double thickness of gyproc lathe on corridor ceilings; (d) laminated wooden beams; (e) thickness of party walls.



In view of the fact that the present building code adopted by the City of Toronto permits "ordinary construction for public and separate schools not exceeding 55 feet in height", it was apparent to your Committee that it was not the building code itself which demanded stringent standards but rather the interpretation of it by individual building commissioners. One major exception to this comment would be the requirement in the code that stairwells be enclosed. The Committee is of the opinion that enclosed stairwells act as a deterrent to the swift evacuation of children in the event of a fire and this requirement should be abolished for day schools where children are under constant supervision. Elimination of this requirement would quite definitely reduce cost of school construction.

Your Committee believes it would be inadvisable to submit to the building code committee a list of specific comments regarding building requirements "except, of course, the matter of enclosed stairwells", but rather to raise the point of view, perhaps in the form of a brief, that while school boards charged with the responsibility of construction and maintaining schools recognize their obligation for the safety of children they appreciate also their obligation of insisting on economy of construction and therefore respectfully request whether the building code has been drawn more stringent than is necessary in respect of public and separate day schools. In forwarding this comment the Committee wishes to emphasize that while it is anxious to effect any savings possible in school construction it insists that adequate standards be maintained in areas where fire risks are high, i.e., boiler room, storage rooms, etc.

It is understood that the Committee appointed to recommend a uniform building code for the Metropolitan area is concerned primarily with the establishment of a "performance rating" rather than indicating the specific type of materials which should be used in connection with construction. This appears to your Committee to be a sound approach and one which will permit the ready use of new materials as they come on the market without the necessity of first amending the building code. In other words if an architect specifies a type of material for, say, a roofing which is in

accordance with the "performance rating" there should be no question whether the material is permitted.

The Advisory Council at its meeting held on June 15 concurred in the foregoing report of its sub-committee and suggests that in lieu of requesting representation on the committee appointed to consider a uniform building code for the Metropolitan area, the School Board authorize the preparation of a brief by the Council embodying the foregoing comments for presentation to the building code committee.

Respectfully submitted,  
C. C. GOLDRING,  
Chairman of Council.

#### DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 47.

June 14, 1956.

#### PART I.

#### ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

1. Bell Telephone Co. of Canada, May service .....	\$ 84.70
2. Carswell Company Limited, Board minutes, April 24 .....	98.00
3. H. E. Dean & Son, Florists, Flowers re Mrs. M. Temple .....	6.00
4. Dominion Maintenance Company, May service .....	85.00
5. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, May meeting expenses .....	54.60
6. Gestetner (Canada) Limited: Stencils, \$35.00; Paper \$86.28 .....	121.28
7. Jacobson, Lipson & Richmond, Parking lot rental, June .....	50.00
8. Kendal Printing Co. Ltd., Supplies .....	99.00
9. R. H. King, Advisory Council expenses re visit to Pauline Johnson Collegiate and Vocational School, Brantford .....	20.15
10. New York Window Cleaning Co., May service .....	12.00
11. Ofrex (Canada) Limited, Supplies .....	32.00
12. Ontario Ass'n. School Business Officials, An- nual membership fees, \$24.00; Convention registration, \$10.00 .....	34.00

**Appendix****299**

---

13. Petty Cash: Meeting expenses, \$76.76; Convention expenses, \$39.40; Miscellaneous expenses, \$37.41; less reduction of Petty Cash Fund, \$100.00 .....	53.57
14. Receiver-General of Canada, Postage Stamps .....	51.00
15. Refrigeration Servicentre Limited, Repairs to air conditioner .....	4.90
16. T. Sanderson & Sons, Supplies .....	11.88
17. Smith-Corona (Canada) Limited, Quarterly maintenance (2 machines) .....	10.48
18. Staff Expense allowances, May .....	70.00
19. Staff Salaries, May 18 to May 31, 1956 .....	1,405.73
20. Variprint Services, General expense .....	16.75
	<hr/>
	\$2,321.04

**PART II**

21. W. H. Bosley & Company, re valuation of Lillian Street School property .....	\$ 150.00
--	-----------



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 6 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, September 11, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Bonham, Eve, Ferguson, Lang, Long and Martin, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. On June 15, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board established attendance areas in Etobicoke and North York Townships for the Weston Collegiate and Vocational School and indicated that the apportionment of students from Etobicoke and North York was to be subject to annual review by the boards concerned and by the Metropolitan School Board.

Accordingly, the Committee had before it a communication from the Weston Board of Education dated August 30, 1956, advising that Etobicoke would be sending 413 students and North York 575 pupils to Weston Collegiate and Vocational School in September 1956.

Your Committee recommends that the attendance areas in the Townships of Etobicoke and North York as determined to provide the aforementioned students for the Weston Collegiate and Vocational School be confirmed for the school year 1956-57.

2. Consideration of Report of Special Summer Committee, dated September 7, 1956.

(a) With respect to Section 7 regarding the inclusion of students from the Bennington Heights area (Township of East York) in the attendance area of Leaside High School in view of secondary school attendance area changes effected by the Toronto Board of Education in adjacent areas to Bennington Heights, your Committee recommends that this

matter be referred to the Advisory Council for study and recommendation as to the permanent attendance area for these students commencing September, 1957.

(b) That Section 8 of the Report be amended by the inclusion of the following:—

“(d) Future use of the Toronto Teachers’ College (former Earl Kitchener Public School).

“In a communication dated August 3, 1956, the Minister of Education advised the Board ‘that this school building will not be available for the use of any School Board in the foreseeable future’.”

3. The Committee had before it for consideration a report of existing attendance areas in Metropolitan Toronto under the following headings:—

(a) Attendance areas specifically approved by the Metropolitan School Board.

(b) Attendance areas discussed by the Board but for which no specific approval can be found in the minutes, although the sending, receiving and Metropolitan Boards have recognized the areas.

(c) Attendance areas which exist by reason of arrangements between the two boards concerned but which have not been recognized by the Metropolitan School Board.

(For details of report, see Appendix “A” to this Report.)

Your Committee recommends:—

(1) That Item 10, Public Schools, be deleted. (For recommendation of Committee with respect to Item 10, see Section 1, Report No. 6 of School Accommodation Committee—Part II.)

(2) That the areas listed under (a) with the exception of Item 10, Public Schools, be confirmed.

(3) That the areas listed under (b) be approved retroactive to January 1, 1955, or the date of the actual shift of pupils whichever is the later, subject to confirmation of the areas defined by the local boards concerned.

(4) That the areas listed under (c) be referred to the Advisory Council for study and a report before the end of October.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, September 18, 1956.

---

APPENDIX "A."

September 7, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members of the  
School Accommodation Committee:

Since the beginning of 1954, the Metropolitan School Board has discussed and approved quite a substantial number of school attendance areas involving the resident pupils of more than one municipality. In order to clarify the position of the Board regarding the eligibility of non-resident pupils for the extra payment as allowed under Section 125(6) of Bill 80, certain attendance areas are set out under three headings in the pages following:

(a) Attendance areas specifically approved by the Metropolitan School Board.

(b) Attendance areas discussed by the Board but for which no specific approval can be found in the minutes, although sending, receiving, and Metropolitan boards have recognized the areas.

(c) Attendance areas which exist by reason of arrangements between the two boards concerned but which have not been recognized by the Metropolitan School Board.

It is recommended:—

1. That the areas listed under (a) be confirmed as they stand.

2. That the areas listed under (b) be approved formally by the Metropolitan School Board retroactive to January 1, 1955 or the date of the actual shift of pupils whichever

is the later subject to confirmation of the area defined by the local boards concerned.

3. That the areas listed under (c) be referred to the Advisory Council for study and a report before the end of October.

Respectfully submitted,

W. J. McCORDIC,  
Executive Secretary.

---



(a) ATTENDANCE AREAS APPROVED PREVIOUSLY BY METROPOLITAN  
SCHOOL BOARD.

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School	Boundaries	Grades to be served	Date of M.S.B. Approval	Notes
1. East York	Toronto	Earl Beatty	Woodington Ave. (both sides); s. side of Sammon Ave.; w. side of Woodbine Ave.; and the Toronto-East York Boundary projected easterly to Woodbine Ave.	K-6	May 10/55	To be reviewed April, 1958
2. East York	Toronto	Gledhill	East York was requested to define attendance area (letter of May 11, 1955)	K-6	May 10/55	Area now defined— East— Oak Park, both sides; West —Woodbine, east side; North—back of lots on s. side of Lumsden, South —City Limits
3. North York	Toronto	John Fisher Eglinton Maurice Cody	Pupils resident south of Mount Hope Cemetery	K-8	Dec. 14/54	
4. North York	Toronto	Bedford Park	Pupils resident n. of easterly projection to Bayview Ave. of n. boundary of Blythwood P.S. district (i.e. a line s. of Cheltenham Ave.)	K-8	Dec. 14/54	
5. North York	Toronto	Blythwood	Pupils resident between easterly projection to Bayview Ave. of n. bndry of Blythwood P.S. district (i.e. a line s. of Cheltenham Ave. and Sherwood Park between Bayview and the Toronto-North York boundary)	K-8	Dec. 14/54	

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School	Boundaries	Grades to be served	Date of M.S.B. Approval	Notes
6. Scarborough	Toronto	Adam Beck	N. side of Kingston Rd. between Victoria Park and Blantyre. E. side of Victoria Park from Kingston Rd. to Gerrard. Meadow and Beachdale Aves.	K-8	June 22/54	
7. Toronto	East York	Chester	Nearest 25 kindergarten pupils.	K	June 22/54	To be reviewed in May, 1957
8. Toronto	York	Harwood	Maybank Area	K-8	Apr. 27/54	
9. York	Forest Hill	South Prep. and Jr. High	Heath St. W.; Walmer Rd.; and Tweedsmuir Ave.	K-8	Apr. 27/54	
10. York	Toronto	Hughes	(a) 2 classes trans. from Rawlinson to Hughes. (b) n. side of Rogers Rd. (from e. side of Kane to C.N.R.); e. side of Kane between Rogers Rd. and Kersdale; both sides of Kersdale between s. side of Kane and where it joins Silverthorn; Silverthorn to n. side of Alleen from Kersdale northerly to No. 405; both sides of Alleen between Silverthorn and Blackthorn; Blackthorn n. (almost to Dunraven) No. 432; area on s. side of Rogers Rd. and s. to city limits, e. from C.N.R. to No. 189 Rogers Rd.	K-8	Apr. 27/54	
11. York	Toronto	General Mercer	S. Toronto City limits W. C.N.R. and C.P.R. right of way N. Old Weston and Rogers Roads E. C.N.R. right of way	K-8	Apr. 27/54	

12. York	Toronto	St. Clair	W. along St. Clair W. from city limits to Castleton Ave.; n. on Castleton Ave. to Belt Line C.N.R.; e. to and incl. Blakely St. and s. to city limits	K-8	Apr. 27/54	
(b) ATTENDANCE AREAS RECOGNIZED BY THE SENDING, RECEIVING, AND METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARDS BUT WITH NO SPECIFIC APPROVAL IN THE BOARD MINUTES.						
1. North York	Toronto	John Wanless	N. Melrose W. Avenue Road S. and e. City of Toronto	K-8	.....	
(a) ATTENDANCE AREAS APPROVED PREVIOUSLY BY METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD.						
SECONDARY SCHOOLS						
1. East York	Leaside	Leaside H.S.	Bennington Heights District	Acad. 9-13	July 20/56	Academic students have option of attending Leaside H.S. or Toronto Schools
2. East York	Toronto	Jarvis C.I. Oakwood C.I. Northern Tech. Comm.	Bennington Heights District	Acad., Comm. and Tech. 9-13	July 20/56	Academic students may attend Jarvis, Oakwood and comm. or tech. shall attend Northern Technical-Commercial School
3. Etobicoke	Weston	Weston C. & V.S.	Area bounded by centre line of Royal York Rd. on west; Weston Golf Club to north; valley n. of Chapman Ave. running between Royal York Rr. and Humber River on the south and the limits of the Township on the east	Acad., Comm. and Tech 9-13	June 14/55	Any additional spaces are to be used in common with North York up to capacity of school. Subject to annual review.
4. North York	East York	East York C.I.	Those s. of Eglinton Ave. and near Bayview	Acad. 9-13	Jan. 26/54	

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School	Boundaries	Grades to be served	Date of M.S.B. Approval	Notes
5. North York	Scarborough	Warden-St. Clair	S. of proposed Eglinton Ave. extension—e. of C.N.R. tracks and s. to twp. of North York boundaries	Acad. and Comm. 9-13	June 19/56	To be erected 1956-57
6. North York	Scarborough	Agincourt H.S. Winston Churchill	North of Highway 401, East of Woodbine (Don Mills Ext.)	Acad and Comm. 9-13	June 19/56	Tech. students will attend Jr. Voc. classes at Winston Churchill (Grades 9 and 10)
7. North York	Toronto	Danforth Tech.	S. of proposed Eglinton Ave. extension—e. of C.N.R. tracks and s. to twp. of North York boundaries	Tech. 9-13	June 19/56	
8. North York	Weston	Weston C. & V.S.	Part of North York s. of Hwy. 401 and w. of proposed extension of Hwy. 400 and Weston limits in s. and w.	Acad., Comm. and Tech. 9-13	June 14/55	Any additional spaces are to be used in common with Etobicoke up to capacity of school Subject to annual review.
9. North York	York	York Memorial George Harvey	To include houses between Geo. Anderson Drive and Lawrence Ave. W. but not any students on Lawrence Ave.	Acad., Comm. and Tech. 9-13	June 19/56	
10. Swansea	Toronto	Humberside Western Tech.	Village of Swansea	Acad., Comm. and Tech. 9-13	May 26/56 June 19/56	(Humberside) (Western)
11. York	Toronto	Oakwood C.I.	West—Dufferin Street East—West side of Wychwood Ave. North—Approx. a line due west from Maplewood Avenue. South—City of Toronto	Acad. 9-13 Comm. and Tech. (part) 9-13	Apr. 5/55	Tech. and Comm. allowed choice of schools. Majority will attend Norvok. (Mar. 22/55—95 students (Gr. 9) from Vaughan Rd. attendance area be trans. to Oakwood so that by 1959 York students (300) will be at Oakwood.)

.....

**Pupils from the Oakridge area have option of going to Eastern Commerce.**

BETWEEN THE TWO

## SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Business Administrator  
will recommend such an  
area to the East York  
Board.

**Business Administrator**  
will recommend such an  
area to the Leaside Board.

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School	Boundaries	Grades to be served	Date of M.S.B. Approval	Notes
4. Scarborough	Toronto	Danforth Tech.	?	Tech. 11-13		
5. Etobicoke	Lakeshore	New Toronto	?	Tech. 9-13		
6. Forest Hill	Toronto	Northern Tech.-Comm.	Village of Forest Hill	Comm. and Tech. 9-13		

---

REPORT No. 11 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART I.

---

September 11, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Grayson, Lockhart, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education regarding the following subdivision plans as supplemented by comments of the Executive Secretary, subject to further information being available to the Board with respect to subdivision plan T-10010.

## Township of North York.

T-10032—13 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Geo. Anderson Drive Public School. Intermediate school students will eventually attend Gracefield Junior High School. Secondary students will attend York Memorial C.I. or Geo. Harvey Vocational School.

T-10010—644 lots.

Public school pupils living south of Finch Avenue will eventually attend a school to the south in subdivision T-9876; those public school pupils living to the north of Finch Avenue will attend a school to the north of the Hydro Line in subdivision T-9594. Intermediate school students will eventually attend Woodbine Junior High School.

A minimum of 3 acres will be required as part of a secondary school site in the vicinity of Milondell Drive and Broadgreen Road; and secondary school students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually the aforementioned secondary school.

\* Capital funds have not been included in the 1956 estimates for purchase of the aforementioned site. No permanent accommodation can be provided before 1958.

T-10022—221 lots.

The Board of Education will require 2-3 acres as part of a public school site in the vicinity of Willowview Road and Rabalan Drive. Intermediate school students will eventually attend Woodbine Junior High School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually a collegiate in the north-east of the Township.

\* Capital funds have not been included in the 1956 estimates for purchase of the aforementioned site. No permanent accommodation can be provided before 1958.

T-10023—26 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Lillian Street Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend Cummer Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Earl Haig C.I.

T-10029—224 lots.

Public school pupils will eventually attend a school to the south in subdivision T-10022. Intermediate students will eventually attend Woodbine Junior High School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually a collegiate in the north-east of the Township.

\* Capital funds have not been included in the 1956 estimates for purchase of the aforementioned site. No permanent accommodation can be provided before 1958.

T-10040—28 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Roding Street Public School, eventually Southview Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend Finch Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-10046—236 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Brian Drive Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend Pleasantview Junior High School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Agincourt High School (as approved by Metropolitan School Board June 19), eventually a secondary school in the north-east of the Township.



T-10090—771 lots.

The Board of Education will require a school site of 5 acres completely within the proposed subdivision; the proposed school site (Block B) of 4.5 acres is geographically acceptable. Intermediate students will eventually attend Woodbine Junior High School. Secondary students will temporarily attend York Mills C.I., eventually a secondary school in the north-east of the Township.

\* Capital funds have not been included in the 1956 estimates for purchase of the aforementioned site. No permanent accommodation can be provided before 1958.

T-10115—23 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Tumpane Public School, eventually Southview Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend Finch Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-10127—36 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily be transported by bus to Tumpane Public School, eventually attend the Stanley Road Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend Finch Junior High School. Secondary students will temporarily attend Downsview C.I., eventually a collegiate in the north-west of the Township.

T-10072—24 lots.

Public school pupils will attend York Mills Public School. Intermediate students will eventually attend St. Andrews Junior High School. Secondary students will attend York Mills C.I.

T-5644—72 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Scarborough or East York schools. Secondary students will attend East York C.I.

Although it would appear entirely logical that pupils from this area would be served by East York schools, it is our understanding that this designation is reported without the concurrence of the East York Board of Education. It is therefore recommended that this subdivision and the comments of the North York Board be referred to the East York Board of Education for their observation.

\* Comments of Executive Secretary.

2. In favour of sections 1 to 6 of Report of Summer Committee—Part I, dated September 7, 1956.

3. Your Committee submits for information of the Board a comparison of 1956 capital estimates with actual at August 31, 1956, in connection with building projects and a summary of Bulk Site approvals to August 31, 1956. (For details, see Appendix "A" to this Report.).

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, September 18, 1956.

---

APPENDIX "A"  
COMPARISON OF 1956 CAPITAL ESTIMATES  
WITH ACTUAL AT AUGUST 31, 1956.

(Buildings.)

Public.

	A 1956 Estimates	B Tent. M.S.B. Approval	C Metro. Council Approval	D A-B	E A-C
East York .....	\$ 2,380,000.00	\$ 2,112,320.00	\$ 1,313,880.00	\$ 143,675.00	\$ 143,675.00
Etobicoke .....	586,670.00	586,670.00	586,670.00	217,680.00	1,016,120.00
Lakeshore .....	3,007,325.00	1,113,565.00	1,113,565.00	1,893,760.00	1,893,760.00
North York .....	4,391,200.00	3,761,880.00	3,442,580.00	629,320.00	948,620.00
Scarborough .....	2,801,965.00	2,801,965.00	1,853,320.00	213,000.00	948,645.00
Toronto .....	52,000.00	265,000.00	188,260.00	.....	52,000.00
Weston .....	188,260.00	188,260.00	.....	.....	.....
York .....	\$ 13,537,495.00	\$ 10,866,060.00	\$ 8,534,675.00	\$ 2,671,435.00	\$ 5,002,820.00
Secondary					
Etobicoke .....	\$ 1,019,800.00	\$ 1,061,000.00	\$ 1,061,000.00	\$ 41,200.00	\$ 41,200.00
North York .....	601,000.00	47,500.00	47,500.00	553,500.00	553,500.00
Scarborough .....	1,050,000.00	1,066,500.00	1,600,500.00	16,500.00	16,500.00
Toronto .....	761,000.00	761,000.00	761,000.00	.....	500,000.00
York .....	500,000.00	416,020.00	.....	83,980.00	.....
	\$ 3,931,800.00	\$ 3,352,020.00	\$ 2,936,000.00	\$ 579,780.00	\$ 995,800.00

1956 Bulk Site Order No. 5102—\$6,000,000.00.

SUMMARY OF BULK SITE APPROVALS TO  
AUGUST 31, 1956.

Area	Public	Secondary
Etobicoke .....	\$ 370,687.37	.....
Lakeshore .....	9,770.00	.....
North York .....	509,400.00	\$ 196,784.31
Scarborough .....	616,775.00	.....
Toronto .....	2,837,400.00	67,000.00
York .....	25,000.00	70,000.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 4,369,032.37	\$ 333,784.31
		4,369,032.37
		<hr/>
		\$ 4,702,816.68
		<hr/>

REPORT No. 11 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, September 13, 1956.

At a meeting of the above-named Committee, held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Might, Power and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. The Committee had before it a communication from the Deputy Minister of Education advising that “following a discussion of the Board’s interpretation of section 126 (1) (e) of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, between officials of the Department and the Municipal Legislative Counsel, it has been agreed that for the purpose of establishing the basis of fees, under the section noted, the Metropolitan School Board might set forth the gross amount of the fees under The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, 1954, and the respective portions of such fees to be paid by the Metropolitan School Board and the sending Board.

"The General Legislative Grant Regulations for 1956 provide under regulation 18 (1) (c) (ii) for tuition fees paid by a Board or on its behalf to be included in approved cost for grant purposes.

"It would now seem that the way is clear for the Department to pay a grant on the portion of the tuition fees paid by the Metropolitan School Board on behalf of a high school district in the Metropolitan area for the education of non-resident pupils attending a school in another high school district in the Metropolitan area. It will be necessary for the Metropolitan School Board to supply such supplementary information as may be required to provide an accurate record of such payments.

"No change has been made in the procedure with respect to tuition fees for non-resident public school pupils in the Metropolitan area."

The Committee recognized that the following requirements must be met if the Board is to qualify for the additional grant:—

1. Revise both the 1955 and 1956 non-resident fee schedules to show gross fees and a breakdown indicating how much is paid by the sending board and how much by the Metropolitan School Board. (Revised Schedules are shown in Appendix "A").

2. Obtain from each local board of education a statement showing the total average daily attendance of pupils in 1955 on which it paid fees to another board in Metropolitan Toronto for 1955.

Your Committee recommends that the Board approve the revised fee schedules for 1955 and 1956, and that the Executive Secretary be authorized to obtain from the local boards of education the information referred to in 2 above and to submit the necessary request to the Department of Education in order to avoid the grant loss in 1956.

2. The Committee had before it a communication from the Royal Ontario Museum reporting on the increase during the past two years in the number of pupils in Metropolitan

Toronto who have visited the Museum and suggesting to the Superintendents of the various boards of education that they urge their classes to visit the Museum during the autumn and winter to leave the spring months free for out-of-town classes.

Your Committee referred the above-mentioned letter to the Board for information with the suggestion that area board chairmen urge their respective boards to support the Royal Ontario Museum.

3. On September 8, 1955, the Committee requested the Advisory Council to review the ceiling cost formula and to submit by November 15 any recommendations for change.

Since it is expected that most of the work on the 1957 capital estimates will take place prior to the end of 1956, your Committee recommends that the Advisory Council undertake at an early date this annual revision and that a letter be forwarded to area boards of education urging that their suggestions for change in the formula be submitted for transmission to the Council without delay.

4. The Committee had before it a communication from the Metropolitan Solicitor advising that the Highbury Development Limited has applied to the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal the decision of the Ontario Municipal Board to that Court. Previously the Ontario Municipal Board had decided in favour of a request made by the Etobicoke Board of Education, Etobicoke Township Council and Metropolitan School Board that approval of the application for subdivision by the Highbury Development Limited be withheld until the Etobicoke Board had obtained a signed Offer to Purchase for school sites located in the planned subdivision.

