

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

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

137 WELLINGTON ST. W.
TELEPHONE EL. 1904



TORONTO
CANADA

White Paper No. 276

March 1st, 1943

CITY VOTING

A RECORD OF THE FEW WHO VOTED—
AND THE MANY WHO DID NOT

What we get in municipal government services depends largely on what the users of such services do or fail to do.

At the last municipal election, about one in five legally qualified to vote voted, and four out of five did not vote. Of those who voted, the number who voted for all offices to be filled, and the number who participated in nominations is not known. That is, the voting efficiency of the Toronto electorate as a whole is even less than is indicated by the number of individuals who voted in relation to the possible number of individual voters.

COMPOSITION OF VOTERS LIST

On the 1943 voters list, there were 361,342 names. Of these, 122,066 were owners, entitled to vote for mayor, controllers and aldermen, and on money by-laws. 126,095 were tenants, entitled to vote for mayor, controllers and aldermen only. 113,181 were, as it is styled "courtesy" voters (wife or husband of owner or tenant) entitled to vote for mayor, controllers and aldermen only.

If the 122,066 property voters had all voted, they might have cast 488,264 votes for controllers. If courtesy voters, belonging to property owners' families, were one-half as many as the property owners themselves, direct and indirect property voters might have cast for controller 714,624 votes. In fact, only 199,076 votes were cast for controllers, many of which must have been cast by tenants and tenants' wives.

If the 126,095 tenants had all voted, they might have cast 504,380 votes for controller. If courtesy voters belonging to tenants families were one-half as many as the tenants themselves, direct and indirect tenant voters might have cast 730,752 votes for controllers. As a matter of fact, 199,076 votes for controllers were cast—and these included those of owners.

What do these facts mean? Did either property-owning voters or tenant voters distinguish themselves? Could either have controlled the elections if they had so desired? Which had the better record?

The table below, which allows for 33 1/8% of duplication for mayor and controllers, shows the voting record in recent years.

QUERIES

Would the composition of the City Council be the same as it is if all (except those who were sick or unavoidably absent and not eligible for an advance poll) had exercised their full franchise? No. It might have been entirely different. Under present conditions a City election is anything but a true expression of citizen opinion.

Why not have a tentative city budget printed some time before nomination day and made available for discussion in civic elections? Then there would be something worth-while, tangible and impersonal to discuss. The existence of a real issue would be obvious. The election of persons to supervise the expenditure of \$37,000,000 of public funds is always an issue.

If our liberty is worth dying for, it is worth voting for. Our right to have a say as to how our money is to be spent, and on what services, is at stake.

TORONTO CIVIC ELECTION

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Election Date	For Year	Population	Names on Voters' List	Estimated No. of Individuals on List*	Individuals Who Actually Voted	VOTES FOR COUNCIL			VOTES FOR BOARD OF CONTROL			VOTES FOR MAYOR		
						Possible** (Est.)	Cast	%	Possible*** (Est.)	Cast	%	Possible† (Est.)	Cast	%
Jan. 1, 1936	1936	645,462	325,784	217,190	128,987	651,568	192,682	29.57	868,760	324,128	37.31	217,190	125,136	57.62
Dec. 7, 1936	1937	648,309	345,462	230,308	107,058	690,924	159,277	23.05	921,232	263,922	28.65	230,308	101,124	43.91
Dec. 6, 1937	1938	647,803	348,402	232,268	128,177	696,804	188,556	27.06	929,072	311,853	33.57	232,268	120,507	51.88
Jan. 2, 1939	1939	649,123	350,740	233,827	154,458	701,480	237,706	33.88	935,308	421,020	45.01	233,827	146,701	62.74
Jan. 1, 1940	1940	648,098	350,372	233,581	125,533	700,743	194,809	27.84	934,324	333,882	35.73	233,581	120,451	51.57
Jan. 1, 1941	1941	655,751	352,691	235,127	92,327	569,722g	115,539g	20.28	940,508	250,324	26.62	235,127	88,793	37.76
Jan. 1, 1942	1942	669,130	366,767	244,511	72,115	733,534	111,220	15.16	978,044	195,528	19.99	Acclamation		
Jan. 1, 1943	1943	?	361,342	240,895	73,083	722,684	112,973	15.63	963,580	199,076	20.66	Acclamation		

* Estimated, by allowing duplication at 33 1/8%.

** Estimated, twice number on Voters' List.

*** Estimated, four times net individuals.

† Estimated, net individuals on list.

g Acclamation in Ward 3 (25,361 names) and Ward 9 (42,469 names). 705,382 less twice 67,830.

Based on: Votes cast by Wards as in Toronto Council Minutes. Summary of Names on List and Actually Voted. Population as in City Estimates except for 1942 and 1943. The 1942 figure is also official.

On basis of 300,000 possible voters:

Mayor—January 2, 1939—48.90% voted.

January 1, 1940—40.15% voted.

January 1, 1941—27.60% voted.

January 1, 1942—Acclamation.

January 1, 1943—Acclamation.

No. of people entitled to vote on Money By-laws. Duplication within a ward eliminated.

1940—120,244

1941—119,603

1942—121,048

1943—122,066

The Bureau of Municipal Research is, and has been from the first, supported by private subscriptions from public-spirited citizens. It has received no governmental or municipal grants, for the reason that its statements of facts, and suggestions as to policy, must not only be independent and unbiased, but must be so considered by the general public. The value of the Bureau to the citizens of Toronto depends on its independence as an agency of constructive criticism and citizen cooperation.