

# Citizen Control of the Citizen's Business

TORONTO'S CITIZENS CAN CONTROL TORONTO'S AFFAIRS ONLY THROUGH FREQUENT, PROMPT, ACCURATE AND PERTINENT INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO TORONTO'S BUSINESS.

ISSUED BY THE  
BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH  
189 CHURCH STREET, TORONTO.

WHITE PAPER No. 52

FEBRUARY 14, 1922

The original estimates  
of last year's Board of Education are said to have  
provided for an expenditure in 1921  
equivalent to

**10¼ MILLS**

on the assessment.

The actual rate adopted was 10 mills.

*But even if the Board had received the full 10¼ mills,  
the revenue resulting would not have been sufficient  
to meet all bills chargeable to current account.*

---

WHAT WILL BE THE FINANCIAL RECORD  
OF THIS YEAR'S BOARD?



## SOME 1921 FACTS

When in the last hours of the last meeting of the City Council in December 1921, the Board of Education asked the City Council for an additional \$450,000 to be paid not later than December 21st, in order that the teachers might be paid before Christmas, it was stated that the overdraft was made up approximately, as follows:—

\$158,000 overdraft on business of 1921

\$128,000 carried over from 1920 and "not discovered in time to include in the 1921 estimates, due to the fact that the Board did not have at that time proper appropriation ledgers installed."

\$164,000 equivalent to the  $\frac{1}{4}$  mill which the City Council deducted from the Board's 1921 Estimates.

Of these three items, the City Council could not be held responsible by any stretch of the imagination for any except the third. How could the City Council have been aware of, and therefore, by inference, indirectly responsible for the \$128,000 item, if the Board itself did not know of it in time to insert it in the 1921 estimates? How could one expect the City Council to be aware of the \$158,000 item, if at least some members of the Board didn't know of it on December 5th, 1921? Yet on one day's notice the Council is asked to find the whole \$450,000.

## QUERIES

1. In a total expenditure of about 7 millions, or about \$65.00 per family of five, was there no way, if early action had been taken, in which this overdraft could have been taken care of without a twelfth hour demand on the City Council?
2. Was there any item other than teachers' salaries on which the Board could have gone short?
3. Was a deficiency in teachers' salaries the best weapon, from the stand-point of practical psychology, with which to force the City Council's hand?
4. When did the Board of Education first learn of the item of \$128,000 carried over from 1920?
5. When was this information passed on to the public and to the City Council?
6. When did the Board become aware that it would close the year with a large deficit on 1921 operations?
7. When was this made known to the public and the City Council?
8. Did the Board tacitly agree to the cut of  $\frac{1}{4}$  mill for 1921?
9. If so why did it not live within the appropriation?



## UNCONTROLLABLE ?

Does the following official analysis by the Board of Education of its estimates for 1921 throw any light on the question of why the Board experiences such difficulty in keeping expenditures within bounds ?

### Uncontrollable

Salaries .....	\$4,679,470.00	67.13%
Debt Charges .....	1,219,932.00	17.50%
Fuel, Gas, Electricity, Tele- phones, Water and Insur- ance .....	345,370.00	4.95%
Text Books and General School Supplies .....	272,394.00	3.91%
Sundry Items .....	99,375.00	1.43%
Total Uncontrollable .....	\$6,616,541.23	94.92%

### Controllable

Repairs and Alterations to Buildings and Equipment..	\$ 354,341.00	5.08%
Gross Total of Estimates for year, excluding Grants, Fees, Sundry, Receipts etc.	<u>\$6,970,882.23</u>	100.00%

If the Board considers only 5.08% of its expenditures controllable, what room is there for retrenchment ?

The time approaches when the expenditures for the municipality for 1922 are to be determined. Is the business of the City of Toronto to be considered as a unit or as a number of unrelated units? Are the needs of the City of Toronto to be considered as a whole through close and cordial co-operation between the City Council and "Outside Boards", or is each authority to stand on its "rights"? When authorities stand on their rights, who is considering the rights of the people who pay the bills?

*There never was a time when team-play was more necessary than at present. Will there be team-play in 1922 ?*