The Secretary reported, also, that the Legal Department of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto had advised that since appearances before the Ontario Municipal Board do not come within the regular duties of the Legal Department for which the Board is billed, there will likely be a further charge made for appearances of the Metropolitan Solicitor before the Municipal Board on behalf of the School Board.

Your Committee recommends that the Solicitor be authorized to continue to support the Board with respect to this appeal with the understanding that the Board will accept payment of extra costs involved by this support.

5. In favour of section 2 of Report No. 11 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I, dated September 11, 1956.

6. In favour of section 9 of Report of Special Summer Committee, Part I, dated September 7, 1956.

7. That Disbursement List No. 49, dated September 13, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$939,646.46 be approved. Appendix p. 354.

8. Your Committee submits for information of the Board a report from the Executive Secretary including the following four statements:

(1) A revised schedule for 1955, adjusted to actual, showing to the nearest thousand dollars the extent to which each municipality has gained or lost in terms of tax dollars as a result of the Metropolitan arrangement for schools.

(2) A similar schedule for 1956 using estimated expenditure and grant figures.

(3) A statement showing the mill rates in each of the municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto in 1954, 1955 and 1956 indicating the percentages of the total mill rate applicable to schools.

(4) A statement indicating sundry information of use in interpreting the other schedules.

GORDON F. FERGUSON,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, September 18, 1956.

---

## APPENDIX "A"

NON-RESIDENT FEES FOR 1955 (Per Pupil of A.D.A.)  
(as revised September 1956)

	Public Elementary			Academic Secondary		
	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion
East York ...	\$200.	\$150.	\$ 50.	\$337.	\$250.	\$ 87.
Etobicoke ....	190.	150.	40.	305.	250.	55.
Forest Hill ..	266.	150.	116.	381.	250.	131.
Lakeshore ....	208.	150.	58.	413.	250.	163.
Leaside .....	262.	150.	112.	358.	250.	108.
North York ..	207.	150.	57.	368.	250.	118.
Scarborough ..	181.	150.	31.	286.	250.	36.
Swansea .....	243.	150.	93.			
Toronto .....	251.	150.	101.	459.	250.	209.
Weston .....	188.	150.	38.	270.	250.	20.
York .....	215.	150.	65.	*390.	250.	140.
	Commercial Secondary			Technical Secondary		
	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion
East York ...						
Etobicoke ....						
Forest Hill ..						
Lakeshore ....	\$378.	\$300.	\$ 78.	\$472.	\$300.	\$172.
Leaside .....						
North York ..	356.	300.	56.	356.	300.	56.
Scarborough ..						
Swansea .....						
Toronto .....	499.	300.	199.	639.	300.	339.
Weston .....	429.	300.	129.	429.	300.	129.
York .....	**391.	300.	91.	391.	300.	91.

\* Includes both academic and commercial students in collegiate buildings.

\*\* For commercial students in the technical school only.

NON-RESIDENT FEES FOR 1956 (Per Pupil Day)  
(as revised September 1956)

	Public Elementary			Academic Secondary		
	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion
East York ...	1.13922	.76142	.37780	1.85382	1.27551	.57831
Etobicoke ....	1.07902	.76336	.31566	1.72005	1.27551	.44454
Forest Hill ...	1.53212	.76531	.76681	2.20127	1.28242	.91885
Lakeshore ....	1.10610	.76142	.34468	2.35258	1.27551	1.07707
Leaside .....	1.37739	.76531	.61208	2.02140	1.27551	.74589
North York ...	1.27277	.76142	.51135	2.09581	1.27551	.82030
Scarborough ...	1.16556	.76531	.40025	1.88371	1.27551	.60820
Swansea .....	1.37419	.76531	.60888			
Toronto .....	1.40831	.76336	.64495	2.58931	1.26904	1.32027
Weston .....	1.06365	.76531	.29834	1.45638	1.27551	.18087
York .....	1.13065	.76531	.36534	2.02084	1.27551	.74533
Weighted Average .....				2.19966	1.27226	.92740



	Commercial Secondary			Technical Secondary		
	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion	Total Fee	Metro Portion	Sending Board Portion
East York ...	1.85382	1.53061	.32321			
Etobicoke .....	1.89065	1.53061	.36004			
Forest Hill ...						
Lakeshore .....	2.09202	1.53061	.56141	2.53952	2.04082	.49870
Leaside .....	2.02140	1.53061	.49079			
North York ...	2.11198	1.53061	.58137	2.11198	2.04082	.07116
Scarborough ...	1.69136	1.53061	.16075	1.48885	2.04082	nil.
Swansea .....						
Toronto .....	2.62310	1.52284	1.10026	3.35884	2.03046	1.32838
Weston .....	1.87339	1.53061	.34278	2.81746	2.04082	.77664
York .....	2.07307	1.53061	.54246	2.39628	2.04082	.35546
Weighted Average .....	2.36077	1.52284	.83793	3.18397	2.03046	1.15351

## Notes:—

- (a) The 1956 schedule is subject to correction following the report of the Metropolitan Auditor.
- (b) The Metropolitan School Board is to pay the excess of the per pupil cost of the receiving board over that of the sending board if any.

# REPORT No. 6 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE—PART II

September 11, 1956.

1. On April 24, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board passed the following resolution, which was re-affirmed by the Special Summer Committee on August 28, 1956.—

“that the following attendance area, approved by the York Township Board be included in the attendance area for Hughes Public School, effective September 1, 1956:

(1) The north side of Rogers Road (from the east side of Kane Avenue to the C.N.R. tracks).

(2) The east side of Kane Avenue between Rogers Road and Kersdale Avenue.

(3) Both sides of Kersdale Avenue, between the east side of Kane Avenue and where it joins Silverthorn Avenue.

(4) Silverthorn Avenue to the north side of Aileen Avenue from Kersdale Avenue northerly to No. 405.

(5) Both sides of Aileen Avenue between Silverthorn Avenue and Blackthorn Avenue.

(6) Blackthorn Avenue north (almost to Dunraven Road) No. 432.

(7) The area on the south side of Rogers Road and south to the city limits, east from the C.N.R. Tracks to No. 189 Rogers Road.

and that the York Township Board be advised (i) that it is not within the power of an area board of education to reverse on its own decision of this nature and that any appeal to this decision should be directed to the Metropolitan School Board and considered by the Metropolitan School Board, (ii) that such appeal cannot be considered until after the commencement of school on September 4, and (iii) that the Metropolitan Solicitor be requested to provide for transmission with this resolution to the York Township Board his opinion with respect to the Metropolitan School Board's authority insofar as the establishment of attendance areas is concerned."

The Committee had before it a communication from the York Township Board of Education requesting that the matter of the extension of the Hughes Public School attendance area to include additional York Township pupils be further considered by the School Accommodation Committee and that members of the York Township Board be permitted to attend the meeting to present the views of that board.

Following consideration of the presentation made by the delegation from the York Township Board of Education and in view of the fact that the students concerned have been accommodated in York Township schools commencing September 4, your Committee recommends—

(a) that the afore-mentioned resolution of the Board dated April 24, 1956, re-affirmed by the Summer Committee, August 28, 1956, having reference to the extension of the Hughes Public School attendance area to include portions of York Township be rescinded; (Amended.)

(b) that the extension of the Hughes Public School attendance area to include portions of York Township be referred to the Advisory Council for report and recommendation;

(c) that all future applications for establishment of attendance areas be referred to the Advisory Council for study and recommendation.

2. With regard to Section 18 of the Report of the Special Summer Committee, dated September 7, 1956, regarding enrolment standards for Opportunity, Academic Vocational and Special Vocational classes, your Committee recommends that the action of the Summer Committee be referred to the Advisory Council for further consideration.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, September 18, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 11 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART II.

September 11, 1956.

1. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

North York Board of Education.

Three Valleys Drive Public School, 4 standard classrooms, kindergarten, library and ancillary space.

Estimated Cost .....	\$124,950.00
Ceiling .....	124,950.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—97.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—194.

2. That FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Regent Park Public School, 22 standard classrooms, double kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.

Metro Share .....	\$472,000.00
Local Share .....	138,050.00
Total .....	610,050.00
Ceiling .....	610,050.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—950.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—950.

3. That approval be given to the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of a public school site extension, but that the application be processed through the Metropolitan Council to the Ontario Municipal Board and not charged against the bulk site fund since the North York Council has disapproved the application on the basis of what it deems exorbitant cost:—

Bunty Lane Intermediate School Site:	Estimated Cost
1 acre .....	\$65,000.00*

Frontage on Bunty Lane, east of Bayview Avenue between Sheppard Avenue and Finch Avenue East (Bayview Village).

Date school required—January, 1958.

No. of classrooms proposed—27 plus 2 shops, 2 home economics.

\* Previously approved 5 acres at a cost of \$22,000.00, making a total of \$87,000.00.

4. The Committee had before it for consideration an application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of an addition consisting of 8 standard classrooms to the Yorkview Drive Public School, now under construction under a contract with Gardiner-Wigton Limited. The North York Board requests that approval be given to the original contractor being employed to build the addition for the following reasons:—

(a) It would be inadvisable and probably impossible to have two different firms engaged in construction on the same project at the same time, requiring close co-operation.

(b) The construction of the addition makes certain portions of the original work unnecessary or subject to alteration. It is to the Board's advantage in time and money to complete the entire project as a unit, rather than complete the original building and then destroy parts of it for the addition.

(c) Part of plans for the addition is to convert one grade classroom in the original school to a second kindergarten, and the contractor has been instructed to defer certain finishing work on that room. The present contractor is in a better position to finish the work than a new contractor. Also, the conversion could be completed and the second kindergarten put into service earlier along with 10 classrooms.

(d) The present contractor is familiar with conditions on the job and with plans and specifications which in the addition follow those of the original building.

(e) Use of the same contractor will expedite the job and there is urgent need of the complete school.

The North York Board has obtained from Gardiner-Wighton Limited a tender for the addition in the amount of \$101,825.00 which has been approved by the architects as reasonable and applies for issuance of debentures in the amount of \$123,000.00, based on the following estimate of costs:—

Contract price .....	\$101,825.00
Architect's fee .....	6,109.00
Equipment .....	12,000.00
Contingency reserve .....	3,066.00
<hr/>	
Total .....	\$123,000.00

Your Committee recommends that the application of the North York Board of Education to award the aforementioned contract for construction of an addition of 8 standard classrooms to the Yorkview Drive Public School to Gardiner-Wighton be approved. On June 18, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave approval in the amount of \$195,150.00 for the afore-mentioned project. The Committee

recommends that the application for capital funds in the amount of \$123,000.00 be approved and that this application be forwarded to the Metropolitan Council.

5. The Committee had before it for consideration a request of the North York Board of Education for permission to discontinue the operation and maintenance of the Elia Public School and to sell the land and building. The school lands consist of a parcel of 1.8 acres situated at the north-easterly cortner of Finch Avenue West and Keele Street. The property was purchased in July 1926 by the Trustees of School Section No. 18, Township of North York, for a price of \$500.00. As of January 1st, 1954, no debentures were outstanding for the capital cost of land or building to be assumed by the Metropolitan School Board.

Your Committee recommends that approval be given to the closing and sale of the Elia Public School and site. As no outstanding debentures for this property were assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation on January 1, 1954, there will be no Metropolitan share of proceeds from this sale as provided in Section 131 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953.

6. On November 30, 1955, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to the following project:—

Highland Hill Public School, 14 standard classrooms, double kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Amount ..... \$404,250.00

In a letter dated August 31, 1956, the North York Board of Education requests as follows:—

“The Board of Education now plans, if approvals are received, to construct the same school of 14 grade classrooms and double kindergarten but without the playroom-auditorium on a site owned by the Board on Elkhorn Drive, east of Bayview Street and north of Sheppard Avenue. The Board of Education therefore requests that the approvals received be retained and transferred, to be known as the Elkhorn Drive Public School.”

The ceiling formula for the new Kindergarten to Grade 6 school would remain unchanged at \$404,250.00.

Your Committee recommends that approval be given to the application of the North York Board of Education.

7. That REVISED FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:—

Gainsford Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten.

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—September 1956.

Anticipated opening enrolment—350.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—350.

8. On September 30, 1955, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to the following application of the York Township Board of Education in the amount of Metro Share—\$100,000.00; Local Share—\$286,100.00; Total—\$386,100.00:—

Rockcliffe School (to replace York Handicraft School), 5 standard classrooms, 6 shops, Gymnasium-Auditorium, Counselling Room, Lunchroom facilities.

The York Township Board of Education has revised the accommodation for Rockcliffe School and requests revised FINAL approval for the following:—

Rockcliffe School, 6 standard classrooms, 4 shops, combined gymnasium, offices, staff room, health room, store room, etc.

Metro Share .....	\$120,000.00
Local Share .....	266,100.00
Total .....	386,100.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

Date school required—September 1st, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—176.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—200.

Your Committee recommends that revised FINAL approval be given the application for Rockcliffe School.

9. In favour of sections 10 to 16 of the Report of Special Summer Committee—Part II, dated September 7, 1956.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, September 18, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 11 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, September 13, 1956.

1. On July 27, 1956, the Scarborough Board of Education submitted a request that a ruling be given whether a Separate School, with its own Board of Trustees situated 1½ miles outside the Metropolitan Toronto area, and not under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Separate School Board, can be used by that School Board to obtain Separate School taxes from assessments within the Township of Scarborough.

The School in question is St. Mary's Separate School, situated on Toyndale Road in the Township of Pickering.

The Summer Committee of the Board referred this request to the Metropolitan Solicitor for an opinion. The Committee had before it the following reply from the Solicitor:—

“By reference to subsection (1) of section 56 of The Separate Schools Act, i.e.,

“(1) Every person paying rates, whether as owner or tenant, who by himself or his agent, on or before the 15th day of July in any year, gives to the clerk of the municipality notice in writing that he is a Roman Catholic and a supporter of a separate school situate in the municipality or in a municipality contiguous thereto shall be exempt from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of public schools and of public school libraries, or for the purchase of



land or the erection of buildings for public school purposes within the city, town, village or section in which he resides, for the following year, and every subsequent year thereafter while he continues a supporter of a separate school."

"The answer to the request for this ruling from the Scarborough Board of Education is in the affirmative if the person applying "resides" within three miles in a direct line of the site of the school house (section 57) and complies with the provisions of section 56(1) herein set out."

Your Committee recommends that a copy of the letter from the Metropolitan Solicitor be forwarded to the Scarborough Board of Education together with a letter from the Executive Secretary to the effect that the Board is satisfied with the legal accuracy of the statement given by the Solicitor.

2. That the Board undertake the expenses for luncheon on two occasions when the Public School Sub-Committee of the Advisory Council, currently engaged in a study of the future needs with respect to building, staff, etc. for the education of children with orthopaedic handicaps and deaf children, would be calling upon the services of specialists in this field.

It is proposed that the Public School Sub-Committee meet with the eminent visitors from the University of Manchester, England, Drs. A. W. G. and Irene Ewing, at a noon luncheon on Wednesday, September 19. In addition it is proposed to hold a meeting to be convened through the dinner hour Wednesday, October 10, to which would be invited a number of specialists in this field active in the Toronto area.

It is understood that this would be done by a caterer on the Board premises in much the same manner as was provided for the special meetings of the Legislation and By-laws Committee.

3. That Disbursement List No. 49, dated September 13, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,965,327.60 be approved. Appendix p. 354.

4. In favour of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of Report No. 11 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II, dated September 11, 1956.

5. In favour of Section 19 of Report of Special Summer Committee, Part II, dated September 7, 1956.

GORDON F. FERGUSON,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, September 18, 1956.

---

#### REPORT OF SPECIAL SUMMER COMMITTEE.

September 7, 1956.

To the Members of the  
Metropolitan School Board:

On July 19th the School Board adopted the following resolution:

"That the following be appointed as a Special Committee to transact necessary business during the summer adjournment of the School Board, viz., Chairman of the Board, Vice-Chairman of the Board, Chairman of the School Accommodation Committee, Chairman of the Buildings and Sites Committee, Chairman of the Finance Committee, Chairman of the Legislation and By-laws Committee and Chairman of the Toronto Board of Education, and that any three of the foregoing persons be a quorum. It is understood that any action taken by the Special Committee will be reported to the first meeting of the School Board in September."

As directed by the foregoing resolution, the Special Committee begs to report as follows:—

#### PART I. MATTERS NOT EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

1. Concurred in the following comments of area boards of education in connection with subdivision plan referrals:

---

Township of Etobicoke.

T-7341 (Fourth Revision)—471 lots.

The Etobicoke Board has a signed Offer to Purchase for a public school site, as shown on plan of subdivision. Secondary students will attend Thistletown C.I. when completed in September, 1957.

T-9111 Revised—69 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School in 1956 and Stock Farms Estates Public School in 1957. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until other secondary school facilities are available.

T-9280—181 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Kingsview Village Public School (opening September 1956). Secondary students will attend Thistletown C.I. when completed in September 1957. In 1956 Grade 9 students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I. and other grades Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

T-9768—22 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Thistletown Public School. Secondary students will attend Thistletown C.I. when opened in September 1957, Burnhamthorpe C.I. (Grade 9) and Weston Collegiate and Vocational School in 1956.

T-9849—4 lots.

Public school pupils, kindergarten to grade 6, will attend Lanor Public School. Grades 7 and 8 pupils will attend Franklin Horner School. Secondary students will attend Alderwood C.I.

T-9882—32 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Albion Gardens Public School when completed. Secondary students will attend Thistletown C.I. when it opens in September, 1957.

T-9919—19 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

T-9948—100 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Albion Gardens Public School when completed. Secondary students will attend Thistletown C.I. when completed in September, 1957, Burnhamthorpe C.I. (Grade 9) and Weston Collegiate and Vocational School in 1956.

Township of North York.

T-9851—14 lots.

Pupils will attend Cornelius Parkway Public School, Gracefield Junior High School and Downsview Collegiate Institute.

T-9873—21 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Burnett Avenue Public School. Intermediate pupils will attend temporarily Gorman Park, eventually Senlac Junior High School. Secondary students will attend temporarily Earl Haig C.I., eventually Northview Heights C.I.

T-9876—1441 lots.

The Board will require two school sites, one completely within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision, the other partially within the boundaries; the proposed public school site of 5.0 acres (Block E) should be re-located further north in the vicinity of Oasis Street and approximately 5.0 acres should be located near the corner of Callahan Avenue and Indianola Road adjoining the Greenbelt area (Block F) for a junior high school. Secondary students will temporarily attend Earl Haig C.I., eventually a collegiate to be located in the north-east of the township.

T-9893—17 lots.

Pupils will attend Downsview Public School, Belmar Junior High School and Downsview Collegiate Institute.

T-9904—134 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Tumpane Public School, eventually a school to be located on Stanley Road. Secondary students will attend Downsview Collegiate. No provision has been made in the 1956 capital programme for erection of a school on Stanley Road.

T-9915—50 lots.

Pupils will attend Yorkview Drive Public School, Senlac Junior High School and Northview Heights C.I.

T-9920—71 lots.

Public school pupils will temporarily attend Melody Road Public School, eventually Gulfstream Road Public School. Intermediate pupils will temporarily attend Belmar Park, eventually Finch-Main Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

T-9937—153 lots.

The North York Board will require part of a public school site (2 to 3 acres) within the boundaries of the proposed subdivision, more specifically in the vicinity of lots 77 to 84. Junior high school students will eventually attend a school in the vicinity. Secondary students will eventually attend a collegiate to be located in the north-east of the township.

T-9955—13 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Drewry Avenue Public School. Junior High School students will eventually attend Drewry-Grantbrooke Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Northview Heights C.I.

T-9978—16 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Geo. Anderson Public School. Junior high school students will attend Gracefield Junior High School. Secondary students will attend York Memorial C.I. and George Harvey Vocational School.

T-9990—305 lots.

Public school pupils will eventually attend a school immediately north of the proposed subdivision. Junior high school students will eventually attend a school in the vicinity. Secondary students will eventually attend a collegiate in the north-east of the township.

#### Township of Scarborough.

T-9186—397 lots.

The Scarborough Board of Education will require a school site within the boundaries of this plan.

T-9570—14 lots.

Public school pupils will attend the William Treadway Public School, to be completed for September, 1956. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-9932—7 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Eastview Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-10041—83 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Poplar Road Public School when erected. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-10055—19 lots.

Public school pupils will attend a school to be erected on a site to be acquired in a adjacent subdivision (T-9532—Churchill Heights). Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-10077—187 lots.

No school site is required. Public school pupils will attend a school to be erected in the Masaryktown subdivision. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-10079—59 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Eastview Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

City of Toronto.

T-9983—13 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Roden Public School.

Secondary students will attend Riverdale C.I. (academic), Danforth Technical School (vocational) or Eastern H.S. of Commerce (commercial).

2. Concurred in the following comments of area boards of education in connection with amendments to the official plans of the municipalities concerned:

Township of Etobicoke.

Amendment No. 102—

an area at the north-west corner of Riverwood Parkway and Stephen Drive from Residential to Commercial.

---

an area on the west side of Riverwood Parkway north of Berry Road from Commercial to Residential.

Amendment No. 103—

an area on the east side of Concession Four, north of Rathburn Road from Residential to Commercial.

Amendment No. 104—

re-zoning of an area east of Highway No. 27, between Rathburn Road and Richview Side Road and lying to the west of the Mimico Creek from Residential to Commercial.

The Etobicoke Board has no objection to proposed amendments Nos. 102, 103 and 104.

Township of North York.

Amendment No. 55—

re-zoning of areas on the south side of Lawrence Avenue and the east side of Don Mills Road from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area at the north-west corner of Sheppard Avenue and Burbank Drive from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area on the north side of Cummer Avenue and the east side of Bayview Avenue from Commercial to Residential.

re-zoning of an area on the south side of Sheppard Avenue, east of Dufferin Street from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of an area on the north side of Glen Park Avenue west of Dufferin Street from Residential to Commercial.

re-zoning of areas north and south of Glengrove Avenue west of Dufferin Street from Residential to Open Space.

re-zoning of an area west of Jane Street south of Sheppard Avenue from Industrial to Residential.

The North York Board has indicated that with respect to the re-zoning of the areas on the south side of Lawrence Avenue and the east side of Don Mills Road from Residential

to Commercial, the North York Board does not approve of this re-zoning since such a re-zoning would place the commercial development, with its attendant noise and traffic adjacent to the proposed Don Mills Secondary School.

Amendment No. 57—

re-zoning of lands located at the south-west corner of Sheppard and Bathurst from Residential to Commercial.

The North York Board has no objection to proposed amendment No. 57.

City of Toronto.

Amendment No. 40—

an area bounded by Asquith Avenue, a line approximately 150 feet west of Park Road, Collier Street and Church Street east of Park Road from Residential to Commercial.

Amendment No. 45—

an area abutting the right-of-way of the C.N.R. north of Walpole Avenue and west of Woodfield Road from Industrial to Residential.

Amendment No. 43—

an area at the south-east corner of Bathurst Street and Davenport Road from Residential to Commercial.

Amendment No. 42—

an area on the south side of Yorkville Avenue, between Avenue Road and Bellair Street from Residential to Commercial.

The Toronto Board of Education has no objection to the foregoing proposed amendments.

3. Gave TENTATIVE approval to the following application for capital funds for secondary school accommodation:

Royal York Collegiate Institute, addition to cafeteria.

Estimated Cost .....	\$25,000.00
Ceiling .....	78,000.00*

\* N.B.—Net excess available from the first and second additions to Royal York C.I. is \$78,000.00.



4. FINAL approval was given to the following applications for capital funds for secondary school accommodation:—

Etobicoke Board of Education.

Royal York C.I., addition to cafeteria.

Metro share .....	Nil
Local share .....	\$ 25,000.00
Total .....	25,000.00
Ceiling .....	*78,000.00

Date addition required—January 1, 1957.

Present enrolment—1,181.

\* Balance remaining from 1st and 2nd additions.

Toronto Board of Education.

Danforth Technical School, addition of 8 drafting rooms, increased accommodation for dressing and shower rooms.

