

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

189 CHURCH STREET



TELEPHONE: MAIN 3620

White Paper No. 76

May 29th, 1924

The taxpayers of Toronto, which term includes directly or indirectly every resident of the City, are to spend in 1924 on regular city services

\$28,268,145.07

This does not include the ratepayers' share of local improvements which are paid for by special taxation. It does not include expenditures on the water works or any other municipally owned utility which are maintained by their own revenues, except for any deficit which must be met out of general revenue*. It does include expenditure on the schools.

It is met by general taxation to the extent of \$23,950,952.41 (84.7%); by last year's unexpended balance of tax spending departments and Boards, amounting to \$1,719,074.78 (6.1%); and by revenues arising through fees, fines, charges for services, governmental subventions, water works surplus (\$677,767.88) and other incidental revenues to the amount of \$2,598,117.88 (9.2%)

*The cost of the high pressure fire system is included as well as the charges to the Fire Department for water services against which the annual surplus devoted to the reduction of taxation may be regarded as a partial set off.

SOME FACTS AS TO ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE FOR 1924

Cost of Main Functions	Service of Persons	Other Services	Heat Light and Power	Supplies other than H. L. & P.	Upkeep and Depreciation	Sinking Funds and Installments	Interest	Unclassified	Capital paid out of Current Revenue	Total	Per Capita		% of Total	
											1924	1923	1924	1923
General Government	\$ 1,036,024	\$ 108,546	\$ 29,958	\$ 89,911	\$ 93,146	\$1,180,037	\$ 900,158	\$ 342,966	\$ 95,126	\$ 3,875,872	\$ 7.07	\$ 8.00	13.7%	15.3%
Protection of Persons and Property	3,363,080	61,430	52,302	1,158,858	158,561	35,629	72,737	996	84,025	4,987,618	9.09	9.18	17.7%	17.5%
Health and Sanitation	2,293,478	75,007	39,718	276,327	95,478	162,297	395,358	85	118,444	3,461,192	6.31	6.37	12.2%	12.1%
Highways	677,966	47,116	445,421	294,534	205,216	337,716	419,624	36,437	2,464,030	4.49	4.18	8.7%	8.0%
Education	6,364,861	33,622	265,964	409,305	466,654	500,254	1,241,167	32,980	178,901	9,493,708	17.31	17.22	33.6%	32.8%
Recreation	676,102	25,276	58,869	116,248	92,204	209,601	252,797	550	46,900	1,478,547	2.70	2.42	5.2%	4.6%
Charities and Correction	124,084	709,611	29,698	46,389	14,692	48,890	83,576	593,004	4,100	1,654,044	3.02	3.28	5.9%	6.3%
Special Services	59,816	2,661	16,247	2,339	55,681	43,923	124,712	19,691	325,070	.59	.77	1.1%	1.5%
War Purposes and Special Grants	467,000	35,925	25,139	528,064	.96	1.01	1.9%	1.9%
TOTAL	\$14,600,411	\$1,063,269	\$938,177	\$2,393,911	\$1,181,632	\$2,985,347	\$3,526,054	\$1,015,411	\$563,933	\$28,268,145	\$51.54	\$52.43	100%	100%
1924														
Per Capita	26.62	1.94	1.71	4.37	2.15	5.44	6.43	1.85	1.03	51.54				
% of Total	51.6%	3.8%	3.3%	8.5%	4.2%	10.5%	12.5%	3.6%	2.0%	100%				
1923														
Total	\$14,388,053	\$1,113,644	\$884,788	\$2,568,693	\$1,088,022	\$2,821,282	\$3,594,513	\$1,113,489	\$673,953	\$28,246,437				
Per Capita	26.70	2.07	1.64	4.77	2.02	5.24	6.67	2.07	1.25	52.43				
% of Total	50.9%	4.0%	3.1%	9.1%	3.8%	10.0%	12.7%	4.0%	2.4%	100%				

The Per Capita are based on the expectation that the increase in population will be as great as it was last year. The population figure chosen was 548,459.

If the correct figure were only 545,000, the per capita total expenditure would be \$51.87 instead of \$51.54 and the subsidiary per capitae would have to be increased proportionally.

In view of the fact that without including the ratepayers' share of local improvements the cost of ordinary city government works out at

\$250

per average family of five, and the further fact that at no time in years has the average citizen had more difficulty in financing his expenses including his various taxes, municipal and federal, are not the following questions pertinent?

1. Why has not centralized price getting for the Municipal Government and all outside Boards been established? Is it because as the result of careful enquiry, it has been discovered that no money would be saved to the taxpayer thereby?
2. Why have not two recent opportunities for combining departments been acted upon? What influences prevented amalgamation? What action will be taken in similar cases in the future?
3. Why has not a thorough survey been made of the civic service as outlined in the resolution passed by the City Council in January, 1923? What were the influences which prevented the survey which the Council then believed and most other citizens believe would have had results of great value to the taxpayer?
4. Should any consideration be given to a civic pension scheme until such a survey has been completed.
5. Particularly at this time should any consideration be given to a pension scheme to which taxpayers would contribute at least until it can be shown that the civic employees need assistance more than their employers, the taxpayers, and that such assistance would improve the efficiency of the civic service?