

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

21 KING STREET EAST



TELEPHONE ELGIN 1904

White Paper No. 141

June 12th, 1929

The 1929 City Budget

STORY No. 2

The net general taxation for 1929 is estimated at

\$28,580,929.61

The estimated net general revenues other than from taxation, including governmental subventions, surpluses carried over from 1928, reserves for deferred expenditures, and various incidental revenues, amount to

\$4,428,147.64

or a total estimated general revenue from which appropriation may be made of

\$33,009,077.25

On the population estimated as in the city estimates—598,000—this represents a per capita general taxation of

\$47.79

and a per capita expenditure from all general funds of

\$55.20

If the net ratepayers' share of local improvements—\$2,152,429.07—be included, the estimated total current expenditure from general taxation and special taxation and miscellaneous and current revenues available for appropriation is

\$35,161,436.32

which represents a gross civic expenditure per person of over \$58.80 and per family of about \$280.

Comparison of Estimated Civic Expenditure from Current General Funds 1929, 1928 and 1927

COMMUNITY SERVICE	TOTAL			PER CAPITA			PER CENT. OF TOTAL EXPENDITURE		
	1929	1928	1927	1929*	1928†	1927	1929	1928	1927
General Government	\$ 3,278,693	\$ 3,125,614	\$ 3,329,429	\$ 5.48	\$ 5.34	\$ 5.84	9.93%	10.0%	11.1%
Protection of Persons and Property	6,200,329	5,647,757	5,280,451	10.37	9.64	9.27	18.78%	18.0%	17.5%
Health and Sanitation	3,843,289	3,709,882	3,615,090	6.43	6.34	6.34	11.64%	11.8%	12.0%
Highways	3,103,222	3,070,747	2,803,650	5.19	5.24	4.92	9.41%	9.8%	9.3%
Education	11,149,016	10,541,979	10,102,836	18.64	18.00	17.73	33.78%	33.6%	33.5%
Recreation	1,924,538	1,861,081	1,798,374	3.22	3.18	3.15	5.83%	5.9%	6.0%
Charities and Correction	2,123,100	1,846,460	1,737,057	3.55	3.15	3.05	6.43%	5.9%	5.8%
Special Services	1,346,140	1,529,577	1,426,463	2.25	2.61	2.50	4.08%	4.9%	4.7%
Special Grants	40,750	30,353	33,575	.07	.05	.06	0.12%	0.1%	0.1%
Totals	\$33,009,077	\$31,363,450	\$30,126,925	\$55.20	\$53.55	\$52.86	100%	100%	100%

*On an estimated population of 598,000. See Civic Estimates.

†On actual assessed population, hence slight difference from last year's analysis.

COMMENT.

1. It will be noted that general government has increased slightly in total and in per capita over 1928, but is a smaller percentage of the total.
2. The cost of protection of persons and property, as foreshadowed last year, has continued to increase in total per capita and percentage of the total. The increase this year is due partly to the installation of an up-to-date police signal system, which is commendably being financed out of current revenues.
3. The cost of education continues to increase in total, per capita and percentage of total.
4. Owing to the reduction in deficits of special services there is a considerable reduction under this heading over the year previous. This is extremely encouraging. The adoption of the sound policy of paying all such deficits out of general revenues naturally led to increased expenditure from general funds.
5. If Toronto is to reap the most complete benefit from the expenditure on industrial promotion and is to continue to grow as a residential city, it must control expenditure from general funds so as to reduce the tax burden on business, industry and homes.

Capital expenditure is reflected in current expenditures through the annual debt charges. The annual debt charges are a considerable element in the total current budget. One way therefore of controlling current expenditures is to control the cost of capital improvements. City planning offers the best method of attaining this end, in that it means the most economical use of capital funds in the production of necessary improvements. Toronto is a wealthy city; but it is not so wealthy as to be able to throw away money. To operate without a long term plan of capital improvements and financing is to throw away money.

What stand are you taking on this important question of community policy?