Metro share .....	\$ 160,000.00
Local share .....	516,000.00
Total .....	676,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Present enrolment—1,700.

Anticipated increase—250.

5. Approval was given to the following applications for capital funds for purchase and/or extension of secondary school sites:—

		Estimated Total Cost
North York Board of Education.		
Bathurst Heights C. & V.S. Site Extension,		
2.24 acres .....		\$ 8,000.00
northwest corner of Lawrence Avenue and Varna Drive.		
Original site .....	10.132 acres	
Extension .....	2.24 acres	
Total 12.372 acres .....		12.372 acres

---

Downsview Collegiate Institute Site, 12.5 acres	125,000.00
Less previously approved .....	60,000.00

---

This application ..... \$ 65,000.00

On Hawksdale Road north of Wilson Avenue, east of  
Keele Street.

Date school required—now built.

Toronto Board of Education.

Malvern Collegiate Institute Site Extension,  
.16 acres ..... \$ 17,000.00

50 Hannaford Street.

Required for playground purposes.

The existing site, including the school, is 2.89 acres.

6. On May 29, the School Board advised the North York Board of Education that it would approve the sale of the Westminster Parkway site to the Corporation of the Township of North York for park purposes subject to receipt of a valuation of the site and the proceeds of the sale being apportioned in accordance with Section 131 of The Metropolitan Act.

Accordingly, on July 10 the summer committee received from the North York Board of Education a valuation prepared by G. W. Cooke and Son in the amount of \$106,500.00. The Committee approved the valuation and sale of the Westminster Parkway site to the Corporation of the Township of North York in accordance with Section 131 of The Metropolitan Act.

7. On June 19 the School Board referred to the summer committee for consideration the possibility of including the Bennington Heights area (Township of East York) in the attendance area of Leaside High School in view of secondary school attendance area changes effected by the Toronto Board of Education in adjacent areas to Bennington Heights.

Following consultations with the East York, Leaside and Toronto Boards of Education the committee adopted the following motion:—

"that for the school year 1956-57, academic secondary school students from Bennington Heights district (Township of East York) shall attend Leaside High School, Jarvis C.I. or Oakwood C.I. and that commercial or technical students shall attend Northern Technical-Commercial School."

8. On July 10th, a delegation from the School Board waited upon the Honourable, the Minister of Education to present for his consideration the following problems:— (Amended.)

- (a) reduction of grants on cost of educating non-resident pupils;
- (b) maintenance payments on the basis of the average daily attendance for the current year;
- (c) method of determining the Metropolitan share and local share of capital projects.

Following the meeting the Minister of Education requested that further consultations be held with officials of the Department of Education to discuss possible ways and means of effecting the foregoing requests. Arrangements were made for further meetings with Departmental officials particularly with respect to reduction of grants payable to the Metropolitan School Board. Insofar as the maintenance assistance payments on the basis of the average daily attendance for the current year are concerned, the Committee has requested the Metropolitan Solicitor to draft a suitable amendment to the Metropolitan Act for presentation to the Department of Education.

The summer committee was not prepared to make a decision with regard to a method of determining the distribution as between Metropolitan and Local share of capital projects and so referred this matter to the Finance Committee for study.

9. Disbursement List No. 48, dated July 31, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$181,084.25 was approved for payment. (For details see Appendix "A", page 353.)

PART II. MATTERS EXCLUSIVELY AFFECTING  
PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

10. The Committee gave TENTATIVE approval to the following applications of area boards of education for capital funds for public school accommodation:—

Etobicoke Board of Education.

Lambton-Kingsway Public School, General Purpose Room.

Estimated cost .....	\$	45,000.00
Ceiling .....		64,750.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Stock Farm Estates Public School, 9 standard classrooms, Art, Science, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Auditorium-Playroom.

Estimated cost .....	\$	352,190.00
Ceiling .....		352,190.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—385.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—495.

West Humber Estates Public School, 8 standard classrooms, Auditorium-Playroom.

Estimated cost .....	\$	247,380.00
Ceiling .....		\$205,800.00
		*41,580.00
		—————
	\$	247,380.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—280.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—460.

\* 15% allowance against future addition.

North York Board of Education.

(Revised Tentative Approval) Keele-Sheppard Public School, 12 grade classrooms, kindergarten and ancillary space.

Estimated Cost .....	\$	330,750.00
Ceiling .....		330,750.00

Date school required—September 1, 1957.  
 Anticipated opening enrolment—480.  
 Anticipated maximum enrolment—480.

Scarborough Board of Education.

General Brock Public School, 8 standard classrooms, Teacher's room, Storage space for supplies.

Estimated cost .....	\$ 205,800.00
Ceiling .....	205,800.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1957.  
 Present enrolment—393.  
 Anticipated increase—323.

Mason Road Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom, usual ancillary space.

Estimated cost .....	\$ 279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—September, 1957.  
 Anticipated opening enrolment—390.  
 Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.

11. FINAL approval was given to the following applications of area boards of education for capital funds for public school accommodation:—

Etobicoke Board of Education.

Bloorlea Sr. Public School, 7 standard classrooms, Art, Library, Music, Industrial Arts, Science, Home Economics, Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 220,000.00
Local Share .....	226,250.00
Total .....	446,250.00
Ceiling .....	446,250.00

Date school required—September, 1957.  
 Anticipated opening enrolment—375.  
 Anticipated maximum enrolment—450.

Lambton-Kingsway Public School, addition to Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	Nil
Local share .....	\$ 45,000.00
Total .....	45,000.00
Ceiling .....	64,750.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Present enrolment—834.

Anticipated increase—Nil.

West Humber Estates Public School, 8 standard classrooms, Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 160,000.00
Local share .....	87,380.00
Total .....	247,380.00
Ceiling .....	*247,380.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—280.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—460 (when school enlarged).

\* includes 15% allowance for future addition.

Hilltop Public School (potential intermediate school) (formerly Stock Farm Estates), 9 standard classrooms, Science, Art, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 220,000.00
Local share .....	132,190.00
Total .....	352,190.00
Ceiling .....	352,190.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—385.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—495.

Westway Public School, 12 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 260,000.00
Local share .....	70,750.00
Total .....	330,750.00
Ceiling .....	330,750.00

Date school required—Easter, 1957.  
 Anticipated opening enrolment—480.  
 Anticipated maximum enrolment—480.

North York Board of Education.

Sheppard-Keele Public School, 12 standard classrooms,  
 kindergarten.

Metro share .....	\$ 260,000.00
Local share .....	70,750.00
Total .....	330,750.00
Ceiling .....	330,750.00

Date school required—September 1, 1957.  
 Anticipated opening enrolment—480.  
 Anticipated maximum enrolment—480.

Scarborough Board of Education.

Clairlea Public School (Addition No. 2), 4 standard class-  
 rooms.

Metro share .....	\$ 80,000.00
Local share .....	22,900.00
Total .....	102,900.00
Ceiling .....	102,900.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1957.  
 Present enrolment—774.  
 Anticipated increase—125.

C.K.E.Y. Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kinder-  
 garden, Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 220,000.00
Local share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.  
 Anticipated opening enrolment—410.  
 Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.

Dorset Park Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single  
 kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

---

Metro share .....	\$ 220,000.00
Local share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—410.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.

General Brock Public School, addition of 8 standard classrooms, Teachers' room, and storage space.

Metro share .....	\$ 160,000.00
Local share .....	45,800.00
Total .....	205,800.00
Ceiling .....	205,800.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1957.

Present enrolment—393.

Anticipated increase—323.

Gooderham Public School, 7 standard classrooms, special education class, kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 180,000.00
Local share .....	47,850.00
Total .....	227,850.00
Ceiling .....	227,850.00

Date school required—September 1, 1956.

Anticipated opening enrolment—310.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—320.

Mason Road Public School, 10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom, ancillary space.

Metro share .....	\$ 220,000.00
Local share .....	59,300.00
Total .....	279,300.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—390.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.



Watford Heights Public School, 9 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, Auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$ 200,000.00
Local share .....	53,575.00
Total .....	253,575.00
Ceiling .....	253,575.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—338.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—375.

West Hill Public School, Industrial Arts, Home Economics.

Metro share .....	Nil
Local share .....	\$ 40,000.00
Total .....	40,000.00
Ceiling .....	40,000.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1956.

Present enrolment—358.

Anticipated increase—10.

Toronto Board of Education.

Park Public School (Convert to Senior School), Double Gymnasium, Remodel 12 existing rooms.

Metro share .....	Nil
Local share .....	\$ 241,920.00
Total .....	241,920.00
Ceiling .....	313,777.00

Date addition required—December, 1956.

Present enrolment—1,140.

Anticipated increase—240 Senior pupils.

Sunny View School, 6 standard classrooms, Therapeutic Pool.

Metro share .....	\$ 120,000.00
Local share .....	64,000.00
Total .....	184,000.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

Date addition required—December, 1956.

Present enrolment—260.

Anticipated increase—60 plus.

12. That application has been made to the Metropolitan Council and the Ontario Municipal Board for a further bulk site order in the amount of \$2,000,000.00. The previous bulk site order was exhausted during the summer months. However, even with approval of the additional order the total amount will be less than that included in the School Board's composite estimates for 1956 for site purchases.

13. That approval was given to the following applications for capital funds for purchase of school sites or extension to existing sites:—

	Estimated Total Cost
North York Board of Education.	
Brian Drive Public School Site:	
5.2 acres .....	\$ 12,000.00
On east side of extension of Brian Drive south from plan 3312. North of Sheppard Avenue between Victoria Park Avenue and Woodbine Avenue.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
Number of Classrooms proposed—6 and kindergarten.	
Lawrence Heights Public School Site:	
5.046 acres .....	\$ 12,400.00
Frontage on Flemington Road. North of Lawrence Avenue between Bathurst Street and proposed Spadina Road extension.	
Date school required—September, 1957.	
Number of Classrooms proposed—16 plus kindergarten.	
Sheppard Avenue-Bayview Street Public School Site:	
5.3 acres .....	\$ 68,000.00

	Estimated Total Cost
On Elkhorn Drive, east of Bayview Street north of Sheppard Avenue.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
Number of Classrooms—14 plus kinder- garten.	
Sheppard Avenue-Keele Street Public School Site:	
6.21 acres .....	\$ 84,000.00
On the north side of Sheppard Avenue, 250 feet west of Keele Street.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
Number of Classrooms proposed—12 plus kindergarten.	
Stanley Road Public School Site:	
5.3 acres .....	\$ 45,000.00
On Stanley Road, west of Jane Street, north of Sheppard Avenue.	
Date school required—Probably Septem- ber, 1958.	
Number of Classrooms proposed—not yet known.	
Underhill Drive Public School Site EAST:	
5 acres .....	\$ 26,000.00
On Underhill Drive at Fordsham Crescent in Victoria Park subdivision. West of Victoria Park Avenue south of C.P.R.	
Date school required—September, 1958, if development proceeds.	

	Estimated Total Cost
Number of Classrooms proposed—10 plus kindergarten.	
Underhill Drive Public School Site WEST: 3.5 acres .....	\$ 16,000.00
On Underhill Drive at Sweeney Road, west of Victoria Park Avenue north of C.P.R.	
Date school required—Possibly September, 1957, if house construction proceeds this year as planned.	
Number of Classrooms proposed—6 plus kindergarten.	
Scarborough Board of Education:	
Guildwood Village Public School Site: 6 acres .....	\$ 42,000.00
East of Livingston Road, south of C.N.R., north of Eglinton Avenue East, west of Galloway Road.	
Date school required—September 1, 1957.	
Number of Classrooms proposed—8 plus kindergarten and auditorium-playroom.	
Toronto Board of Education.	
Garden Avenue Junior School Site: Additional funds re purchase of 1.4 acres (see application dated March 14, 1955) .....	\$ 74,000.00
Regent Park Public School Site: Approximately 4 acres; Carlton Street, 29 lots; Gifford Street, 35 lots; 6 miscellaneous properties .....	\$ 818,000.00

Date school required—1957.

Number of Classrooms proposed—22 classrooms, 2 junior kindergartens, double kindergarten, general purpose room.

14. On November 22, 1955, the School Board gave FINAL approval to an application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for Chine Drive Public School, in the amount of \$150,675.00. The Scarborough Board submitted a capital funds request in the amount of \$168,710.00 following receipt of tenders for this school and requested that the ceiling allowance for the project (\$150,675.00) be increased by an amount of 15 per cent. against a future five-room addition. Following a review of the data supporting the need for a future addition, the Committee approved the request of the Scarborough Board. The revised ceiling will be \$169,968.75.

15. In 1955 the School Board gave approval to an application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for King Edward School in the amount of \$770,000.00 which amount was included in the composite capital estimates of the School Board for 1956. (The ceiling formula for the project at that time was \$1,039,600.00.) However, due to a revision in the plans the ceiling formula for the project is now \$1,095,150.00 and following receipt of tenders the Toronto Board submitted an application for capital funds in the amount of \$1,161,056.00, of which \$65,906.00 will be paid from current funds of the Toronto Board.

Since the application for capital funds is \$325,150.00 in excess of the amount included in the capital estimates, the Committee approved the application for King Edward Public School in the amount of \$1,095,150.00 on the understanding that the Toronto Board will defer seeking final approval of the Jesse Ketchum Public School application (\$345,230.00) until early 1957, if it be ascertained that there are insufficient funds available in the Metropolitan School Board's estimates originally appropriated for other area boards of education.

16. On August 9, the Etobicoke Board of Education submitted an application for capital funds for erection of

Etienne Brule School (Park Lawn relief school) in the amount of \$265,155.00. Tentative approval of the Ontario Municipal Board was given in the amount of \$227,850.00 being the ceiling formula for a school consisting of 8 standard classrooms and single kindergarten. The application from the Etobicoke Board indicated that the excess cost over the ceiling formula approved by the Metropolitan School Board results from two factors, (i) necessity of providing piling for school building due to soil conditions, and (ii) provision of a double kindergarten rather than a single kindergarten unit as approved by the Metropolitan School Board. The Committee reviewed data submitted by the Etobicoke Board supporting the need for a double kindergarten but, in the opinion of the Committee, the data submitted did not indicate with sufficient emphasis the necessity for a double kindergarten in the near future.

Accordingly, the Committee gave revised FINAL approval to the application in the amount of \$244,185.00, being the original ceiling formula of \$227,850.00 plus an allowance of \$16,335.00 required for piling.

17. During the summer adjournment of the School Board, the York Township Board of Education requested the School Board to rescind its approval of the extension of the Hughes Public School attendance area (Toronto) incorporating a section of the Township of York for public school purposes. The special committee was unable to approve the request of the York Township Board and subsequently the York Township Board advised the special committee that as of September 4, York Township pupils included in the extended Hughes Public School attendance area would be accommodated in York Township Schools.

In its consideration of this matter, the special committee invited the Chairman of the York Township Board of Education and the Superintendents of Public Schools for York Township and Toronto to attend committee meetings. Following discussion of the problem, the special committee, at its meeting on August 28, adopted the following motion:—

“that the committee re-affirm a previous decision of the School Board dated April 24, 1956, viz.,

"that the following attendance area, approved by the York Township Board be included in the attendance area for Hughes Public School, effective September 1, 1956:—

- "(1) the north side of Rogers Road (from the east side of Kane Avenue to the C.N.R. tracks.)
- (2) The east side of Kane Avenue between Rogers Road and Kersdale Avenue.
- (3) both sides of Kersdale Avenue, between the east side of Kane Avenue and where it joins Silverthorn Avenue.
- (4) Silverthorn Avenue to the north side of Aileen Avenue from Kersdale Avenue northerly to No. 405.
- (5) Both sides of Aileen Avenue between Silverthorn Avenue and Blackthorn Avenue.
- (6) Blackthorn Avenue north (almost to Dunraven Road) No. 432.
- (7) The area on the south side of Rogers Road and south to the city limits, east from the C.N.R. tracks to No. 189 Rogers Road.

and that the York Township Board be advised (i) that it is not within the power of an area board of education to reverse on its own a decision of this nature and that any appeal to this decision should be directed to the Metropolitan School Board and considered by the Metropolitan School Board, (ii) that such appeal cannot be considered until after the commencement of school on September 4, and (iii) that the Metropolitan Solicitor be requested to provide for transmission with this resolution to the York Township Board his opinion with respect to the Metropolitan School Board's authority insofar as the establishment of attendance areas is concerned."

18. When the School Board approved reimbursement of the operating costs of opportunity, academic vocational and special vocational classes the following resolution was also adopted:

"That reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board shall also be conditional upon an area board's willingness to conform to the enrolment standard set forth below:

- (i) Opportunity classes, *16* plus or minus 4 pupils.
- (ii) Academic Vocational classes, *20* plus or minus 4 pupils.
- (iii) Special Vocational classes, *20* plus or minus 4 pupils.

The enrolment of less than the number in italics above will be approved where there is a concentration of special problem cases or where the geography of the area makes it impossible to support the larger class."

At its meeting held on July 17th, the Committee had before it for information a list of special classes operated by area boards of education in which enrolments for the major part of the period January to June, 1956, were either below or above the limits set by the foregoing resolution.

Since the conditions enunciated in the resolution of the School Board appear to be restrictive the Committee recommended to the Board that the minimum enrolments be revised as follows:—

- (i) Opportunity classes, not less than 10 pupils.
- (ii) Academic Vocational classes, not less than 15 pupils.
- (iii) Special Vocational classes, not less than 15 pupils.

The Committee also directed that payments for all special education classes approved by the School Board be made as previously decided upon.

19. Disbursement List No. 48, dated July 31, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$831,469.02 was approved for payment. (For details of list see Appendix "A", page 353.)

GORDON F. FERGUSON,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, September 18, 1956.



## APPENDIX "A".

## DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 48.

July 31, 1956.

## PART I.

1. Auxiliary Class Costs, January 1 to June 30, 1956 payment—Secondary .....	\$ 169,715.15
ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.	
2. Advisory Council, expense allowances May and June, \$480.00; honorariums May and June, \$1,920.00 .....	\$ 2,400.00
3. Automatic Cartage and Delivery, general expense .....	3.00
4. Bell Telephone Company Ltd., June service, \$85.95; July service, \$86.10 .....	172.05
5. Canadian Linen Company Ltd., June service .....	10.00
6. Carswell Company Limited, Minutes, May 15, \$287.00; Minutes, May 29, \$241.00 ...	528.00
7. Dominion Maintenance Company, June service .....	85.00
8. Gainsborough Kitchens Ltd., June meeting expense .....	12.50
9. Mr. G. L. Gray, editorial assistance, March 6 to June 15 .....	60.00
10. Marchant Calculators Limited, yearly maintenance service for machine .....	34.00
11. New York Window Cleaning Co., July service .....	12.00
12. Ontario Association of School Business Officials, convention expenses .....	93.00
13. Ontario Towel Supply Company, May service .....	10.00
14. Orange Crush Limited, meeting expense ...	7.87
15. Remington Rand Limited, supplies .....	1.50
16. T. Sanderson & Sons, supplies .....	22.00
17. Staff salaries, pay period June 1 to June 14, 1956, \$1,405.73; June 15 to June 28, 1956, \$1,405.73; June 29 to July 12, 1956, \$1,405.73; July 13 to July 26, 1956, \$1,405.73 .....	5,622.92

---

18. Staff expense allowances, June .....	70.00
19. Stainton & Evis Limited, supplies .....	10.00
20. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, building rental, June 15 to July 14, \$1,087.50; July 15 to August 14, \$1,087.50 .....	2,175.00
21. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, May serv- ice, \$19.72; June service, \$20.54 .....	40.26
	<hr/>
	\$ 181,084.25
	<hr/>

## PART II.

1. Auxiliary Class costs, January 1 to June 30, 1956 payment, public .....	<hr/>
	\$ 831,469.02
	<hr/>

## DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 49.

September 13, 1956.

## PART I.

1. Maintenance assistance payments, due September, 1956, SECONDARY .....	\$ 930,674.25
---	---------------

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

2. Bell Telephone Company Limited, August service .....	\$ 80.65
3. Canadian Linen Company Limited, July service, \$10.00; August service, \$10.00 ...	20.00
4. Canadian National Telegraphs, conven- tion expense .....	1.78
5. The Carswell Company Limited, printing Minutes, June 19, \$195.50; Binders for Minutes, \$113.85 .....	309.35
6. Cleanol Services Limited, cleaning drapes and washing of walls .....	202.50
7. H. E. Dean & Son, flowers (Mr. McCordic)	5.00
8. Dominion Maintenance Company, July service, \$85.00; August service, \$85.00	170.00
9. Mr. N. Hutton, area school surveys .....	146.00

## Appendix.

355

10. International Business Machines Co., supplies, \$26.00; maintenance and repairs to typewriters, \$26.60 .....	52.60
11. Jacobson, Lipson & Richmond, July parking, \$50.00; August 1 to 14 parking, \$22.58 .....	72.58
12. Hugh C. MacLean Publications Ltd., 3 year subscription to MacLean Building Guide .....	9.00
13. C. H. Munn Co. Ltd., supplies .....	97.14
14. New York Window Cleaning Co., cleaning windows .....	12.00
15. Orange Crush Limited, meeting expenses ...	1.85
16. Petty Cash, supplies, \$12.61; meeting expense, \$19.57; miscellaneous expense, \$17.96 .....	50.14
17. Receiver General of Canada, postage stamps .....	56.00
18. Staff expense allowances, August .....	70.00
19. Staff salaries, July 27 to August 9, 1956, \$1,405.73; August 10 to August 23, 1956, \$1,405.73; August 24 to September 6, 1956, \$1,448.45 .....	4,259.91
20. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, building rental, August 15 to September 14 .....	1,087.50
21. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, July service .....	17.38
22. Trustees' expense allowances, 2nd instalment, May 1 to August 31, 1956 .....	2,200.00
23. Van Nes Flowers, flowers (the late Mr. Temple) .....	15.00
24. Workmen's Compensation Board, 1956 payment .....	35.83
	\$ 939,646.46

## PART II.

1. Maintenance assistance payments, due September, 1956, PUBLIC .....	\$ 1,965,327.60
---	-----------------



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 12 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE PART I.

Tuesday, October 9, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Lockhart, Milgram, Van Esterik, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—Amended.

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendments to the Official Plan of the Etobicoke Township Planning Area:—

Amendment No. 106—

re-zoning of an area west from Mimico Creek to the Township boundary, north from H.E.P.C. line almost to C.N.R. tracks from rural area to Industrial.

Amendment No. 107—

re-zoning of an area at the northwest corner of Bloor Street and Humber Boulevard from Residential to Commercial.

The Etobicoke Board has no objection to the above proposed amendments.

2. That the Board concur in the comments of area boards of education with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

Township of Etobicoke.

T-10034—3 lots.

Grades Kindergarten to 6 will attend Lanor Public School. Grades 7 and 8 will attend Franklin Horner Senior School. Secondary students will attend Alderwood C.I.

T-10037—43 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

\*While Humber Heights Public School is over-crowded at the moment, it is proposed that the Hilltop Senior Public School will serve this area and bring relief.

T-10060—50 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Rosethorn Public School. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I.

\*While Rosethorn Public School is over-crowded portable accommodation is being used.

T-10109—107 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Humber Heights Public School until a school is built on the Chapman Site. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until accommodation is available within Etobicoke Township.

T-10166—17 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Hilltop Senior Public School when opened in September, 1957. Secondary students will attend Etobicoke C.I. or Weston Collegiate and Vocational School until the new secondary school is opened at Richview-Islington.

\*Hilltop Senior School will temporarily serve grades K-8.

T-10178—14 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Rexdale Public School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School (Grade 9—Burnhamthorpe C.I.) for 1956-57; Thistletown C.I. in September, 1957.

\*The permanent accommodation at Rexdale Public School is over-crowded, therefore 3 portable units are being used for this school term.

T-10180—13 lots.

Industrial development.

---

Town of Leaside.

## T-8521 (Third Revision)—Multiple Dwellings.

Two public school sites will be required (Blocks S and V) 8.0 and 6.01 acres. The Leaside Board is considering an option on the above school sites, but believes that the development will take some time to get under way and to complete. They propose wherever possible to handle the pupils residing in the development in the present public and high school buildings in Leaside.

To begin with it is proposed to have secondary school students from the above area to attend the present Leaside H.S. should accommodation be available. Should it not be available, either an addition to same will have to be built, or accommodation will be requested at the neighbouring York Mills and Don Mills Collegiates.

\*No provision has been made in the 1956 estimates for the purchase of the school sites or construction of school accommodation. No permanent accommodation could be provided before 1958.

## Township of North York.

## T-9859—22 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Pelmo Park P.S. Intermediate pupils will eventually attend Gracefield Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Weston Collegiate and Vocational School.

## T-10008—46 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Downsview P.S. Intermediate pupils will eventually attend Belmar Junior High School. Secondary students will attend Downsview C.I.

## T-10251—14 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Blythwood Public School in Toronto. Secondary students will attend Toronto secondary schools.

## Township of Scarborough.

## T-9987—9 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ionview Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-10128—110 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Meadowvale Public School. Secondary students will attend West Hill C.I.

T-10176—7 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Ionview Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-10184—10 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Hunter's Glen Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-10184 Revised—23 lots.

Public school pupils will attend Hunter's Glen Public School. Secondary students will attend Winston Churchill C.I.

T-10226—25 lots.

Public school pupils will attend J. G. Workman Public School. Secondary students will attend W. A. Porter Memorial C.I.

\*Comments of Executive Secretary.

3. That approval be given to the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds with respect to the purchase of a secondary school site extension:—

Downsview C.I. Site Extension, 12 acres (total), on Hawksdale Road north of Wilson Avenue, east of Keele Street.

Estimated Total Cost .....	\$130,300.00
Less previously approved .....	125,000.00
<hr/>	
This application .....	\$ 5,300.00

Date School required—Now built.

No. of Classrooms proposed—40.

4. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds:—



Maintenance Shop and Warehouse-Properties and buildings known as 180 and 182 Norseman Street.

Estimated Cost ..... \$ 66,795.00

(20% of the foregoing capital expenditure will be chargeable to the secondary school account and 80% to the public school account.)

5. That tentative and final approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for additional capital funds, subject to receipt of approval by the local council:—

Alderwood Collegiate.

Metro Share .....	Nil
Local Share .....	\$ 22,000.00
Total .....	22,000.00

The original approval for Alderwood C.I. was \$850,000.00. The actual cost of the school to September 27, 1956, is \$872,000.00. The ceiling formula for the Alderwood C.I. is \$918,000.00.

6. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following applications of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of intermediate school accommodation:—

Ledbury Park Junior High School, addition of 11 standard classrooms, 2 industrial arts, 2 home economics, double gymnasium, cafeteria, guidance rooms and ancillary space—plus conversion of existing accommodation for use as junior high school facilities.

Estimated Cost .....	\$662,000.00
Ceiling .....	662,000.00

Anticipated opening enrolment—985.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—1,085.

Highland Hill Intermediate School, 27 standard classrooms, 2 Home Economics, 2 Industrial Arts, double gymnasium, offices, cafeteria, guidance rooms, staff rooms, and storage.

---

Estimated Cost .....	\$1,139,250.00
Ceiling .....	1,139,250.00

Date school required—September 1958.

Anticipated opening enrolment—769.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—1,085.

7. The Committee also had before it for consideration the following application of the North York Board of Education for intermediate school accommodation.—

Bunty Lane Intermediate School, 27 Standard classrooms, 2 Home Economics, 2 Industrial Arts, double gymnasium, offices, cafeteria, guidance rooms, staff rooms, storage.

Estimated Cost .....	\$1,139,250.00
Ceiling .....	1,139,250.00

Date school required—September 1958.

Anticipated opening enrolment—822.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—1,085.

In a review of the accommodation requirements for the area to be served by the Bunty Lane Intermediate School, it was noted that a considerable number of vacant classrooms would result in the junior public schools which will feed the intermediate school. Accordingly, the Committee referred the application to the North York Board for further review with particular reference to the matter of surplus junior school accommodation.

8. That revised FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for new secondary school accommodation subject to further information regarding the \$27,294.00 requested for extra costs involved because of the unique features of the Thistletown School Site being made available for the next meeting of the School Board. It was understood that the Etobicoke Board would be advised regarding the adjusted balance between the secondary and public school accounts in the Board's 1956 capital estimates due to this application—Amended.

Thistletown C.I., 12 standard classrooms Art, Music, 2 Science Labs, Library, 2 Home Economics, 2 Shops, Typing Room, double gymnasium, Cafeteria.

---

Metro Share .....	\$ 360,000.00
Local Share .....	737,844.00
Total .....	1,097,844.00*
Ceiling .....	918,000.00
*Includes:—30% against future addition—\$152,550.00.	
Allowance for site conditions—\$27,294.00.	

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Amended as follows:

1. By adding the following as sub-section (b) of section 1:—

“That the Board concur in the comments of the North York Board of Education with respect to the following proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the North York Township Planning Area with the exception of the last sentence of the comment:—

Amendment No. 48—

re-zoning of an area of the proposed extension of Highway 400 immediately north of the northern boundary of the Township of York from Greenbelt to Open Space.

re-zoning of an area east of the proposed Highway 400 extension immediately south of Flamborough Road from Greenbelt to Residential.

Comment of North York Board of Education:

“The North York Board has indicated that it has no objection to proposed Amendment No. 48. However, the Board feels that Greenbelt areas should be preserved rather than developed as residential areas.”

2. By deleting section 8 having reference to Thistletown C.I. and substituting the following therefor:

8.(a) That revised FINAL approval be given to the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education:—

Thistletown C.I., 12 standard classrooms, Art, Music, 2 Science Labs, Library, 2 Home Economics, 2 Shops, Typing Room, double gymnasium, cafeteria.

---

Metro Share .....	\$ 360,000.00
Local Share .....	710,550.00
Total .....	1,070,550.00
Ceiling .....	\$918,000.00
	144,496.00*
	8,054.00**
	<hr/> \$1,070,550.00

\*Portion of 30% allowance against future addition.

\*\*Special allowance for site conditions.

(b) that since the Chairman of the Etobicoke Board of Education has indicated that Hilltop Senior Public School will not likely be proceeded with before 1957, the Etobicoke Board be requested to withdraw their application for Hilltop Senior Public School should such withdrawal be necessary in order that the Etobicoke Board stay within the amount included in the Metropolitan School Board's 1956 capital estimates.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, October 16, 1956.

---

#### REPORT No. 12 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, October 11, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Long, Might, Power and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. The Parking Authority of Toronto which recently acquired the parking area on Holly Street used by tenants of 10 Eglinton Avenue East has indicated that arrangements will be made for the parking of cars of members of the School Board and members of the Advisory Council for their regular meetings, and employees of the School Board on Municipal Carpark No. 29 located on Holly Street, immediately south of Eglinton Avenue East. The Authority

has indicated that it will be pleased to implement the following arrangements:

- (a) Three spaces on a monthly basis, with the privilege of increasing this number to five if required.
- (b) Billing privilege for spaces used by Board members and members of the Board's Advisory Council at their regular meetings. It was agreed that this might be accomplished in the following way: each authorized member as defined above would carry a certificate issued by the Metropolitan School Board, and a complete list of authorized users with the description of car and licence would be furnished to the attendant on the parking lot.

(Authorized users will be given time-stamped parking tag and allowed to park without deposit. The user will enter his signature on the parking tag and transfer same to the attendant on claiming his car. Parking tags so designated would be accumulated and billed for on a monthly basis together with the bill for the three spaces previously referred to.)

Your Committee recommends that the Executive Secretary be authorized to complete the necessary arrangements to give effect to the foregoing.

3. The Metropolitan Solicitor has advised that the Highbury Developments Limited entered an appeal before the Court of Appeal on October 4 but that the Court reserved judgment on the appeal. The appeal was entered against a decision upholding the right of the Township of Etobicoke to refuse approval of the plan of subdivision of Highbury Developments Limited until such time as the Etobicoke Board of Education has made satisfactory arrangements with the owners of the land for acquisition of the necessary school sites.

4. At its meeting of June 19th, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board adopted the following recommendation of the Finance Committee regarding non-resident fees:

"That billings based on these fees be made by the receiving board to the sending board at the lower of the send-

ing board or receiving board's fee multiplied by the actual aggregate attendance of the pupils concerned for the period covered by the billing and that the Metropolitan School Board be billed by the receiving board for the excess of the receiving board's fee over the sending board's fee where such excess exists."

Subsequently the Metropolitan Solicitor made the following observation relative to this proposal:—

"It is my opinion therefore that while the School Board may increase its maintenance assistance payments in accordance with the provisions of the above amendments, it cannot be done except in accordance with subsection 1 of section 125, i.e., on the average daily attendance during the preceeding year."

In view of the opinion of the Metropolitan Solicitor, the Committee recommends that payments to receiving boards in 1957 be based on the 1956 attendance of non-resident pupils, and that area boards of education be advised that the payments for the non-resident pupils will be made early in January 1957.

5. Your Committee had before it for information a copy of a communication from the North York Board of Education addressed to the Associate Deputy Minister of National Defence, indicating that the R.C.A.F. Downsview School Board has been dissolved effective from September 1, 1956. The communication also indicated that, on the understanding that the Federal properties and the parents of the children are assessed and pay taxes for school purposes or that taxes are paid on behalf of the parents, for school purposes, the Township of North York and the school boards concerned have become responsible for the education of these children. By resolution, the North York Board on September 13, 1956, approved the assumption of normal responsibility for the education of children residing on the Downsview Airport.

The Committee recommends:

I. that the Department of Education be requested—

- (a) to confirm the dissolution of the Downsview R.C.A.F. School Board,

- (b) to give assurances that pupils resident on the Crown lands known as Downsview R.C.A.F. station qualify as resident pupils within the definition of Section 114(e) of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act,
- (c) that in the event that pupils are resident pupils that legislative grants will be paid on the same basis as for all other pupils in North York Township.

II. that the Assessment Commissioner apprise the School Board of the present assessment of the Crown lands comprising the Downsview R.C.A.F. station and be requested to advise the School Board as to whether the assessment is equitable having regard for all other assessment in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

III. that the Executive Secretary communicate with the North York Board of Education acknowledging receipt of the communication in which is set forth the North York Board's decision with respect to assumption of the normal responsibility for the education of children residing on the Downsview Airport and request that in view of the Metropolitan School Board's financial involvement that the following additional information be furnished relative to this change:—

- (a) the sum and proposed distribution of any annual grant in lieu of taxes agreed to by the Federal Government;
- (b) the sum and disposition of any special grants being made by the Federal Government with respect to the change; and
- (c) the number of public elementary, separate elementary pupils in the Township of North York and the number of public elementary and separate elementary pupils resident on Downsview R.C.A.F. station and the number of secondary school students resident on Downsview R.C.A.F. station and the number of public elementary pupils resident on Downsview R.C.A.F. station who are enrolled in special education classes.

IV. that the Executive Secretary secure from the Metropolitan Solicitor an opinion relative to the legal obligations

of the School Board with respect to pupils resident on the Downsview R.C.A.F. station.

6. Your Committee begs to report receipt of the following audited 1955 average daily attendance of area boards of education submitted by the Metropolitan Auditor and recommends that the audited figures as shown below be approved as the basis for 1956 maintenance assistance payments. It is further recommended that area boards of education be requested to confirm the correctness of the 1955 average daily attendance audit.

	Public	Academic	Com- mercial	Techni- cal
East York:				
Per Estimates .....	7,175.02	1,473.71	177.93	
Per Audit .....	7,174.83	1,473.58	177.93	
Etobicoke:				
Per Estimates .....	12,347.02	1,986.96	200.97	
Per Audit .....	12,347.02	1,986.97	200.98	
Forest Hill:				
Per Estimates .....	1,965.35	812.17	17.90	
Per Audit .....	1,966.53	865.00	18.20	
Lakeshore:				
Per Estimates .....	3,560.14	602.21	223.97	190.62
Per Audit .....	3,558.64	602.21	223.97	190.62
Leaside:				
Per Estimates .....	2,075.56	757.65	16.24	
Per Audit .....	2,074.82	757.65	16.24	
North York:				
Per Estimates .....	19,753.66	2,069.53	485.40	149.88
Per Audit .....	19,752.51	2,069.53	485.42	149.89
Scarborough:				
Per Estimates .....	15,608.48	1,882.80	246.40	68.63
Per Audit .....	15,646.09	1,533.66	522.42	154.82
Swansea:				
Per Estimates .....	690.26			
Per Audit .....	689.71			



	Public	Academic	Com- mercial	Techni- cal
Toronto:				
Per Estimates .....	55,160.55	7,675.80	3,846.06	5,222.95
Per Audit .....	55,159.67	7,676.19	3,846.06	5,222.78
Weston:				
Per Estimates .....	1,213.31	652.17	272.67	171.79
Per Audit .....	1,213.99	653.72	272.47	171.79
York:				
Per Estimates .....	11,472.49	2,060.63	612.67	404.31
Per Audit .....	11,349.34	2,060.01	615.30	404.55
Totals—All Boards of Education in the Metropolitan Area.				
Per Estimates .....	131,021.84	19,973.63	6,100.21	6,208.18
Per Audit .....	130,933.15	19,678.52	6,378.99	6,291.45
Total Secondary:				
Per Estimates .....		32,282.02		
Per Audit .....		32,348.96		

7. Your Committee had before it for consideration a request of the Summer Committee, referred by the School Board on September 18, that consideration be given to determining an alternative method of distributing the capital costs of projects as between Metropolitan and Local Shares.

The Committee has requested the Advisory Council to give study to the foregoing and to submit a report thereon to the Committee. In addition, the Committee requested the Chairman of the Board to appoint a small committee to wait upon the Metropolitan Chairman, the Metropolitan Solicitor, and the Commissioner of Finance in regard to this matter.

8. That Disbursement List No. 50, dated October 11, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$935,713.99, be approved, see Appendix p. 380.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, October 16, 1956.

REPORT OF JOINT MEETING OF CHAIRMEN'S  
COMMITTEE AND FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Tuesday, October 11, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-mentioned Committees, held this day, the following members being present, viz, Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Long, Might, Morton, Power and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. The Board's By-laws require that the Advisory Council be appointed not later than November 1st in each year. It has become the practice for the Chairmen's Committee to make the recommendations for these appointments, the recommendations to be subject to review by the Finance Committee. Accordingly, a joint meeting of the two Committees was held for this purpose.

The Committee had before it the recommendations re composition of the Advisory Council adopted by the Board December 13, 1955. It also had before it certain observations relative to the composition of Council respectfully filed by the Council.

After careful study of the recommendations contained therein, the Committee recommends that the proposal set forth in the aforementioned decision of the Board dated December 13, 1955, be not followed and recommends that the Advisory Council for the term November 1, 1956 to October 31, 1957, be as follows:

Name	Position	Board
Mr. H. M. Brownlee	Business Administrator	North York
Mr. D. L. Emond	Business Administrator	Etobicoke
Mr. C. H. R. Fuller	Business Administrator	Toronto
Mr. A. G. Gillespie	Supt. of Public Schools	Lakeshore
Dr. C. C. Goldring	Director of Education	Toronto
Mr. D. M. Graham	Director of Education	Forest Hill
Mr. R. H. King	Director of Education	Scarborough
Dr. F. W. Minkler	Director of Education	North York
Mr. J. R. H. Morgan	Supt. of Secondary Schools	Toronto
Mr. D. A. Morrison	Business Administrator	East York
Mr. Z. S. Phimster	Supt. of Public Schools	Toronto
Dr. K. F. Prueter	Supt. of Public Schools	Etobicoke

and further, that the Executive Secretary be instructed to secure the permission of the Etobicoke Board of Education for Dr. Prueter's re-appointment to the Advisory Council after an absence of two years.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, October 16, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 12 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, October 9, 1956.

1. That approval be given to the following applications for capital funds for purchase of public sites:

Estimated  
Total Cost

Etobicoke Board of Education.

Hilltop Senior Public School Site:

9.686 acres. Fronts on Trehorne Drive and flanks on Royal York Road .....	\$ 59,000.00
Date School required—September, 1957.	
No. of classrooms proposed — 13.	

Flagstaff Public School Site:

6 acres. Kearney Crescent lying west of Martin Grove Road and north of Rex- dale Boulevard (Flagstaff Heights Sub- division—T-7669) .....	23,000.00
Date school required—January, 1958	
No. of classrooms proposed—8.	

Lebovic (Shields) Public School Site Extension:

1,200 square feet (to square off part of a school site already purchased) .....	5,566.50
Date school required—January, 1958.	
No. of classrooms proposed—	

	Estimated Total Cost
Thistletown Public School Site Extension:	
Two parcels approximately .6 acre and .3 acre on Islington Avenue .....	6,302.55
The original site comprised only 2.7 acres.	

North York Board of Education.

Calico Drive Public School Site:	
4 acres. On east side of Calico Drive, south of Sheppard Avenue, east of Jane Street	20,000.00

Date school required—depends on subdivision progress.  
No. of classrooms proposed—approximately 8.

2. On March 23, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to the following application for capital funds for new school accommodation:

Toronto Board of Education.

Wellesley Public School—16 standard classrooms, kindergarten, auditorium-playroom.

Metro share .....	\$340,000.00
Local share .....	57,000.00
Total .....	397,000.00
Ceiling .....	433,650.00

The Toronto Board of Education has submitted an application for funds in the amount of \$433,650.00. A breakdown of the costs for this project is as follows:

Contract price .....	\$448,113.00
Architect's fee .....	33,890.00
Equipment .....	19,200.00
Contingency .....	12,000.00
Total .....	\$513,203.00*

\* The Toronto Board proposes to provide the excess funds required over the ceiling formula, i.e., \$79,553.00 from current revenues. Final Departmental approval for this project is in the amount of \$352,000.00 which leaves a local share of \$81,650.00.

The Toronto Board has also submitted the following list of tenders received for construction of Wellesley Public School:

C. A. Smith Contracting Co. ....	\$438,682.00
Dell Construction Company .....	448,113.00
Olmstead & Parker Construction Co. ....	461,500.00
Teagle & Son .....	476,400.00

Since the tender of C. A. Smith Contracting Company, the lowest received, had conditions that the Toronto Board of Education were not willing to accept the Toronto Board awarded the contract to the second lowest tenderer, i.e., Dell Construction Company in the amount of \$448,113.00.

Your Committee recommends that approval be given to the revised application of the Toronto Board of Education.

3. That TENTATIVE approval be given to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:

Maryvale Public School (Addition No. 1):

6 standard classrooms, auditorium-playroom.	
Estimated cost .....	\$154,350.00
Ceiling .....	154,350.00
Date addition required—September 1, 1957.	
Present enrolment—671.	
Anticipated increase—74.	

4. On September 18, 1956, the Board gave FINAL approval to the following application of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds for erection of new school accommodation: Amended

Rockcliffe Handicraft School:

6 standard classrooms, 4 shops, combined gymnasium, offices, staff room, health room, store room, etc.

Metro share .....	\$386,100.00
Local share .....	Nil
Total .....	386,100.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

Date school required—September 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—176.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—200.

The Committee had before it for consideration the following application of the York Township Board for capital funds for the project:

Contract price .....	\$389,952.00
Architect's fees .....	23,400.00
Equipment .....	45,000.00
Contingencies .....	1,648.00
	<hr/>
	\$460,000.00

By virtue of re-tendering on re-design, Architect fees will likely be 4 per cent. of the original tender of \$500,000.00 thereby increasing costs by an additional ..... \$ 20,000.00

Total .....	<hr/>
	\$480,000.00
	<hr/>

Following a review of accommodation to be provided in the Rockcliffe School the Committee requested a special committee consisting of the following, viz., Messrs. J. R. H. Morgan, H. M. Brownlee, Dr. J. McIntosh and the Executive Secretary and officials of the York Township Board to review the plans and facilities and to report to the Board at its next meeting re

(a) capacity of proposed school

(b) the general suitability of the proposed plant as a junior vocational (handicraft unit).

5. The Committee had before it for consideration the following application of the Toronto Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of a public school site extension:

	Estimated Cost
Huron Public School .....	\$355,400.00

(Purchase of properties known as Nos. 507, 509, 511, 513, 515, 519, 521, 551, 553, 555, and 557 Huron Street.)  
(Existing school site is 1.2 acres.)

Since the amount included in the bulk site purchase fund for the Toronto Board of Education is now \$286,400.00, the Committee recommends that the application be approved but that the maximum amount of funds advanced shall not be greater than the total amount included in the bulk site purchase fund for the Toronto Board of Education.

6. The Committee had before it the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of portable accommodation:

Two Portable Units Nos. 104 and 105.

Metro share .....	\$ 12,000.00
Local share .....	1,710.00
Total .....	13,710.00
Ceiling .....	N/A

Date required—Approximately November, 1956.

Your Committee recommends approval of the transfer of two portable units from the Township of East York if available at the expense of the Metropolitan School Board, or if not, approval of the construction of two portable units.

7. On March 15, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education:

Hunter's Glen Public School:

12 standard classrooms, kindergarten, auditorium-play-room.

Metro share .....	\$260,000.00
Local share .....	70,750.00
Total .....	330,750.00
Ceiling .....	330,750.00

The Scarborough Board of Education has submitted the following application for capital funds:

---

Contract .....	\$301,528.00
Architect's fees .....	18,091.68
Furniture .....	17,519.48
Contingencies .....	9,045.84
	<hr/>
	\$346,185.00

Since the total cost of the project is in excess of the ceiling formula, the Scarborough Board has made application for an additional 15 per cent. allowance against a future 4-room addition. The Committee reviewed the data supporting the need for a future 4-room addition and accordingly recommends approval of the Scarborough Board's application.

8. The Committee had before it for TENTATIVE approval the following application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation:

Gulfstream Road Public School:

12 standard classrooms, kindergarten, offices, library, health room, staff room.

Estimated cost .....	\$330,750.00
Ceiling .....	330,750.00

Date school required—September 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—170.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—500.

In a review of the supporting data the Committee noted that the rate of home construction in the area is slowing somewhat and it is difficult to justify at the present time a school of 12 classrooms plus kindergarten. Accordingly, the Committee referred the application back to the North York Board of Education for further consideration.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Section 4 amended by deleting the last paragraph and substituting the following therefor:



"It is recommended that the application for capital funds for Rockcliffe Handicraft School be approved as follows: Metro share—\$120,000.00; Local share—\$340,000.00; Total—\$460,000.00, and further that since the amount included in York Township Board's capital estimates for public school accommodation has been exhausted, the necessary capital funds for Rockcliffe Handicraft School in excess of the amount previously approved be transferred from the secondary school capital estimates of the York Township Board of education."

Adopted by the Board, as amended, October 16, 1956.

#### REPORT No. 12 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, October 11, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Report No. 12 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. Your Committee had before it for consideration the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education, referred by the Buildings and Sites Committee on October 9th:

	Estimated Cost
Debenture for school buses .....	\$ 12,890.00

The Committee recommends that the application be not approved and that the Etobicoke Board of Education be so advised.

3. The Committee begs to report of a copy of a communication from the Department of Education, addressed to the Lakeshore District Board of Education, advising that it is not the policy of the Department to accept for grant purposes, under Section 5 of the Department of Education Act, the number of days' attendance lost by pupils because classrooms were closed in order that the accommodation might be used for polling booths.

Your Committee recommends that a copy of the foregoing communication be forwarded to area boards of education for information.

4. On June 19th, the School Board adopted the following resolution:

"That the Metropolitan Assessment Revision Committee be requested to recommend the form of reports to be sent to the Metropolitan School Board by area boards in regard to assessment revision."

Accordingly, the Metropolitan Assessment Revision Committee recommends adoption of the form shown below.

5. That Disbursement List No. 50, dated October 11, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,965,327.60, be approved, see Appendix p. 381.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, October 16, 1956.

---

#### ASSESSMENT REVISION REPORT.

Board of Education

Year

Please answer all of the following questions as accurately as possible and return this report to 10 Eglinton Avenue East as soon as possible after the last session of the Court of Revision has been held in your area.

1. How many properties are assessed to the support of the separate schools in your municipality?

2. How many of these properties were visited this year?

(a) Private?

(b) Business?

By what type of person were the visits made?

3. How many children of Roman Catholic parents (father, where one parent is Protestant) were enrolled in kindergarten to grade 8 in your schools in September?

(a) Roman Catholic separate school supporters?

(b) Roman Catholic assessed public?

4. Give the number and value of appeals filed by representatives of the board this year to change assessments from separate to public.

\$

How many were successful?

What value?

\$

5. Give the number and value of appeals filed by representatives of the Separate School Board this year to change assessments from public to separate.

\$

How many were successful?

What value

\$

6. How many sessions of the courts of revision were attended?

7. Give the number and value of appeals taken to the County Judge by board representatives regarding appeals filed this year.

\$

What are the results of these appeals to date?

8. How was the listing of separate school supporters obtained?

If it had to be copied out by board employees, how many man-hours did it require (approx.)?

9. What is the most difficult problem encountered by you in carrying out the procedure recommended by the Metropolitan School Board?

10. Give a rough estimate of the cost to your board of carrying out this procedure for one year. \$

.....  
Signature of Responsible Official.

## DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 50.

October 11, 1956.

## PART I.

(1) Maintenance Assistance Payments—due October, 1956—SECONDARY .....	\$ 930,674.25
ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.	
(2) Alexander & Cable Litho Co. Ltd., sup- plies .....	61.75
(3) Ashley & Crippen Limited, 1955 Board Pictures .....	190.00
(4) Bell Telephone Company Limited, Sept- ember Service .....	80.80
(5) Clipperton Blueprint Co. Limited, map .....	5.26
(6) Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, Septem- ber meeting expense .....	30.50
(7) Gestetner (Canada) Limited, supplies .....	62.00
(8) Kendall Printing Company Limited, sup- plies .....	84.70
(9) New York Window Cleaning Co. Ltd., September service .....	12.00
(10) Orange Crush Limited, meeting expense ...	2.40
(11) Petty Cash (2 cheques) Trustees' travelling allowances ... \$86.17 General expense ..... 18.61 Miscellaneous ..... 4.86	109.64
(12) Receiver General of Canada, postage stamps .....	69.00
(13) Richcraft Picture Frame Co., framing of Board pictures .....	20.13
(14) Staff Expense Allowances, July \$70.00 and September \$70.00 .....	140.00
(15) Ten Eglinton Avenue East, September 15 to October 14, 1956 .....	1,087.50
(16) Toronto Hydro-Electric System, August service .....	17.27

**Appendix.****381**

---

(17) Trustees' Travelling Allowances.		
G. F. Ferguson .....	\$21.00	
J. C. Van Esterik .....	22.75	43.75
<hr/>		
(18) Staff salaries.		
Pay period September 7 to		
September 20 .....	\$1,511.52	
Pay period September 21 to		
October 4 .....	1,511.52	3,023.04
<hr/>		
		\$ 935,713.99
<hr/>		

**PART II.**

(1) Maintenance Assistance Payments—due	
October, 1956—PUBLIC .....	\$ 1,965,327.60
<hr/>	

**APPENDIX "A".**

October 12, 1956.

To the Chairman and Members  
of the Metropolitan School Board:

On June 14, 1955, the Metropolitan School Board gave tentative approval in the amount of \$386,100.00 to an application by the York Township Board of Education for the construction of Rockcliffe Handicraft School. This approval was given on the understanding that the school would house 220 pupils and would be capable of a future addition to house a further 220 pupils. Tentative approval was given by the Ontario Municipal Board for this project on September 30, 1955.

The York Township Board of Education engaged an architect, proceeded with preparation of plans and eventually tenders were called. On April 26, 1956, application was made for final approval in an amount of \$585,000.00 based on a contract price of \$500,523.00. On May 16, 1956, the York Township Board was advised that the Metropolitan School Board would not approve an increase in capital funds for this project.

Accordingly, the York Township Board undertook a revision of the plans for the school and submitted on October 4, 1956, an application for capital funds as set forth below based on the acceptance of the lowest tender submitted by Cullen Construction Company in the amount of \$389,952.00.

Contract price .....	\$389,952.00
Architect's Fees .....	23,400.00
Equipment .....	45,000.00
Contingencies .....	1,648.00
	<hr/>
	\$460,000.00
By virtue of re-tendering on re-design, Architect fees will likely be 4% of the original tender of \$500,000.00 thereby increasing costs by an additional .....	20,000.00
	<hr/>
Total .....	\$480,000.00

The Buildings and Sites Committee, requested a special committee consisting of Messrs. J. R. H. Morgan, H. M. Brownlee, Dr. J. McIntosh and the Executive Secretary to meet with a representative of the York Township Board to review the plans and facilities and to report to the Board at its next meeting re

- (a) capacity of proposed school,
- (b) general suitability of the proposed plant as a junior vocational (handicraft) unit.

The Committee met at 9:00 a.m., Friday, October 12, and after diligent examination of the plans and specifications of the proposed Rockcliffe Handicraft School desires to report as follows:—

(a) Capacity

It is the opinion of the Committee that the capacity of the proposed school is approximately 220 pupils. Five of the six standard classrooms are of a reduced size and of deliberate design to accommodate 20-24 pupils. This is the normal size of classes for academic subjects in a school of this type.

The sixth standard classroom is somewhat larger with the purpose in mind of its use in various types of handicrafts in addition to academic subjects. The Committee noted a pronounced effort at achieving versatility in all instructional spaces in the planning of this school.

The four shop areas average 1,524 sq. ft., an area quite consistent with the areas previously recommended in connection with the establishment of a ceiling cost formula for junior vocational units.

The gymnasium contains 3,193 sq. ft. It is a single gym and of normal size for the rather extensive use to which this area will be put in a handicraft school. The administration, service and ancillary areas are normal in size; the building is of practical and economic design.

While the Committee did not make an exhaustive examination of the specifications, it is of the opinion that significant economies might have been achieved if other materials or techniques had been used in certain features of the proposed school. The responsibility for failure to achieve the ultimate economy of design should lie with the architect and indirectly with the York Township Board. From its experience, however, the Committee agrees that any effort to implement these economies at this stage in planning would not be particularly successful.

The Committee therefore has unanimously agreed that it would favour approval of capital funds in an amount of \$460,000.00 for the construction of this school. It appears obvious that the estimated \$20,000.00 additional architect's fees incurred in connection with the planning for a building substantially higher in cost than the amount originally approved should not be a charge against the Metropolitan area as a whole.

Respectfully submitted,  
J. R. H. MORGAN  
H. M. BROWNLEE  
J. McINTOSH  
W. J. McCORDIC





## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 7 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION COMMITTEE — PART I.

Tuesday, November 6, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney (Chairman), Messrs. Bonham, Eve, Ferguson, Long and Martin, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:

1. In the fall of 1955, the Metropolitan School Board had before it for consideration applications of the Etobicoke Board of Education for reimbursement of the operating costs of special classes for gifted pupils. Since the Department of Education approved the operation of the classes for one year only and since no similar classes were in operation in the Metropolitan area, the Metropolitan School Board on the advice of the Advisory Council did not approve these special education classes for reimbursement purposes.

However, the School Accommodation Committee requested the Etobicoke Board of Education and any other boards to report on the operation of classes for the gifted in the fall of 1956. Accordingly, representatives of the Etobicoke and East York Boards of Education were in attendance at the meeting of the Committee to inform the members of the programme being conducted in their respective communities.

Arrangements have been made for the Etobicoke Board of Education to forward for the information of the members of the Board a report outlining in some detail the programme being followed by the Etobicoke Board in respect of the special classes for gifted children.

2. On September 18, the Metropolitan School Board requested the Advisory Council to consider the following recommendation of the Summer Committee having reference to reimbursement of operating costs of special education classes:—

"That reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board shall also be conditional upon an area board's willingness to conform to the enrolment standard set forth below:

- (i) Opportunity classes, not less than 10 pupils;
- (ii) Academic Vocational classes, not less than 15 pupils;
- (iii) Special Vocational classes, not less than 15 pupils."

The foregoing recommendation was discussed by the Council and it was the consensus that the previous recommendation approved by the School Board with respect to optimum enrolments was in the main more realistic. However, to clarify the situation with respect to classes that may be less than or in excess of optimum enrolments, the Council recommended approval of the following:—

"That reimbursement by the Metropolitan School Board shall also be conditional upon an area board's willingness to conform to the enrolment standard set forth below:

- (i) Opportunity classes, *16 plus or minus 4* pupils
- (ii) Academic Vocational classes, *20 plus or minus 4* pupils
- (iii) Special Vocational classes, *20 plus or minus 4* pupils

"In areas of greater density with established systems of public transportation where finer grading is possible because of the number of pupils involved it may be that the organization will include a larger number of pupils than the limits set forth above. In such cases classes with a higher number of pupils would be eligible for reimbursement of the operating costs.

"The enrolment of less than the numbers *italicized* above will be approved where the area board of education concerned can establish to the satisfaction of the Metropolitan School Board through the Advisory Council that there is a concentration of special problem cases or where the geography of the area makes it impossible to support a larger class."

Your Committee recommends approval of the recommendation of the Advisory Council.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, November 13, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 13 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
— PART I.

Tuesday, November 6, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Grayson, Milgram, Van Esterik and Mrs. Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. On October 9th the Committee deferred approval of subdivision plan T-10274, City of Toronto (Regent Park South) until such time as the Toronto Board of Education has completed arrangements for the acquisition of land for extension of the Park Public School Site. The Committee had before it for information a communication from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation addressed to the Toronto Board of Education advising them that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is not in a position to advise with respect to the selling price of this parcel until all land acquisition is completed.

The Committee recommends:—

- (a) That the Toronto Board of Education be apprized that the Metropolitan School Board is withholding approval of subdivision plan T-10274 (Regent Park South) until such time as the Toronto Board of Education has made satisfactory arrangements for purchase of the site, and
- (b) That the Toronto Board be requested to notify the Metropolitan School Board when satisfactory arrangements for purchase of the site have been completed.

2. The Committee had before it the following resolution adopted by the School Board at its meeting held on October 16:—

“That the Buildings and Sites Committee be requested to establish a policy with respect to the granting of allowances in excess of the ceiling formula for reasons of abnormal site conditions.”

The Committee recommends that in view of the fact that only a few applications for special allowances for abnormal site conditions have been received to date, no specific policy be established at this time and that each application for special allowances be dealt with on its own merits.

3. At its meeting held on October 30, the Metropolitan School Board considered an application from the Etobicoke Board of Education for Thistletown Collegiate Institute in the amount of \$1,070,550.00 made up as follows:—

Ceiling formula .....	\$ 918,000.00	
Allowance for site conditions		
Grade beams and reinforced		
concrete .....	\$ 5,500.00	
Retaining wall and canti-		
lever .....	2,554.00	
Earth moving .....	19,240.00	27,294.00
Portion of 30% allowance against future		
addition .....		125,256.00
		<hr/>
		\$1,070,550.00

In its approval, the Board noted that with respect to the special allowance requested by the Etobicoke Board of Education to be added to the ceiling formula for site conditions, i.e. \$27,294.00, only \$8,054.00 appeared to be justified in view of action taken by the Board previously in regard to site conditions. In order to enable the Etobicoke Board to continue with its plans, the School Board approved the amount of \$19,240.00 for earth moving to be applied against the 30% allowance for a future addition.

The Committee had before it a request from the Etobicoke Board of Education that the amount of \$19,240.00 required for earth moving to prepare the Thistletown C.I. site for construction of the school be considered a charge against the cost of the site rather than a charge against the cost of construction of the school.

Your Committee recommends that the application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for an amount of

\$19,240.00 for earth moving be a charge against the bulk site purchase fund and that the Executive Secretary be instructed to notify the appropriate authorities of this change.

4. That FINAL approval be given to the following applications of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for erection of intermediate school accommodation:—

Ledbury Park Junior High School, addition of 11 standard classrooms, 2 industrial arts, 2 home economics, double gymnasium, cafeteria, guidance rooms and ancillary space—plus conversion of existing accommodation for use as junior high school facilities.

Metro Share .....	\$ 220,000.00
Local Share .....	442,000.00
Total .....	662,000.00
Ceiling .....	662,000.00

Date addition required—September 1, 1958.

Highland Hill Junior High School, 27 standard classrooms, 2 Industrial Arts, 2 Home Economics, Double Gymnasium, Cafeteria, offices, guidance rooms, staff rooms and storage.

Metro Share .....	540,000.00
Local Share .....	599,250.00
Total .....	1,139,250.00
Ceiling .....	1,139,250.00

Date school required—September, 1958.

Anticipated opening enrolment—769.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—1015.

The Committee noted that the Council for the Township of North York had refused to approve the above applications.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, November 13, 1956.

REPORT No. 13 OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE —  
PART I.

Thursday, November 8, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney, Messrs. Ferguson, Might, Power, Stinson and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of section 2 of Report No. 7 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I, and section 4 of Report No. 13 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I. Section 3 of Report No. 13 of Buildings and Sites Committee is submitted without recommendation.

2. Early in 1956, the Metropolitan School Board authorized the Advisory Council to undertake a study of the financing of education in the Metropolitan area. During the summer months considerable data was compiled and Council is now ready to evaluate and assemble for publication material to be contained within the report. At a recent meeting it was felt that competent advice and assistance should be secured from an experienced statistician.

It is recommended that the Executive Secretary be authorized to commence negotiations with respect to securing such assistance and that he be instructed to report to the Finance Committee at its next meeting the probable total cost involved.

3. On January 31, 1956, the Metropolitan School Board appointed a delegation to wait upon the Minister of Education to discuss losses in legislative grants resulting from the establishment of the Metropolitan School Board. At the same time the delegation was requested to place before the Minister of Education a request that maintenance assistance payments be based on the *current* year's average daily attendance rather than the average daily attendance of the preceding year as provided for in Section 125 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Following the meeting with the Minister of Education, the Minister requested that further consultations be held with officials of the Department of Education to discuss ways of implementing the School Board's requests. The Metropolitan Solicitor has advised the Committee that the School Board's request could be implemented by amending the word "preceding" to read "current" in section 125(1), (a), (b) and (c) of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Accordingly, your Committee recommends that the Provincial Government be requested to amend Section 125 of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, as suggested by the Metropolitan Solicitor, to provide that maintenance assistance payments be based upon the *current* year's average daily attendance.

4. The Committee had before it for consideration communications from the Deputy Minister of Education, the Metropolitan Solicitor, and the North York Board of Education having reference to the dissolution of the Downsview R.C.A.F. School Board and a decision of the North York Board to assume responsibility for educating pupils from the Airport.

The Committee recognizes the validity of the North York Board of Education assuming responsibility for educating pupils from the Downsview R.C.A.F. Station but in order to clarify the interests of the Metropolitan School Board the Committee has requested the Executive Secretary to confer with the Deputy Minister of Education, the Business Administrator of the North York Board of Education and the Business Administrator of the Metropolitan Separate School Board.

5. That Disbursement List No. 51 dated November 8, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$687,656.45 be approved; for details see Appendix p. 394.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, November 13, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 7 OF SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION  
COMMITTEE — PART II.

Tuesday, November 6, 1956.

1. That the Scarborough Board of Education be reimbursed the salaries of the following special education class personnel effective September 1, 1956:

2 Assistant Teachers of Speech Correction—Miss Gertrude Hanna and Mrs. Mary Corchis.

2. At the meeting of the School Board held on October 16, the Board had before it for consideration a request of the North York Board of Education that consideration be given to the provision of school dental service for North York pupils in attendance at Toronto schools. The communication expressed the opinion that since the North York pupils are under the jurisdiction of the Toronto Board of Education such pupils should receive the same dental services as provided for Toronto pupils. However, as the cost of the dental service in Toronto schools is borne solely by the City of Toronto, the Toronto Board of Health has ruled that the North York pupils are not eligible to receive dental treatment at the Toronto school clinics.

Upon investigation it was ascertained that the North York pupils enrolled in Toronto schools receive the same benefits as Toronto pupils. However, the North York Board of Health provides a complete dental service whereas the Toronto Board of Health merely provides a survey examination. In view of the different type of service provided by the respective boards of health your Committee submits for information the attached letter which has been forwarded to the North York Board of Education to clarify the situation.

MARGARET E. PERNEY,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, November 13, 1956.



---

THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD

October 18, 1956.

Dr. F. W. Minkler,  
Director of Education,  
North York Board of Education,  
7 Kenneth Street,  
Willowdale, Ontario.

Dear Dr. Minkler:

In response to your enquiry of October 4th regarding dental service for North York pupils enrolled in Toronto schools, I am happy to confirm the impression in your letter, i.e. that North York pupils under the arrangement receive the same benefits as Toronto pupils.

Since the Township of North York provides a complete dental service for school children, it was necessary to have the following understanding effected between the two Medical Officers of Health. It was agreed that North York pupils attending Toronto schools would receive the same survey examination as Toronto pupils. If treatment was indicated, parents would then be free to avail themselves of the dental service offered through the closest North York school.

There has been no formal commitment between the two Boards of Health in this regard to my knowledge. However, it is my understanding that the North York Board of Health is billed on a per pupil basis on the assumption that the full Toronto service is being extended to each pupil.

Yours sincerely,  
(sgd.) W. J. McCordic,  
Executive Secretary.

WJM/dw

---

REPORT No. 13 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE — PART II.

Thursday, November 8, 1956.

1. In favour of section 1 of Report No. 7 of School Accommodation Committee, Part I.

2. That Disbursement List No. 51, dated November 8, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,281,606.89 be approved, for details see Appendix p. 395.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, November 13, 1956.

---

DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 51.

November 8, 1956.

PART I.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments — due  
November, 1956 — SECONDARY (incl.  
revisions to date) ..... \$ 680,315.23

ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

- |   |          |          |
|---|----------|----------|
| 2. Advisory Council, Honorariums  | 1,920.00 |          |
| Expense Allowances .....  | 480.00   | 2,400.00 |
| <hr/>   |          |          |
| 3. Bell Telephone Company, October service .....  |          | 79.40    |
| 4. Canadian Linen Company Limited, September service .....  |          | 10.00    |
| 5. Carswell Company Limited, printing minutes .....   | 8.00     |          |
| Supplies .....  | 134.20   | 142.20   |
| <hr/>   |          |          |
| 6. Convention Expenses, Association of School Business Officials of U.S. and Canada Convention—G. D. Spry ..... |          | 164.50   |
| 7. Dominion Maintenance Company, September service .....  |          | 85.00    |
| 8. Mr. G. L. Gray, editorial assistance .....   |          | 150.00   |
| 9. Independent Glass & Mirror Supply, repair broken window .....  |          | 3.50     |
| 10. Orange Crush Limited, meeting expense .....   |          | 3.50     |
| 11. Oakes Window Cleaning, window cleaning .....  |          | 12.00    |

## Appendix.

395

12. Petty Cash, travelling expenses	27.08	
Supplies .....	4.01	
Meeting expense .....	14.51	
Miscellaneous .....	27.17	72.77
<hr/>		
13. Receiver General of Canada, postage .....		58.00
14 Staff Expense Allowance, October .....		35.00
15. Staff Salaries		
Pay Period Oct. 5 to Oct. 18 .....	1,511.52	
Pay Period Oct. 19 to Nov. 1 .....	1,511.52	3,023.04
<hr/>		
16. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, October 15 to November 14, 1956 .....		1,087.50
17. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, September service .....		14.81
		<hr/>
		\$ 687,656.45

### PART II.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments — due November, 1956 — PUBLIC (incl. re- visions to date) .....	<hr/>	\$1,281,606.89
--	-------	----------------

## APPENDIX "A".

### PART I.

November 8, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:

On October 16, the School Board concurred in the following recommendation of the Finance Committee:

"That the Chairman of the Board appoint a small committee to wait upon the Metropolitan Chairman, the Metropolitan Solicitor and the Commissioner of Finance with respect to an alternative method of distributing the capital costs of projects as between Metropolitan and Local shares."

As instructed, the Chairman named the following to the Committee, viz., Messrs. Ferguson, Peck, Van Esterik and

Mrs. Temple, who met with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council, the Metropolitan Solicitor and the Commissioner of Finance on November 8th.

The Committee had before it for information various reports relating to Metropolitan school finance from which the conclusion was drawn that the inevitable rapid expansion of school facilities would result in a sharp increase in school rates in all areas. It was further observed that increases would be greatest in the municipalities confronted with the heaviest volume of building, i.e., Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough and Toronto.

It was noted that the local burden would be aggravated by the large amounts required for site purchases which under existing legislation must be borne entirely by the local municipality. This problem, it appeared to the Committee, was common to all four municipalities. In addition, the City of Toronto together with the Townships of East York and York, the Town of Weston and the Lakeshore district would be faced with decisions relative to the replacement or renovation of schools. It was observed that the fact that rehabilitation costs are not eligible for legislative grants gives rise to the unusual situation that it is to the financial advantage of an area municipality to demolish an old school and build a new one rather than to rehabilitate.

The Committee also recognized the discrepancy between the total cost of construction of secondary schools and the amount approved for legislative grant purposes. The resulting burden on area municipalities building secondary schools would also contribute to the rapid spiralling of school costs.

It was agreed that the Committee recommend to the Metropolitan School Board and subject to its approval to the Metropolitan Council that a delegation wait upon the Minister of Education for the purpose of presenting the following petitions:—

- (i) That, effective January 1, 1957, maintenance assistance payments paid to area boards of education by the Metropolitan School Board be made on the basis of the average daily attendance for the *current* year rather than

---

the preceding year and that The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended to give effect thereto.

- (ii) That the amount approved for legislative grant purposes with respect to secondary schools be increased substantially above the \$20,000.00 per standard classroom and that there be included in the amount approved an allowance for gymnasia-auditoria, cafeteria, home economics and shop classrooms.
- (iii) That substantial increases be made in the percentage of approved cost paid in legislative grants by the Department of Education to the Metropolitan School Board with respect to construction of school buildings.
- (iv) That the Department of Education approve for legislative grant purposes a reasonable proportion of the cost involved of rehabilitation and renovation of existing schools as approved by the Metropolitan School Board.
- (v) That the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act be amended to provide that the Metropolitan School Board assume 50% of the capital expenditures involved in the purchase of school sites or extensions thereof in the Metropolitan area.
- (vi) In view of the fact that the Province of Ontario considers it impractical to contribute in the form of legislative grant to the cost of site purchases and, in view of the fact that the Metropolitan School Board and Corporation have indicated their willingness to share in the cost of site purchases that the Department of Education agree to substantial increases in legislative grants in support of current operations of the school boards in the Metropolitan area.

Respectfully submitted,  
G. F. Ferguson,  
Chairman.



## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 14 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE—PART I.

Tuesday, November 20, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Boland, Campbell, Ferguson, Lockhart, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. That the Board concur in the comments of the Etobicoke Board of Education with respect to the following subdivision plans:—

#### Township of Etobicoke.

T-10228—288 lots.

The Etobicoke Board will require Block "B", 6.35 acres, as indicated on the plan of subdivision though this has to be increased by the acquisition of property to the south to bring it up to 8 acres—this will ultimately be established as a senior public school. Secondary students will attend Burnhamthorpe C.I., but ultimately a secondary school located on the east side of the Fourth Line opposite the public school.

T-10312—399 lots.

The Etobicoke Board will require a 6-acre school site. Block "C" which is indicated as a school site on the Plan is not satisfactory. Kipling Avenue is intended as a main north-south artery and as such would not be a suitable location to front a school. If this plan is to be proceeded with, provision should be made for a school to front on Ashford Drive with flankage on Faversham Drive, or alternatively, on the street immediately to the south of Block "C" which forms part of Registered Plan 4864. Secondary students will attend Richview C.I. when opened in September, 1958.

T-10346—6 industrial lots.

N/A

2. That the following applications of the York Township Board of Education for capital funds be not approved since there is no provision in the School Board's ceiling formula for such facilities:—

	Estimated Cost
Runnymede Collegiate Institute. Addition of Swimming Pool, Showers, and Dressing Rooms .....	\$150,000.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.  
Present enrolment—677.

Vaughan Road Collegiate Institute. Addition of Swimming Pool, Showers, and Dressing Rooms .....	250,000.00
---	------------

Date addition required—September, 1957.  
Present enrolment—1,140.

3. On July 6, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to an application of the Toronto Board of Education in the amount of \$85,000.00 for Northern Technical-Commercial School. The project includes revisions to shops to provide proper accommodation for Print, Weld, Tinsmith and Plumbing instruction, Music and Drama instruction, adjacent to Assembly Hall.

The Toronto Board of Education has now submitted the following breakdown of costs for the project and requests that approval be given to an additional amount of \$19,900.00 over the estimate of \$85,000.00 previously approved, making a total approval of \$104,900.00.

Contract Price .....	\$ 77,900.00
Add: Architect's Fees .....	\$ 4,500.00
Equipment .....	20,000.00
Contingency .....	2,500.00
	<hr/>
	27,000.00
Making a total of .....	<hr/>
	\$104,900.00



Your Committee recommends approval of the application for capital funds in the revised amount of \$104,900.00.

4. That the following application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of a secondary school site be approved:—

	Estimated Total Cost
Richview Collegiate Institute Site, 13.56 acres ...	\$137,500.00
Located on the south-west corner of Islington Avenue and Richview Side Road.	

Date School required—September, 1958.

No. of Classrooms proposed—24 instructional units.

5. That the following applications of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for purchase of school sites be approved:—Amended.

	Estimated Total Cost
Ellerslie Avenue Junior High School Site, 7.23 acres .....	\$150,000.00 (est.)

Frontage on Ellerslie Avenue and Senlac Road, west of Yonge Street, between Sheppard Avenue and Finch Avenue.

Date School required—September 1, 1959.

No. of classrooms proposed—27 plus 2 shops, 2 Home Economics, Gymnasium and Cafeteria.

Hilda Avenue Junior High School Site, 9.7 acres	65,000.00 (est.)
---	---------------------

Frontage on Hilda Avenue, west of Yonge Street, between Steeles Avenue and Finch Avenue West.

Date School required—September 1, 1959.

No. of Classrooms proposed—27 plus 2 shops, 2 Home Economics, Gymnasium and Cafeteria.

---

Linthurst Avenue Public School Site. 7.8 acres	
total (2.8 added) .....	\$119,000.00
Previously approved .....	37,000.00
This application .....	<u>\$ 82,000.00</u>

Frontage on Lindhurst Avenue and Belmar Drive. Site is east of Jane Street, between Sheppard Avenue and Wilson Avenue in Belmar Park Subdivision.

The site is being enlarged to facilitate its use as a Junior High School site.

Date School required—September 1, 1958.

No. of Classrooms proposed—27 plus 2 shops, 2 Home Economics, Gymnasium and Cafeteria.

The Committee noted that the following resolution was passed by the Council for the Township of North York with respect to the Linthurst Avenue Public School Site. Similar resolutions were passed in connection with Ellerslie Avenue and Hilda Avenue Junior High School Sites.

“Resolved that notwithstanding the fact that this Council approves of the value of the Tri-level system, in view of the fact it is gravely concerned about the additional financing that will be necessary, which has been estimated by the Board to be an increase of somewhere around fifteen per cent. and twenty per cent., with regret Council refuses to give its approval to the amended application of the Board of Education for the Township of North York to purchase additional lands for a public school site, to be known as Linthurst Avenue Public School Site, at an additional cost of \$82,000.00.”

6. The Committee begs to report for information of the Board that the Ontario Municipal Board has dismissed an application of the North York Board of Education for capital funds for the purchase of additional lands required for the Buntly Lane Junior High School Site on the basis that the cost of the land is excessive.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Section 5 amended to conform to section 1 of Report No. 14 of Finance Committee, Part I.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, November 27, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 14 OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE—  
PART I.

Thursday, November 22, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Ferguson, Long, Power, Stinson and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 2, 3 and 4 of Report No. 14 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I. In connection with section 5 having reference to a request for capital funds for purchase of junior high school sites in the Township of North York, your Committee recommends approval on the understanding that the cost of same will not be applied against the bulk site appropriation but that separate application will be made to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval of the purchase of lands since the applications were not approved by the Council of the Corporation of North York.

2. At the last meeting of the School Board, the Executive Secretary was authorized to secure a qualified person to assist in the statistical aspects of the preparation of a study of school finance in the Metropolitan area.

It is recommended that Mr. Brock Rideout of the Department of Research, Ontario College of Education be engaged to give assistance in the preparation of the report and that he be paid at the rate of \$3.00 per hour.

3. That the Executive Secretary be authorized to approach area boards of education with a view to removing from the 1956 capital programme and specifically from the

appropriation against the bulk site purchase fund any land purchases which cannot be completed by December 31, 1956 in order that other urgent projects might be approved within the bulk site appropriation.

4. At the last regular meeting of the Metropolitan School Board a series of petitions was approved for presentation by delegation to the Minister of Education. It was understood that these petitions were to be placed before the Metropolitan Council through its Executive with a view to securing the support of its members at the time that these petitions are presented.

In study of this memorandum with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council, it was observed that sections (iii) and (vi) dealing with requests for increase in legislative grants might be clarified and strengthened. It is therefore proposed that sections (iii) and (vi) be combined and the following substituted therefor:—

“(iii) That whereas the studies of the Metropolitan School Board indicate that in 1955 the legislative grants amounted to 18 per cent. of the total current expenditures for education in the Metropolitan area, and whereas the portion of capital debt approved in 1955 to be borne by the Department of Education was 26 per cent. of the total programme, that the Department of Education be requested to increase substantially:—

- (a) its support for the current operations of the eleven area boards of education through the Metropolitan School Board;
- (b) the share of the capital programme financed by the sale of debentures to be borne by the Department of Education;

And further, that the grant of the Department of Education towards the cost of school construction be paid as a cash grant at the time of building instead of as a contribution towards debt retirement.”

Sections (iii) and (vi) of the petition approved by the School Board at its meeting on November 13 reads as follows:—

- “(iii) That substantial increases be made in the percentage of approved cost paid in legislative grants by the Department of Education to the Metropolitan School Board with respect to construction of school buildings.
- (vi) In view of the fact that the Province of Ontario considers it impractical to contribute in the form of legislative grant to the cost of site purchases and, in view of the fact that the Metropolitan School Board and Corporation have indicated their willingness to share in the cost of site purchases that the Department of Education agree to substantial increases in legislative grants in support of current operations of the school boards in the Metropolitan area.

5. That the Executive Secretary and Mr. G. L. Gray, Editorial Assistant, be authorized to visit the Ontario School for the Deaf at Belleville, in connection with the preparation of a report requested by the School Board with reference to the future of Sunny View School, and that their expenses be paid. Amended.

6. That Disbursement List No. 52, dated November 22, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$684,012.51 be approved. See Appendix page 421.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,

Chairman pro tem.

Section 5 having reference to a visit to the Ontario School for the Deaf amended by adding the name of Mr. Z. S. Phimister, Chairman of the Public School Committee of the Advisory Council.

Adopted by the Board, as amended, November 27, 1956.

---

REPORT OF JOINT MEETING OF LEGISLATION AND  
BY-LAWS AND CHAIRMEN'S COMMITTEES.

Thursday, November 22, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committees held this day, the following members being present, viz., Dr. Long (Chairman), Messrs. Ferguson, Morton, Stinson, Van Esterik and Miss Perney, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. (a) The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act 1953 provides in Section 120(2) that

“The first meeting of the School Board in the year 1954 and thereafter shall be held not later than the third Wednesday in January on such date and at such time and place as may be fixed by resolution of the School Board.”

For the past three years the Inaugural Meeting has been held on the regular meeting day of the Board, i.e., the second Tuesday in January. In 1957 the second Tuesday is the earliest possible day, i.e., January 8. There is some doubt that the Inaugural Meetings of the area boards which must precede the Inaugural Meeting of the Metropolitan School Board could be completed by Tuesday, January 8.

It is therefore recommended that the Inaugural meeting of the Metropolitan School Board be held on Tuesday, January 15, and that the procedure followed in previous years be continued, i.e., the Board to meet at 4:00 p.m. in the afternoon for the actual election of officers and organization of committees with the report of the committee of the whole being presented at 8:00 p.m. It is also recommended that the practice of the Board adjourning for dinner between the foregoing meetings be continued.

- 
- (b) In preceding years a caucus was arranged between Christmas and New Years at which time a general discussion was held regarding the work and responsibilities

of the Board mainly for the benefit of new members. Since some area boards have been reluctant to select their chairman prior to the area board's inaugural meeting it has been suggested that the caucus meeting be delayed until January.

It is recommended therefore that the caucus meeting be held on Friday, January 11, at 4:00 p.m. (the Friday prior to the Inaugural Meeting), and that the discussion period be so planned that it be concluded before 6:00 p.m. and further that supper be served in the Board Room immediately following the discussion period.

- (c) That, if the foregoing procedure be approved, area boards of education be advised accordingly and that they be requested to declare their representative or representatives to the Metropolitan School Board prior to Friday, January 11.

2. During the months of April and May, the Legislation and By-laws Committee, at the request of the School Board, undertook an evaluation of the operation of the Metropolitan School Board with a view to the possibility of making the operations more effective. A summary of the discussions at meetings of the Committee is attached for information of the members of the Board. (See Appendix "A", pages 412 to 421.)

As a result of the deliberations of the Committee, the following recommendations are submitted for consideration of the School Board:—

- (i) That whereas the members of the Metropolitan School Board have over the past few years demonstrated an ability to meet Metropolitan problems without significant bias to local loyalty, there seems therefore to be no need for change in the composition and method of selection of the members of the Metropolitan School Board and that this viewpoint be communicated to the Metropolitan Council and the provincial government in order that they may be aware of the Board's point of view. Amended.

- (ii) That there seems to be no immediate necessity for appointment of a special officer serving the Metropolitan School Board to co-ordinate technical school services and that such appointment should not be necessary so long as the Advisory Council can adequately advise the Board on this area of work, but that if such appointment should be considered at any future time that consideration be given to the appointment of a co-ordinator of secondary school services without special reference to technical education.
- (iii) That whereas the Advisory Council is now co-ordinating the functions of the Metropolitan School Board with respect to special education there seems to be no necessity of immediate appointment of a co-ordinator of special education.
- (iv) That with respect to the apportionment of capital costs it is the view of the Committee that the Department of Education could not accede to a request that the Department declare by a second type of approval the portion of capital costs to be borne by the Metropolitan area as a whole. It is therefore recommended that the Board continue its own exploration of methods of apportioning more fairly the capital costs particularly with respect to erection of secondary schools, the rehabilitation and renovation of old schools and the purchase of school sites.
- (v) That with respect to assessment revision it is recommended that the Assessment Revision Committee as at present constituted be continued and that further co-ordination of this work throughout the Metropolitan area be a subject of continuing study by the Metropolitan School Board.
- (vi) That with respect to salary schedules whereas significant effort is being made on a voluntary basis by the boards of education within the Metropolitan area to establish a common schedule and whereas any attempt to transfer this responsibility to the Metropolitan School Board would be met with misgivings by some boards, that no action be taken at this time pending study of



the result of the present effort to establish a common schedule.

JOHN A. LONG,  
Chairman of Committee.

Sub-section (i) of section 2 amended by inserting the words "to undertake the duties assigned to it by the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act and" after the word "ability", and deleting the words "and to meet Metropolitan problems".

Adopted by the Board, as amended, November 27, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 14 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES  
COMMITTEE—PART II.

Tuesday, November 20, 1956.

1. That FINAL approval be given to the following applications for capital funds for erection of public school accommodation subject to receipt of the action of the Scarborough Township Council with respect to the application for Courcellette Road Public School:—

Scarborough Board of Education—Courcellette Road Public School—Addition of 9 standard classrooms, auditorium-playroom; demolition of 6 existing classrooms leaving 1 classroom and single kindergarten:—

Metro Share .....	\$180,000.00
Local Share .....	58,325.00
Total .....	238,325.00
Ceiling .....	236,705.00
	6,800.00*
	<hr/> \$243,505.00

Date addition required—September, 1957.

Present enrolment—358.

Anticipated increase—32.

\*—Special demolition cost.

Toronto Board of Education—Jesse Ketchum Public School  
(convert to senior school)—Addition of 2 standard classrooms, double gymnasium; remodel 12 existing classrooms;—

Metro Share .....	\$ 40,000.00
Local Share .....	298,595.00
Total .....	338,595.00
Ceiling .....	345,230.00

Date addition required—December, 1956.

Present enrolment—730.

Anticipated increase—240.

Weston Board of Education—King Street Public School—10  
standard classrooms, kindergarten, auditorium-play-  
room:—

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	45,000.00
Total .....	265,000.00
Ceiling .....	279,300.00

Date school required—September, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—420.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—480.

2. That approval be given to the following applications  
for capital funds for purchase of public school sites:—

	Estimated Total Cost
North York Board of Education.	
Dunlace Drive Public School site, 5 acres .....	\$ 47,000.00
Frontage on Dunlace Drive in Oriole Heights Subdivision, between Bayview Street and Leslie Street, south of Highway 401.	

Date school required—January 1, 1958.

No. of classrooms proposed—6 plus kinder-  
garten.

	Estimated Total Cost
Highpoint Road Public School site, 4.19 acres— 400 feet on Highland Road and 425 feet on Lawrence Avenue frontage .....	45,000.00
Date school required—possibly September 1, 1958, depending upon development.	
No. of classrooms proposed—4 plus kinder- garten.	
Page Avenue Public School site, approximately 4 acres—West side of extension of Page Avenue, between Bayview Street and Leslie Street, south of Finch Avenue .....	40,000.00
Date school required—January 1, 1958.	
No. of classrooms proposed—6 plus kinder- garten.	
Toronto Board of Education.	
Palmerston Public School site extension—Ad- ditional funds required to complete the purchase of Nos. 811, 813, 815 Euclid Avenue	30,000.00

The foregoing application of the Toronto Board of Education was approved on the understanding that the required funds will be transferred from a previous approval given in connection with the Park Public School site extension since the amount included in the bulk site purchase fund for the Toronto Board of Education has been exhausted.

3. On June 19, 1956 the Metropolitan School Board gave FINAL approval to the following application of the Scarborough Board of Education for capital funds for erection of Chancellor Drive Public School (formerly known as Churchill Heights Public School) on the understanding that the School Board would review the application further prior to the calling of tenders to substantiate the need for the school on the basis of the progress of housing development in the area.

Chancellor Drive Public School—10 standard classrooms, single kindergarten, industrial arts, home economics, auditorium-playroom:—

---

Metro Share .....	\$220,000.00
Local Share .....	99,300.00
Ceiling .....	319,300.00
Total .....	319,300.00

Date school required—January 1, 1957.

Anticipated opening enrolment—410.

Anticipated maximum enrolment—410.

Your Committee reviewed further supporting data received from the Scarborough Board of Education and is satisfied with the need for this school. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the Scarborough Board be authorized to call for tenders.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, November 27, 1956.

---

#### REPORT No. 14 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, November 22, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1, 2 and 3 of Report No. 14 of Building and Sites Committee, Part II.

2. That Disbursement List No. 52 dated November 22, 1956, containing Part II accounts totalling \$1,282,489.01 be approved. See Appendix page 422.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, November 27, 1956.

---

#### SUMMARY OF SPECIAL MEETINGS OF LEGISLATION AND BY-LAWS COMMITTEE.

By resolution of the Metropolitan School Board at its meeting on February 28, the Legislation and By-laws Committee was authorized to undertake an evaluation of the

operations of the Board and canvass the possibility of making those operations more effective. Accordingly four meetings were held during April and May. Invited to each meeting was a member of the School Board not on the Legislation and By-laws Committee, a former member of the School Board, a Metropolitan school trustee with no Metropolitan School Board experience, a member of the Advisory Council, a senior official of the Department of Education, a member of the Executive of the Metropolitan Council, and one of the officials of the Metropolitan organization.

Unfortunately we were unable to secure the attendance of some of the people whom we were most anxious to have participate. For one reason or another none of the officials of the Department of Education, nor any of the invited members of the Executive of the Metropolitan Council found themselves able to attend. Otherwise the attendance was very satisfactory.

It was our plan to cover the same agenda in all four meetings. We were unable to hold to this completely. The discussions were entered into so heartily and ranged so widely as to prevent us, usually, from encompassing all that the agenda called for.

Six topics were dealt with: (1) The constitution and operation of the School Board, (2) the control and supervision of technical school services in Metropolitan Toronto, (3) the role of the Metropolitan School Board in the co-ordination of Special Education, (4) the apportionment of capital costs as between the Metropolitan School Board and the Area Boards of Education, (5) Assessment revision, and (6) Teachers' salaries in Metropolitan Toronto.

#### Constitution and Operation of the Metropolitan School Board.

A member of the Legislation and By-laws Committee brought forward a suggestion for the School Board's reorganization. He pointed out certain weaknesses in existing arrangements. (1) the operations of the School Board are rather complex, and are quite unlike those of area

Boards of Education. Unless a new member was unusually diligent in acquainting himself with the provisions of Bill 80 and the manner in which these provisions were being implemented, by the time he becomes fully conversant with the operations of the School Board his term of office would have expired. This would not be so serious a matter were it not for the large annual turnover in School Board membership. (2) The burden of carrying out the School Board's operations fall mainly on a few shoulders, those of the chairman, vice-chairman, and chairmen of the standing committees. (3) The burden of full participation in the School Board's activities was particularly onerous in the case of those members who happened at the same time to be chairmen of one or other of the larger Area Boards.

To overcome these difficulties it was proposed that the School Board function through an Executive Committee, say of 7 members, a committee which would operate in a manner similar to a Board of Control of a city council, or the Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Council. The members of the Executive Committee would be elected by the Metropolitan School Board, but would not necessarily be members of the School Board nor indeed of any Area Board of Education. They would be elected on the basis of their qualifications for the task, and their willingness to devote a good deal of time to it. Their term of office would be such as would permit them to become familiar with the School Board's operations and insure reasonable continuity of service. They would report to the School Board periodically, say quarterly. They might be paid salaries commensurate with their duties.

Such a plan has obvious merits, but a number of objections were raised. (1) The School Board would tend to degenerate into a rubber stamp, and its members, cut off from top-level decisions would lose interest in it. (2) With the elimination of standing committees the members of the School Board would have little opportunity to become familiar with the operations of the Board and would be in a poor position either to direct or to sit in judgment on the actions of the Executive Committee. (3) If the Executive Committee were given any considerable

authority, policy would become rather far removed from the electorate. (4) Many of the duties which the Executive Committee might be expected to perform are now discharged rather well by our Advisory Council. (5) The argument that membership on the Metropolitan School Board places an unduly heavy burden on those who are already chairmen of area Boards is answered in part by the amendment to the legislation which permits an area chairman to decline to serve on the Metro Board if he so desires.

It would be safe to infer that the over-all reaction to the proposal of an Advisory Committee was unfavourable. Members of the Metropolitan School Board frequently complain of the burden entailed in serving on two Boards, but most of them appear not to be so hard pressed as to induce them to yield to others any of their duties on the Metro Board.

There was some discussion of changes in the membership of the School Board with a view to having some regard for representation by population. It is safe to say that this is not as lively an issue with School Board as it appears to be with the Metropolitan Council. Board members seem to be reasonably well satisfied, in this respect, with things as they are. This satisfaction no doubt stems from the fact that during the years of its existence the School Board has consistently behaved as a co-operating unit. At no time have the Board members behaved as a discordant group of individuals each motivated by the special interests of the Area Board which he represents. It was generally agreed that any decisions with respect to changes in representation should not be left wholly to the discretion of the Metropolitan Council. If changes are contemplated the Metropolitan School Board should be a party in all deliberations in the matter.

#### Technical School Education.

With the advent of the Metropolitan scheme, separate technical school facilities existed in the City of Toronto and in the Township of York. Some vocational education was provided in composite schools in the Town of Weston, Lake-

shore District, and the Township of North York. In general, pupils of other municipalities desiring a technical school course attended schools in other municipalities at the expense of the home Board.

Technical education is expensive. It is estimated that it would cost 10 million dollars to duplicate Toronto's Central Technical School. At the moment the Metropolitan School Board operates on the assumption that technical education for grades 9 and 10 can most advantageously be provided in junior vocational units added to academic secondary schools. It is assumed that technical schools as such shall be devoted to the more highly specialized courses of grades 10 and 11, and that they can not be provided economically for enrolments of under 800 pupils. Any technical school built through the Metro Board would serve a rather wide area, probably more than one municipality. There is a problem in determining the most advantageous locations, geographically, for such schools. The primary problem, however, lies in assessing the need for technical schools, and in determining the demand for courses which would justify their inclusion in any schools to be built. Are these problems of sufficient importance and complexity to justify the full-time employment of a technical school expert who would act as co-ordinator of technical school education over the whole Metropolitan area?

In general the discussion opposed any bifurcation of secondary education into academic and technical branches. The fear was expressed that any coordinator of technical school education would all too likely be an enthusiast in his field, who would press unduly for its expansion. It was argued that if a coordinator were appointed he should have responsibility over the whole field of secondary education. He should be a man with a comprehensive knowledge of secondary education who could view conflicting demands impartially, with no interest in promoting any particular type of school.

#### Assessment Revision.

The discussion here centred about the responsibility of the Metropolitan School Board in the matter of assess-



ment rolls as between public and separate school supporters. The members of the Board will recall that the area Boards, when canvassed on the matter some months ago, did not show unanimous enthusiasm for having this Board play an active part in assessment revision in the area municipalities.

In the discussion on assessment revision, Mr. Alf Gray was very helpful, and a good deal of time was devoted to the matter on the occasion of his attendance. He pointed out the complexity of the problem by explaining that over the Metropolitan area as a whole there was a movement of over 25 per cent of the population annually, averaging, over the year almost 1000 persons a day. There appears to be a fairly general belief that the separate school boards are more diligent than are the public school boards in seeing that property occupied by their supporters is properly registered.

Mr. Gray gave us the following information and advice: (1) Keeping the assessment rolls in proper order requires the combined assistance of everyone concerned. It is a continuous problem, and work on it should commence as early in the year as possible. (2) It would be an aid to the Metropolitan Assessment Department if the school administration offices were to keep the Department informed on all pupils coming into the public schools. If the public school supporters move into a house previously occupied by separate school supporters, the property may continue to be listed on the separate school rolls for assessment purposes unless the Assessment Department is made aware of the change. (3) If a husband is a Protestant, the property occupied by the family is assessed for public school support even though it be held in the name of his Roman Catholic wife. (4) There are in the Metropolitan area tax exempt properties such as the Ontario Hydro Electric Commission, crown properties, and other utilities properties. Utilities having tax exempt status now pay monies to the general fund of the municipality. Previously school boards received money from such utilities. If persons are resident in exempted properties and have children attending school the local Board of Education is legally entitled to charge such pupils non-resident fees.

Loop-holes in assessment revision in the Metropolitan area are being plugged and the situation is constantly improving, but it is a tremendous task and it can be discharged properly only through constant vigilance.

Through the interest of the Metropolitan School Board there have been held in the Board's quarters a number of meetings of the officials responsible for assessment revision in the Metropolitan municipalities. They are under the chairmanship of Mr. Topping of Toronto, with Mr. Spry serving as secretary. These officials discuss their common problems and the method employed in discharging their responsibilities. It is reported that the meetings have proved very useful.

Apportionment of Capital Costs between the Metropolitan School Board and Area Boards of Education.

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act (Bill 80) provides that the Metropolitan share of capital costs of school buildings shall be the amount approved for legislative grant purposes by the Department of Education.

A problem is created by the fact that the Department's grant structure for school construction has no regard for costs of school rehabilitation, costs of site purchases, and costs of anything in school construction other than standard classrooms at \$20,000 each. The legislation can be assumed to work a hardship on Toronto, with many old schools badly in need of renovation, and on the more rapidly-growing suburban municipalities which must buy sites for new elementary and secondary schools and build secondary schools in which standard classrooms account for less than half the total cost of the buildings.

Two alternative solutions to the problem were suggested for discussion:—

(1) to provide that the Metropolitan School Board shall determine in connection with each application for capital funds the proportion of the debt which shall be borne by the Metropolitan School Board and that proportion which shall be borne by the Area Board.

(2) to provide that the Department of Education shall, in addition to indicating an amount approved for legislative grant purposes, indicate a second amount for all municipalities in the Metropolitan area which shall be the amount of debt to be borne by the Metropolitan School Board.

Either of these alternatives entail an amendment to the legislation, and it was generally agreed that an amendment should be sought with a view to spreading the total cost of site purchases, school construction and rehabilitation costs more evenly over the whole Metropolitan Area.

Of the two alternatives presented the first was considered preferable, and was judged to have a better chance of acceptance by the Department of Education. It was assumed that the officials of the Department would be hesitant about assuming responsibility for the Metropolitan School Board share of school debentures when the matter could probably more effectively be handled by the School Board itself.

If the first proposal were given effect a good deal of study would need to go into its implementation. Should the Metropolitan School Board assume the entire debenture burden up to the ceiling formula in each instance? If not, what percentage of the ceiling formula costs should the school Board assume? Any rehabilitation program would need to be carefully regulated and supervised. If a new subdivision springs up with hundreds of children with no existing school accommodation the need for further building is beyond the need for debate. It is much less easy to determine just how badly and to what extent an old school needs renovation, or whether it had better be demolished and a new school built.

#### Teachers' Salaries.

The Metropolitan School Board Trustees and the Area Boards in general are constantly annoyed at the differences which obtain in teachers' salary schedules among the Metropolitan municipalities. These differences, even though small, encourage prospective teachers to use competition among area Boards to their own advantage. Through consultation

and mutual agreement among Boards, the salary schedules are much more nearly equalized than they were a decade ago, but we appear to have gone about as far as we can by this means. As a cure for the problem it has been suggested that legislation be sought giving the Metropolitan School Board some control over salaries paid to teachers in the Metropolitan area. It can probably be assumed that unless the situation becomes worse such a move would be viewed with misgivings by some of the area Boards. In its most acceptable form it would permit negotiations to continue at the local level, with the Metropolitan Board setting limits in such basic matters as minima, maxima, yearly increments, and credit for experience elsewhere.

A former member of the Metropolitan School Board offered a rather radical suggestion. This was that a central hiring authority be set up. This authority would determine salary schedules and all teachers engaged in Metropolitan area would be hired and placed by it. The suggestion met with rather strong disapproval. Apparently trustees would rather take their chance in the open market to secure the sort of teachers they want than to trust their needs to any central body. If a science teacher is needed they would rather be left to secure the best person available than to accept whomever the central hiring authority might see fit to assign to them.

#### The Role of the Metropolitan School Board in the Co-ordination of Special Education.

During the first year of its operation the Metropolitan School Board exercised its prerogative provided in the Act to undertake the payment in full to area Boards of Education of the cost of special classes. As a consequence the special classes existing in the Metropolitan area became equally available to all children in the area.

From the outset it was recognized that the establishment of special classes would need to be very carefully controlled because of the understandable temptation for area boards to shift as much as possible of the cost of education into the Metropolitan tax-rate. As a step toward simplification it was decreed that the special classes recognized by the Metropolitan School Board should not include classes for

emotionally disturbed children or advancement classes for gifted children. Had these not been excluded the situation would have become almost impossible of control, since it might be argued that all children are to some extent emotionally disturbed and there appears to be no agreement with respect to what qualities and to what degree entitle a child to be termed "gifted".

All applications for the establishment of special classes are carefully screened, normally through the assistance of the Advisory Council. The need for these classes must be established, and this need must be evaluated in relation to existing services of a like nature throughout the Metropolitan area. In addition to the need for the classes, attention must be given to such matters as transportation facilities and costs of equipment requirements.

The question proposed for discussion was whether, in view of the many-sided and rather complex nature of the problem, the appointment of a co-ordinator of special education might result in improved economy and efficiency. The reaction here was, for the most part, similar to that obtained in the case of a co-ordinator for technical education. The weight of opinion was against singling out special education as a separate entity with its own co-ordinator. Some went as far as to express the view that if a co-ordinator were appointed he should have responsibility not only for technical and academic secondary education, but for all education throughout the entire school system. It was pointed out that the coordinating functions of the Metropolitan School Board were now being performed very largely through the collective wisdom of the Advisory Council and were being performed rather well. It was recognized, however, that there was a limit to the burden which the Advisory Council should be expected to bear.

---

#### DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 52.

November 22, 1956.

#### PART I.

1. Maintenance Assistance Payments—due December, 1956—SECONDARY ..... \$ 680,543.73

## ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANARY 31, 1956.

2. Bell Telephone Company of Canada, November Service .....	84.75
3. Canadian Linen Company Limited, October Service .....	10.00
4. Carswell Company Limited, Printing Minutes .....	407.50
5. Dominion Maintenance Company, October Service and Supplies .....	123.50
6. Gainsborough Kitchens Limited, October Meeting Expense .....	52.20
7. Gestetner (Canada) Limited, Supplies .....	63.24
8. International Business Machines Co., Quarterly Inspection (4 typewriters) .....	26.00
9. Ofrex (Canada) Limited, Supplies .....	32.00
10. Orange Crush Limited, Meeting Expense .....	1.38
11. Staff Salaries, Pay Period November 2 to November 15 .....	1,511.52
12. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental November 15 to December 14, 1956 .....	1,087.50
13. Toronto Hydro-Electric System, October Service .....	19.09
14. Treasurer, Metropolitan Toronto, Copies of M.M.T.A. 1953 .....	46.50
15. Underwood Limited, Supplies .....	3.60
	<hr/>
	\$684,012.51

## PART II.

1. Auxiliary Class Payment, Payment to Toronto re Linda Romanoff and James Dewis \$	882.20
2. Maintenance Assistance Payments, due December, 1956 PUBLIC .....	1,281,606.81
	<hr/>
	\$1,282,489.01

---

## Metropolitan School Board

### REPORT No. 15 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE PART I.

Tuesday, December 4, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Messrs. Peck (Chairman), Campbell, Ferguson, Grayson, Lockhart, Milgram, Mesdames McBrien and Norman, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In September of this year the Department of Planning and Development approved a draft plan of subdivision T-9663 (478 lots) located in the Township of Scarborough on the understanding that no residential lots north of Highland Creek would be registered before 1957.

At the time of approval of the draft plan the Scarborough Board of Education had indicated that it was prepared to approve the south half of the plan, i.e., that portion south of Highland Creek. The Scarborough Board has now advised that it is agreeable to release of the north portion on condition that access be provided for the children from the north section across Highland Creek to the Coombe-Nelson school site.

Your Committee recommends that the Board concur in the comments of the Scarborough Board of Education.

2. On September 7, 1955, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to an application of the York Township Board of Education for an addition to George Harvey Vocational School consisting of 4 standard classrooms and 8 shops in the amount of Metro Share—\$240,000.00; Local Share—\$120,000.00; Total—\$360,000.00. The York Township Board has submitted the following breakdown of costs and requests approval of additional funds in the amount of \$129,999.00, making a total cost of \$489,000.00 for the project:—

---

Contract price .....	\$403,288.00
Architect's fees .....	24,000.00
Equipment .....	60,000.00
Contingencies .....	1,712.00
	<hr/>
	\$489,000.00

As this project was previously approved on the basis of the ceiling formula for academic secondary schools and since no ceiling formula has been established for construction of technical school accommodation, your Committee recommends that approval be given to the application for George Harvey Vocational School in the revised amount of \$489,000.00.

3. The Committee submits for consideration of the Board a report of the Advisory Council containing pupil ceiling cost formulae for construction of junior elementary schools (kindergarten to grade 6); elementary schools (kindergarten to grade 8); intermediate schools (grades 7 and 8 or 7, 8 and 9); academic secondary schools (grades 9 to 13) and junior vocational units. For details of report, see Appendix, page 425.

Your Committee recommends:

- (a) that the report be adopted;
- (b) that an expression of the Board's appreciation be extended to members of the Advisory Council for their efforts in preparing the report;
- (c) that the Executive Secretary be authorized to arrange a meeting with the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council for discussion of the proposed ceiling formulae during December prior to presentation of the formulae to the Metropolitan Council.

4. The Committee had before it for consideration the tentative 1957 capital programme of the Metropolitan School Board including buildings and sites to be presented to the Metropolitan Council for approval in 1957.



---

Your Committee recommends:—

- (a) that the capital programme for 1957 be revised on the basis of the proposed ceiling formulae and forwarded to area boards of education for further consideration regarding possible reduction of their requirements for 1957;
- (b) that the Executive Secretary be authorized to make application to the Metropolitan Council for approval of a bulk site appropriation in the amount of \$3,000,000.00.

GEORGE PECK,  
Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, December 18, 1956.

---

PREAMBLE TO THE CEILING FORMULA.  
1957.

The History of the Formula.

One of the priority tasks undertaken by the Metropolitan organization in January, 1954, was the review and approval of the applications for new school construction. From the outset representatives of the Metropolitan School Board were present at each Executive meeting with an imposing list of proposed school buildings. School applications were debated at length and it became increasingly evident that there was need for a common understanding between the two bodies if the important work of building schools was to continue without interruption.

A variety of proposals were entertained but after a series of conferences held in the summer of 1954, it was decided that a formula should be established setting forth a ceiling cost within which the Metropolitan Council could be expected to give approval for debenturing purposes. Accordingly, the Advisory Council of the Metropolitan School Board was given the task of preparing and making recommendations with respect to this formula. The Advisory Council compiled school costs in the Metropolitan Area over

the previous five years; studied school cost data from other urban centres in the province and from cities in the United States.

On the basis of these studies ceiling costs were established for public elementary school accommodation and academic secondary school accommodation. During 1955 the formula was expanded to include a ceiling cost for senior public school accommodation (Grades 7 and 8, or Grades 7, 8 and 9, or Grades 7, 8, 9 and 10).

Since its establishment the formula has served very well the purposes for which it was contrived. Its application to individual school projects has required that the formula be kept under constant review and from time to time special features have been added. Any amendment to the original formula has been approved by both the Metropolitan School Board and the Metropolitan Council.

In 1956 a formula was established for junior vocational schools. Planning for the area seemed to indicate that technical school education could be provided either through existing schools or through the establishment of junior vocational units for the next few years. In the meantime studies are being undertaken in connection with the establishment of a formula for senior technical schools.

It was agreed when the formula was first conceived that it should be reviewed on an annual basis and together with such revisions as might be required incorporated in the annual capital budget of the Metropolitan School Board. Provision was also made in 1956 for mid-year review in the event of extraordinary increases in building costs.

Most school projects processed during 1955 and 1956 were within the ceiling formula. During the period, however, the building cost index did increase from 261.1 in September 1954 to 283.5 in November 1956, an increase of 8.6%. It has now become evident that the formula for 1957 must be increased substantially.

Accordingly, the Committee undertook in September 1956 to make a thorough analysis of the factors on which the formula is based with two goals in mind:—

- (a) Validation of the areas on which the formula is based;
- (b) Adjustment of the cost factor proportional to the increase in building costs.

This study has been done with meticulous care and has included a critical examination by business and academic personnel of instructional and ancillary areas provided in various types of schools, of trends in instructional techniques which might tend to influence these features, of building practices throughout the Metropolitan area, and of the impact of local building codes on school construction.

On the basis of its study, the Committee desires to preface the actual ceiling cost data with a few observations which have affected its thinking during the study.

#### 1. Building Costs.

Since the ceiling cost formula has the arbitrary effect of imposing upon an area board the obligation of financing from current revenue any amount in excess of the formula, it must therefore be sufficiently comprehensive to cover buildings which of necessity will be commenced at all seasons of the year. Examination of recent building costs tends to demonstrate that tenders left in the fall with the prospect of much of the building being done during winter weather give rise to a higher square foot cost. This fact together with the general increase reflected in the building index has resulted in tenders based on unit costs greatly increased over the experience of the first year and a half. It was concluded therefore that an increase in the unit cost of not less than 7% and up to 10% in the case of public elementary schools should be made for 1957.

#### 2. Building Codes.

An examination of building codes during the year demonstrated considerable variation in the construction practices throughout the area. It was felt that certain of the regulations imposed were unrealistic. Examples are enclosed stairwells, emergency battery operated fire alarm systems, safety devices on ventilation systems, etc.

### 3. Instructional Techniques.

Throughout its study the Committee was concerned lest drastic economy should result in school buildings ill-designed to meet educational needs. In its tours the Committee observed that junior grades could not participate fully in an effective programme in a classroom with an area of 750 square feet. It was also obvious that 35 grade 8 pupils could not even conduct a satisfactory formal programme in 750 square feet. This increase which the Committee recommends is the most significant change in the 1957 formula.

### 4. Comparisons.

A study of building statistics for school construction in the eastern United States revealed that the proposed ceiling costs for the various types of schools would lie well below the median for corresponding schools south of the border. The formula seems therefore to represent a fair compromise between an austerity school which would strictly limit the scope of the educational programme and a lavish school with areas used too infrequently to justify their inclusion in a school plant. The emphasis in the school areas on which the formula is based has been multi-use in that ancillary spaces are of such type as may be adapted readily to a variety of uses.

The most impressive evidence however that the formula has served its original goals has been the record of its use over the past two years. In order to meet the formula many school plans have required careful revision. In fact, as a result of the rapid rise in costs over recent months, many of the schools have exceeded the formula, imposing a heavy burden on the current operations of the board concerned. The Committee is agreed that the new formulae presented herein contains adjustments consistent with the current practice in education and the rise in building costs.

It is recommended that, in the event of a significant increase in the building cost index, measured by the building cost index published in McLean's Building Guide, the Metropolitan School Board shall review and suggest any upward revision of the formula made necessary through the increased building cost.

---

PROPOSED FORMULA—1957.

1. Junior Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-6.
  - A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of junior public elementary school accommodation, grades kindergarten to 6, up to an amount calculated on the basis of \$855.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: Single kindergarten classrooms—30; standard classrooms—35.
  - B. That in the case of applications for units of 6 classrooms or more where the board gives evidence satisfactory to the Metropolitan School Board that an addition will be required, that an additional amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 15 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated future addition. In such instances the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

(Note:—It might have been expected that Junior Schools could be constructed at a lower cost than a kindergarten to grade 8 school. The formula for these schools, however, is based upon a smaller unit, i.e., 12 rooms and kindergarten. Any significant reduction in the formula would have required the elimination of ancillary space completely. It was the considered opinion of the committee that the inclusion of one general purpose area of approximately 2,000 square feet represents the minimum facility for this type of school.)
2. Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-8.
  - A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of public elementary school accommodation, grades kindergarten to 8, up to an amount calculated on the basis of \$855.00 per pupil space pro-

vided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: Single kindergarten classrooms—30; standard classrooms—35.

- B. That in the case of applications for units of 8 classrooms or more where the board gives evidence satisfactory to the Metropolitan School Board that an addition will be required, that an additional amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 15 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated future addition. In such instances the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

3. General Shop and Home Economics.

That area boards of education be permitted to include in their requisition for capital funds one shop and one home economics unit for each 480 students of total enrolment in grades 7 and 8 at the rate of \$20,000.00 per unit.

4. Intermediate Schools—Grades 7 and 8 or 7, 8 and 9.

- A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of intermediate schools embracing any combination of grades 7 to 9 an amount calculated on the basis of up to \$1,178.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: Standard classrooms—35; general shop and home economics units—20; single gymnasium unit—30.
- B. That in the case of applications for schools to accommodate 420 pupils or more, where a board gives evidence satisfactory to the Metropolitan School Board that an addition will be required, that a further amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 20 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated addition. In such instances, the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount

by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

5. Academic Secondary Schools—Grades 9-13.

- A. That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each proposal for the erection of academic secondary school accommodation, grades 9 to 13, up to an amount calculated on the basis of \$1,490.00 per pupil spaces provided in the proposed building. Pupil spaces shall be determined according to the following scale: Standard classrooms—30; general shop and home economics units—20; single gymnasium unit—30.
- B. That in the case of applications for schools to accommodate 600 pupils or more where the board gives evidence satisfactory to the Metropolitan School Board that an addition will be required that a further amount be allowed for the construction of the first unit up to 30 per cent. of the ceiling cost of the anticipated addition. In such instances the Board shall reduce the amount approved for the addition at the time of application by the amount by which the capital funds provided for the first unit exceeded the formula.

6. Junior Vocational Shop Units.

That the Metropolitan School Board approve for debenturing purposes for each junior vocational shop unit constructed as part of an addition to an academic secondary school up to an amount of \$2,845.00 per pupil space provided in the proposed shop unit. Pupil spaces for this purpose shall be 20 per shop.

7. Special Cases.

- A. That in the rehabilitation of existing accommodation, if the estimated cost exceeds 50 per cent. of the allowance under the formula for a new building to accommodate the same number of pupils, the area board concerned should consider demolition of the existing accommodation and erection of a new school unit;
  - (i) Where it is possible to determine the cost separately for rehabilitation features of any con-

struction project, it is recommended that boards be permitted to request an increase in the ceiling formula with respect to any project involving rehabilitation up to the amount separately provided for in the contract for the rehabilitation. Each board's application for such increase would then be considered by the Metropolitan School Board on its merits.

- (ii) Where such facilities as heating, plumbing, wiring, etc., are being replaced during a rehabilitation and construction program, these facilities being installed to serve both the old school and the new unit, the proportion of the cost of replacement that the number of pupil spaces in the old school bears to the total pupil spaces in the old school and the new addition may be treated as rehabilitation cost.

It is understood, of course, that the Board would not likely approve a rehabilitation expense which exceeds 50 per cent. of the allowance under the formula for a new building to accommodate the same number of pupils.

- B. That additions to existing facilities shall be within the formula already approved for new school accommodation.
- C. That the Metropolitan School Board shall retain the right to approve the necessary capital financing for ancillary accommodation which an area board proposes to erect to bring the accommodation of any school in line with the minimum standards on which the formula is based.

In the event that a board gives evidence that in an addition or separate building to be part of a school unit where there is existing accommodation, it is recommended that the area board be permitted to increase the ceiling cost by the amount shown in the appropriate table for any ancillary features which the board proposes to erect to serve existing classroom accommodation.



## DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS.

1957.

## A. Junior Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-6.

## 1. Optimum Capacity of School:—

12 standard classrooms .....	420 pupil spaces
Kindergarten .....	30 pupil spaces
	<hr/>
	450
	<hr/>

## 2. Optimum Area of School:—

	Square Footage	
(a) Instructional Space		
12 standard classrooms at 875 .....	10,500	
1 kindergarten (including wash- rooms, etc.) .....	1,200	11,700
	<hr/>	
(b) Ancillary Space		
General Purpose Room and/or library and special services ...	2,000	
Staff room and staff washroom facilities .....	400	2,400
	<hr/>	
(c) Administrative Areas		
Office .....	350	
Health room .....	250	600
	<hr/>	
(d) Service Areas		
Caretakers' and general storage	500	
Boiler room and fuel storage .....	700	
Corridors .....	4,500	
Pupils' washrooms .....	1,000	6,700
	<hr/>	
		21,400
Inside and Outside Walls .....		2,530
		<hr/>
		23,930
		<hr/>

3. Calculation of Contract Price:—  
 23,930 square feet at \$13.50 = \$323,055.00.
4. Total Cost:—
- |                        |              |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Contract .....         | \$323,055.00 |
| Architects Fees .....  | 19,383.00    |
| Equipment .....        | 19,500.00    |
| Site Improvement ..... | 13,505.00    |
| Contingencies .....    | 9,762.00     |
|                        | <hr/>        |
|                        | \$384,750.00 |
5. Per Pupil Cost:—  
 \$384,750.00 divided by 450 = \$855.00.

DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS.  
 1957.

B. Public Elementary Schools—Grade K-8.

1. Optimum Capacity of School:—
- |                              |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| 16 standard classrooms ..... | 560 pupil spaces |
| Kindergarten .....           | 30 pupil spaces  |
|                              | <hr/>            |
|                              | 590              |
2. Optimum Area of School:—
- |   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
|   | Square<br>Footage |
| (a) Instructional Space                               |                   |
| 16 standard classrooms at 875 .....                   | 14,000            |
| 1 kindergarten (including wash-<br>rooms, etc.) ..... | 1,200             |
|   | <hr/>             |
| (b) Ancillary Space                                   |                   |
| General Purpose Room .....                            | 2,400             |
| Library .....   | 450               |
| Staff room and staff washroom<br>facilities .....     | 500               |

	Square Footage	
Special Services .....	425	3,775
(c) Administrative Areas		
Office .....	350	
Health room .....	250	600
(d) Service Areas		
Caretakers' and general storage	600	
Boiler room and fuel storage .....	800	
Corridors .....	5,800	
Pupils' washrooms .....	1,200	8,400
		<u>27,975</u>
Inside and Outside Walls .....		3,300
		<u>31,275</u>
3. Calculation of Contract Price:—		
31,275 square feet at \$13.50 = \$422,213.00.		
4. Total Cost:—		
Contract .....	\$422,213.00	
Architects Fees .....	25,333.00	
Equipment .....	25,500.00	
Site Improvement .....	18,738.00	
Contingencies .....	12,666.00	
	<u>\$504,450.00</u>	
5. Per Pupil Cost:—		
\$504,450.00 divided by 590 = \$855.00.		

DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS.  
1957.

C. Intermediate Schools—Grades 7 and 8 or 7, 8 and 9.	
1. Optimum Capacity of School:—	
20 classroom areas .....	700 pupil spaces
2 general shops .....	40 pupil spaces
2 home economics .....	40 pupil spaces
1 double gymnasium .....	60 pupil spaces
	<u>840</u>

## 2. Optimum Area of School:—

	Square Footage	
(a) Instructional Space		
15 standard classrooms at 825 .....	12,375	
1 library classroom .....	1,200	
1 music classroom .....	1,000	
1 art classroom .....	1,000	
2 science classrooms (1,000 + 825) .....	1,825	
2 general shops at 1,200 .....	2,400	
2 home economics at 1,200 .....	2,400	
1 double gymnasium (and stage) .....	7,000	29,200
(b) Ancillary Space		
Lunch room and Special Purpose		
Room .....	2,200	
Extra-curricular area .....	400	
Staff room or rooms .....	1,000	
Dressing rooms .....	1,900	
Kitchen (Pupil, Public, Staff) .....	500	6,000
(c) Administrative Areas		
Offices .....	800	
Guidance and counselling .....	400	
Health room .....	450	1,650
(d) Service Areas		
Pupil washrooms .....	1,600	
Storage:—		
Caretaker .....	700	
Athletic .....	400	
General .....	400	1,500
Boiler room and fuel storage .....	2,000	
Corridors and entranceways .....	9,500	14,600
		51,450
Inside and Outside Walls, 12½ %		6,430
		57,880

3. Calculation of Contract Price:—  
 57,880 square feet at \$14.00 = \$810,320.00.
4. Total Cost:—
- |                        |              |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Contract .....         | \$810,320.00 |
| Architect's Fees ..... | 48,619.00    |
| Equipment .....        | 81,000.00    |
| Site Improvement ..... | 25,200.00    |
| Contingencies .....    | 24,381.00    |
|                        | <hr/>        |
|                        | \$989,520.00 |
|                        | <hr/>        |
5. Per Pupil Cost:—  
 \$989,520.00 divided by 840 = \$1,178.00.

---

DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS.

1957.

D. Academic Secondary Schools—Grades 9 to 13, 10 to 13 or 11 to 13.

1. Optimum Capacity of School:—
- |                                   |                    |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 34 Classroom Teaching Areas ..... | 1,020 pupil spaces |
| 2 Shops .....                     | 40 pupil spaces    |
| 1 Home Economics .....            | 20 pupil spaces    |
| 1 Double Gymnasium .....          | 60 pupil spaces    |
|                                   | <hr/>              |
|                                   | 1,140              |
|                                   | <hr/>              |

2. Optimum Area of School:—

	Square Footage
(a) Instructional Area	
25 Standard Classrooms at 720 ...	18,000
2 Music Rooms—(1 Vocal, 1 Instrumental) 720 + 1,180 ...	1,900
1 Art and Crafts .....	1,000
5 Science Labs (2 Chem., 2 Phys., 1 Gen.) at 1,000 .....	5,000

	Square Footage	
1 Library-Classroom .....	1,200	
2 General Shops at 1,400 plus Storage 230 each .....	3,260	
1 Home Economics .....	1,400	
1 Double Gym (Including Office and Bleacher Space) .....	8,000	39,760
(b) Ancillary Space		
Auditorium (Including dressing rooms, stage, etc., for 570 pupils) .....	8,000	
Staff room(s) .....	1,000	
Dressing rooms, showers, team rooms .....	2,000	
Cafeteria and kitchen for 400 pupils .....	5,500	
Extra Curricular Activities and Committee Room .....	600	17,100
(c) Administrative Areas		
Offices .....	1,050	
Guidance and Counselling .....	500	
Health Room .....	450	2,000
(d) Service Areas		
Pupils' washrooms .....	1,800	
Storage Space:—		
Caretaker .....	800	
Athletic .....	600	
General .....	1,000	2,400
Boiler Room and Fuel Storage .....	1,400	
Electrical Equipment .....	500	
Mechanical Equip- ment .....	600	2,500
Corridors and Entranceways .....	22,240	28,940
		87,800
Inside and Outside Walls .....		8,000
		95,800

3. Calculation of Contract Price  
 95,800 square feet at \$14.50 = \$1,389,100.00
4. Total Cost
- |                        |                 |                 |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Contract .....         | \$ 1,389,100.00 |                 |
| Architect's Fees ..... | 83,000.00       |                 |
| Equipment .....        | 150,000.00      |                 |
| Site Improvement ..... | 34,500.00       |                 |
| Contingencies .....    | 42,000.00       | \$ 1,698,600.00 |
- 
5. Per Pupil Cost:—  
 \$1,698,600.00 divided by 1,140 = \$1,490.00

## DETAILED CALCULATION OF PER PUPIL COSTS.

1957.

- E. Junior Shop Units constructed as part of or as an addition to an academic secondary school.
1. Optimum Capacity:—  
 4 shops at 20 pupils = 80 pupil spaces.
2. Optimum Areas:—
- |  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| (a) Instructional                      |       |       |
| 4 shops at 1,400 square feet each      |       | 5,600 |
| (b) Administrative and Ancillary space |       |       |
| 80/1140 of 19,100 .....                | 1,340 |       |
| (c) Service Areas                      |       |       |
| 80/1140 of 36,940 .....                | 2,592 | 3,932 |
- 
- (d) Double Gymnasium—Net Cost
- |                                      |                     |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Contract Cost 8,000 × \$14.50 .....  | \$116,000.00        |
| Less Pupil Allowance 60 × \$1,490.00 | 89,400.00           |
|                                      | <u>\$ 26,600.00</u> |

- 
3. Calculation of Contract Price:—
- |  |              |              |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Instructional, 5,600 square feet at \$15.50 .....                                | \$ 86,800.00 |              |
| Administration, Ancillary, and Service areas, 3,932 square feet at \$14.50 ..... | 57,014.00    |              |
| Double Gymnasium—<br>Net Cost 80/1140 of<br>\$26,600.00 .....                    | 1,867.00     | \$145,681.00 |
|  |              | <hr/>        |
4. Total Cost:—
- |                        |              |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Contract .....         | \$145,681.00 |
| Architect's Fees ..... | 8,741.00     |
| Equipment .....        | 40,000.00    |
| Contingencies .....    | 4,378.00     |
|                        | <hr/>        |
|                        | \$198,800.00 |
|                        | <hr/>        |
5. Cost per pupil space  $\$198,800.00 \div 80 = \$2,485.00$ .



1957 ALLOWANCE FOR ANCILLARY AND ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS  
NOT PROVIDED FOR IN AN EXISTING BUILDING.

A. Junior Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-6.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Special Space Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Appropriate Portion of Construction Cost on a Per Classroom Basis	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, Etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
General Purpose Room, Lib- rary and Special Serv- ices .....	2,000	830	\$ 2,940.00	\$ 560.00	\$ 3,500.00
Staff Room(s) .....	400	170	590.00	110.00	700.00
Office .....	350	150	520.00	100.00	620.00
Health Room .....	250	100	360.00	70.00	430.00
	<u>3,000</u>	<u>1,250</u>	<u>\$ 4,410.00</u>	<u>\$ 840.00</u>	<u>\$ 5,250.00</u>

Costs Based on \$13.50 Per Square Foot.

B. Public Elementary Schools—Grades K-8.

General Purpose Room .....	2,400	990	\$ 2,690.00	\$ 520.00	\$ 3,210.00
Library .....	450	190	510.00	100.00	610.00
Staff Room(s) .....	500	210	560.00	110.00	670.00
Special Services .....	425	170	470.00	90.00	560.00
Office .....	350	140	390.00	80.00	470.00
Health Room .....	250	100	280.00	50.00	330.00
	<u>4,375</u>	<u>1,800</u>	<u>\$ 4,900.00</u>	<u>\$ 950.00</u>	<u>\$ 5,850.00</u>

Costs Based on \$13.50 Per Square Foot.

1957 ALLOWANCE FOR ANCILLARY AND ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS  
NOT PROVIDED FOR IN AN EXISTING BUILDING.

C. Intermediate Schools—Any Combination Grades 7-9.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Special Space Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, Etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
Lunch Room, Kitchen, etc. ....	2,700	1,030	\$ 440.00	\$ 2,450.00
Extra Curricular Area .....	400	150	70.00	370.00
Staff Room(s) .....	1,000	380	170.00	910.00
Dressing Rooms .....	1,900	720	310.00	1,720.00
Offices .....	800	300	130.00	720.00
Guidance Offices .....	400	150	70.00	370.00
Health Room .....	450	170	70.00	400.00
	<u>7,650</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>\$ 1,260.00</u>	<u>\$ 6,940.00</u>
Costs based on \$14.00 per square foot and 26 instructional areas.				
Double Gymnasium—Area .....			7,000	
—Applicable Share of Walls and Corridors .....			2,660	9,660 square feet
—Contract Cost 9,660 @ \$14.00 .....				\$135,240.00
—Portion of Architect's Fees, etc. ....				29,900.00
—Less Cost Allowed on a per pupil basis $60 \times \$1,178.00$ .....				\$165,140.00
—Excess Cost per Classroom or Shop .....			\$94,460.00	\$ 94,460.00
			$\div 24 =$	\$ 3,940.00

1957 ALLOWANCE FOR ANCILLARY AND ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS  
NOT PROVIDED FOR IN AN EXISTING BUILDING.

D. Academic Secondary Schools—Grades 9-13.

	Square Foot Area	Applicable Special Space Share of Wall and Corridor Space	Appropriate Portion of Architect's Fees, Equipment, Etc.	Allowance Per Classroom of Existing Accommodation
Auditorium .....	8,000	3,690	\$ 970.00	\$ 5,320.00
Staff Room(s) .....	1,000	460	120.00	660.00
Dressing Rooms, Etc. ....	2,000	920	240.00	1,330.00
Cafeteria .....	5,500	2,540	670.00	3,660.00
Extra Curricular and Com- mittee Room .....	600	280	70.00	400.00
Offices .....	1,050	480	130.00	700.00
Guidance Offices .....	500	230	60.00	330.00
Health Room .....	450	210	50.00	290.00
	<u>19,100</u>	<u>8,810</u>	<u>\$ 2,310.00</u>	<u>\$12,690.00</u>
Costs based on \$14.50 per square foot and 39 instructional areas.				
Double Gymnasium—Area .....			8,000	11,690 square feet
—Applicable Share of Walls and Corridors .....			3,690	
—Contract Cost 11,690 @ \$14.50 .....				\$169,510.00
—Portion of Architect's Fees, etc .....				37,770.00
				<u>\$207,280.00</u>
—Less Cost Allowance on a per pupil basis 60 × \$1,490.00 .....				89,400.00
				<u>\$117,880.00</u>
—Excess Cost per Classroom or Shop .....			\$117,880.00 ÷ 37 =	<u>\$ 3,190.00</u>

## ADDITIONAL PRINCIPLES.

1. In calculating the formula allowance for an addition to an existing school the cost of the school or the cost of previous additions thereto shall be taken into account if school or additions were subject to the approval of the Metropolitan School Board.

2. Where a special feature which has been incorporated in a school prior to the formula is found to be less than optimum from a size standpoint, an allowance may be made for bringing it up to the optimum size on a proportionate basis.

## Example 1:—

Assume a playroom in a public elementary school (K-8) which was built prior to January 1, 1954 contains 1,200 square feet. The school is to be increased in size from 12 rooms plus kindergarten to 14 rooms plus kindergarten and it is desired to increase the size of the playroom to 2,000 square feet.

## Solution:—

A school of 12 plus K would normally provide sufficient funds for a playroom of  $13/17^* \times 2,400 = 1,835$  square feet. Since the playroom that was built was only 1,200 square feet an additional allowance may be made of  $635/1,835 \times \$3,210.00 \times 13 = \$14,440.00$ . The two additional rooms should provide more than sufficient funds to bring the playroom up to 2,000 square feet.

## Example 2:—

Assume a playroom in a public elementary school (K-8) contains 1,000 square feet. The school as it existed at January 1, 1954 contained 10 standard classrooms and a kindergarten and has an addition of 4 standard classrooms since that time at a cost of \$661.00 per pupil. (While formula at \$735.00 per pupil.) It is now desired to bring the playroom up to 2,400 square feet and to add two more standard classrooms.

## Solution:—

A school of 10 plus K would normally provide sufficient funds for a playroom of  $11/17^* \times 2,400 = 1,555$  square feet.

Since the playroom that was built was only 1,000 square feet an additional allowance may be made of

555/1,555 × \$3,210.00 × 11 = .....	\$12,600.00
The four room addition added since January 1/54 at \$661.00 per pupil will provide 140 × (735. — 661.) = .....	10,360.00
	<hr/> \$22,960.00 <hr/>

The proposed two room addition should provide sufficient funds to allow the increase in the playroom to be made without expenditure out of current funds.

\* Number of classrooms in optimum size elementary school (K-Grade 8).

---

#### REPORT No. 15 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART I.

Thursday, December 6, 1956.

To the Metropolitan School Board:—

At a meeting of the above-named Committee held this day, the following members being present, viz., Miss Perney, Mrs. Temple, Messrs. Ferguson, Might, Stinson and Van Esterik, it was decided to report and recommend as follows:—

1. In favour of sections 2, 3 and 4 of Report No. 15 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part I.

2. The cost of home instruction which is part of the special education programme is borne in full by the Metropolitan School Board. At the present time the Metropolitan School Board reimburses area boards of education for the actual cost. Where full time teachers are employed the salary of the teacher is paid together with a modest amount for travelling expenses. In smaller areas, however, it is common practice to assign a regular teacher or retired teacher in the community to the home instruction task at an hourly rate. These rates have tended to vary.

It is recommended that the Metropolitan School Board undertake the cost of home instruction up to a maximum of \$5.00 per hour for public and secondary school students.

3. (a) The Advisory Council has had under review the problem of students about to enter the final year of their course whose parents move from one municipality to another prior to the opening of school in September. The final year of schooling is generally admitted to be difficult under the best of circumstances.

The Committee recommends adoption of the following recommendation of the Advisory Council and requests that the area boards of education approve the principle contained therein:—

“That, at the request of the parents concerned, secondary school students in their graduating year be permitted to continue in attendance at the school in which they were enrolled as resident students regardless of the location of residence in the Metropolitan area. The graduating year shall be interpreted as being grade 13 of the academic course or grade 12 of the commercial or industrial courses and a student shall not be permitted to continue his attendance in the final year of the particular course beyond one year.”

(b) Your Committee further recommends that area boards of education be requested to approve the reverse principle to that contained in section (a) above, i.e., that in the event that parents in anticipation of a change of residence desire to enrol a child in the school serving the area to which they intend to move that fees be waived by the receiving board for that portion of the year preceding the actual move.

4. That the following revised schedule of rates submitted by the Carswell Company Limited for printing the 1957 Board minutes and appendices be approved, effective January 1, 1957:—

Minutes and Appendix

10 point text, per page .....	\$ 5.55
8 point text, per page .....	7.65
8 point tabular, per page .....	8.95
6 point tabular, per page .....	9.90

## Indices

8 point, per page .....	8.75
6 point, per page .....	9.90

## Estimates

Per page .....	11.95
----------------	-------

Sales tax included.

5. That the Executive Secretary be authorized to arrange for the presentation to the retiring Chairman of the Board of the gavel used by him and a token gift at a cost not to exceed \$50.00.

6. That Disbursement List No. 53, dated December 6, 1956, containing Part I accounts totalling \$20,505.85 be approved. (See Appendix p. 456.)

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,  
Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, December 18, 1956.

REPORT No. 15 OF BUILDINGS AND SITES COMMITTEE  
—PART II.

Tuesday, December 4, 1956.

1. On August 29, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to an application of the Toronto Board of Education for an addition to Sunny View School in the amount of Metro Share, \$120,000.00; Local Share, \$64,000.00; Total, \$184,000.00. Since the ceiling formula does not apply to this special type of school, the Toronto Board of Education has submitted the following application for capital funds with the request that additional funds in the amount of \$38,386.00 be approved, making a total approval of \$222,386.00 for the project:—

Contract price .....	\$188,286.00
Drafting and Engineering Costs .....	5,500.00
Equipment .....	24,600.00
Contingency .....	4,000.00
Total .....	<u>\$222,386.00</u>

Your Committee recommends that approval be given for Sunny View School in the revised amount of \$222,386.00.

2. On September 17, 1956, the Ontario Municipal Board gave tentative approval to an application of the Etobicoke Board of Education for erection of West Humber Public School in the amount of Metro Share, \$160,000.00; Local Share, \$87,380.00; Total, \$247,380.00. The ceiling formula for this project is \$247,380.00.

In submitting the application for capital funds in the amount of \$247,380.00, the Etobicoke Board of Education has indicated that it did not accept the lowest tender for construction of the West Humber Public School. The Etobicoke Board's action in awarding the tender to the second lowest tenderer was based upon experience with the lowest tenderer particularly in the building of the second addition to Royal York C.I. The work of the low tenderer was slow and suffered from poor organization and contrary to specific instructions from the architect and the specifications, the contractor forced the substitution of an inferior locker through failure to order the locker specified in adequate time to permit its manufacture and installation for the scheduled opening of the school.

Your Committee recommends that the Board concur in the action of the Etobicoke Board in awarding the tender to the second lowest tenderer and that the Executive Secretary be instructed to confer with the Metropolitan Solicitor in regard to presentation of the application for capital funds to the Metropolitan Council.

GEORGE PECK,

Chairman of Committee.

Adopted by the Board, December 18, 1956.

---

REPORT No. 15 OF FINANCE COMMITTEE—PART II.

Thursday, December 6, 1956.

1. In favour of sections 1 and 2 of Report No. 15 of Buildings and Sites Committee, Part II.

J. C. VAN ESTERIK,

Chairman pro tem.

Adopted by the Board, December 18, 1956.



## APPENDIX "A"

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School(s)	Boundaries	Grades
East York	Toronto	Danforth Technical	All Township of East York except Bennington Heights district	Tech. 10-13
Etobicoke	Toronto	Western Tech.-Comm.	All students residing between the centre line of Richview Side Road and the centre line of the Queensway in the Township of Etobicoke	Tech. 9-13 and commercial students where the course is not offered in Etobicoke schools.
Etobicoke	Lakeshore	New Toronto Secondary School	All students residing between the centre line of The Queensway and the south limit of the Township of Etobicoke	Tech. 10-13 and commercial students completing their course at Mimico High School
Forest Hill	Toronto York	Northern Tech.-Comm. OR Geo. Harvey Voc.	Village of Forest Hill	Comm.-Tech. 9-13
Leaside	Toronto	Northern Tech.-Comm.	Town of Leaside	Tech. 9-13 and commercial students in courses not offered in the Leaside High School

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School(s)	Boundaries	Grades
North York*	Scarborough Toronto	Warden-St. Clair Danforth Technical	South of Eglinton Avenue extension, east of C.N.R. and south to Township of North York boundary	Acad. 9-13 Tech. 9-13 (or 11-13)
* Students from the area defined shall have the option of attending junior vocational classes in Scarborough secondary schools or Danforth Technical School.				
North York	Weston	Weston Coll. & Voc.	(a) That part of North York north of Highway 401 and west of Highway 400; (b) That part of North York north of Lawrence Avenue West and west of Hopcroft Avenue extended	Acad. Comm. Tech. 9-13
North York	York	York Memorial C.I. Geo. Harvey Voc.	South of Lawrence Avenue West but excluding Lawrence Avenue and west of C.N.R.	Acad. Comm. Tech. 9-13

Note: In connection with the foregoing attendance area it should be noted that students residing in the area between the Black Creek and the boundary of North York have the option of attending schools in Weston or York Township. It is recommended that this arrangement be approved for the school year 1956-57 and that it be reviewed for the school year 1957-58.

Sending Board	Receiving Board	School(s)	Boundaries	Grades
North York	Toronto	North Toronto C.I.	**East of Yonge St. to west branch of Don River bounded on east by Bayview Avenue, south by City Limits and west by City Limits	Acad. 9-13
<p>** Note: Students residing south of Mount Hope Cemetery between the Toronto City Limits on the west and Bayview Avenue on the east shall have the option of attending either North Toronto C.I. or Leaside H.S.</p>				
Scarborough	Toronto	Danforth Technical	Township of Scarborough	Tech. 11-13 and Tech. 10 in subjects not provided in Scarborough Jr. Vocational classes

## APPENDIX "B".

## Etobicoke Board of Education.

## Opportunity Classes (3)

(Note: These classes were previously approved for the period September, 1955 to June, 1956).

Rexdale Public School

I.Q. Range—70-88

Age Range—8.0-12.6

No. of Pupils—14

Department of Education approval—January 31, 1955

Sir Adam Beck (transferred from Franklin Horner)

I.Q. Range—70-91

Age Range—8.0-10.5

No. of pupils—20

Department of Education approval—January 31, 1955

Sir Adam Beck (transferred from Lanor)

I.Q. Range—70-95

Age Range—7.8-11.3

No. of Pupils—19

Department of Education approval—January 31, 1955

## Handicraft Classes (3)

Franklin Horner Intermediate School

I. Q. Range—70-92

Age Range—12.3 plus (Boys)

No. of Pupils—16

Department of Education approval—June 28, 1956

Wedgewood Public School

I.Q. Range—70-89

Age Range—12.6 plus (Girls)

No. of Pupils—16

Department of Education approval—June 28, 1956.

Islington Public School

(Note: This class was previously approved for the period September 55 to June 56—transferred from Norseman)

I.Q. Range—70-94

---

Age Range—12.4 plus  
No. of Pupils—21  
Department of Education approval—January 31, 1955

Scarborough Board of Education

Opportunity Classes (2)

Corvette Avenue Public School  
I.Q. Range—50-80 plus  
Age Range—8-13  
No. of Pupils—16  
Department of Education approval—July 9, 1956

Latcham Public School  
I.Q. Range—50-80 plus  
Age Range—8-13  
No. of Pupils—16  
Department of Education approval—July 9, 1956

Classes operated previously as opportunity classes—

Sr. Academic Vocational Classes (3)

General Crerar Public School  
I. Q. Range—50 to 80 plus  
Age Range—13-16  
No. of Pupils—16  
Department of Education approval—

G. P. Mackie Public School  
I. Q. Range—50 to 80 plus  
Age Range—13-16  
No. of Pupils—16  
Department of Education approval—

West Hill Public School  
I.Q. Range  
Age Range—13-16  
No. of Pupils—16  
Department of Education approval—

## Toronto Board of Education.

## Opportunity Classes (5)

Bruce Public School

I.Q. Range—under 75

Age Range—7-12

No. of pupils—20

Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Duke of York Public School

I.Q. Range—under 75

Age Range—7-12

No. of pupils—20

Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Earlscourt Public School

I.Q. Range—under 75

Age Range—7-12

No. of pupils—20

Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Leslie St. Public School

I.Q. Range—under 75

Age Range—7-12

No. of Pupils—20

Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Orde Street Public School

I.Q. Range—under 75

Age Range—7-12

No. of Pupils—20

Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

## Academic Vocational Classes (9)

Duke of Connaught Public School

I.Q. Range—80-90

Age Range—13-16

No. of Pupils—60 (2 classes)

Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Kent Senior Public School

I.Q. Range—80-90

Age Range—13-16

No. of Pupils—30  
Department of Educational approval—August 8, 1956

King Edward Public School  
I.Q. Range—80-90  
Age Range—13-16  
No. of Pupils—60 (2 classes)  
Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Perth Senior Public School  
I.Q. Range—80-90  
Age Range—13-16  
No. of Pupils—30  
Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Rose Avenue Public School  
I.Q. Range—80-90  
Age Range—13-16  
No. of Pupils—90 (3 classes)  
Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Orthopaedic Classes (2)

Sunny View  
I.Q. Range—over 75  
Age Range—over 5  
No. of pupils—40 (2 classes)  
Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Oral Classes for Deaf (3)

Sunny View  
Age Range—3 and over  
No. of pupils—36 (3 classes)  
Department of Education approval—August 8, 1956

Note: Department of Education approval was granted to the above classes in the City of Toronto with the understanding that—

- “(1) complete lists of pupils would be forwarded to this office when the classes are in operation in September, and
- (2) the unqualified teachers mentioned in nine of the application forms would become qualified or be re-

placed by qualified teachers as of September 3, 1957."

York Township Board of Education.

Opportunity Classes (2)

School—not yet known

I.Q. Range—52-65

Age Range—7-12

No. of Pupils—22 (2 classes)

Department of Education approval—

Handicraft Class

Warren Park

I.Q. Range—70-90

Age Range—12-16

No. of Pupils—20

DISBURSEMENT LIST No. 53

December 6, 1956.

PART I.

1. Advisory Council: November to December Honorariums \$1,920.00; Expense Allowances \$480.00 .....	\$ 2,400.00
2. Canadian Linen Company Ltd.: November Service \$10.00; December Service \$10.00 .....	20.00
3. The Carswell Company Ltd., Minutes, October 30th .....	52.00
4. Dominion Maintenance Co. Ltd.: November Service \$85.00; December Service \$85.00 ..	170.00
5. Mr. G. L. Gray, Editorial Assistance .....	219.00
6. Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto: Treasurer \$5,000.00; Legal Fees \$5,000.00 .....	10,000.00
7. Staff Expense Allowances, December .....	70.00
8. Staff Salaries: Pay Period November 30 to December 13 \$1,511.52; December 14 to December 27 \$1,511.52; December 28 to January 10 \$1,511.52 .....	4,534.56
9. Oakes Window Cleaning, December Service .....	12.00
10. Ten Eglinton Avenue East, Building Rental December 15 to January 14, 1957 .....	1,087.50



---

ITEMS PAID PURSUANT TO MOTION JANUARY 31, 1956.

11. Carswell Company Limited, Minutes October 16th .....	215.50
12. McGraw-Hill Company of Canada, Library .....	3.02
13. Moyer School Supply Limited, Supplies .....	21.10
14. Receiver General of Canada, Postage .....	69.00
15. Staff Expense Allowances, November .....	70.00
16. Staff Salaries, Pay Period November 16 to November 29 .....	1,511.52
17. Expenses re visit to Ontario School for the Deaf—(3)—Auxiliary Classes Expenses .....	50.65

---

\$20,505.85

2