TORONTO PULLIC LIBRARY

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

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

137 WELLINGTON ST. W. TELEPHONE EL. 1904



TORONTO.

White Paper No. 305

December 20th, 1945

Where are
Toronto
and its
Metropolitan Area
Heading?

Distribution Delayed

to secure careful reading

Where are Toronto and its Metropolitan Area Heading?

The present social and financial conditions now obtaining in the City are important to the Citizens. The present trends are more important, because they bear on future conditions amidst which most Toronto citizens will live.

Present conditions and tendencies in the Toronto suburban area are of hardly less vital importance to the citizens of Toronto than the conditions and tendencies within the limits of the corporation of the City of Toronto itself. The city and its suburbs are one social and economic unit and any attempt to treat them as a series of independent units cannot but lead to grave failure in the end.

SOME TRENDS

1. The population of Toronto city is becoming stationary.

		% of Increase						
Year 1899 1904 1909 1914 1919 1924 1929 1934 1939 1940	Population 192,907 226,365 325,302 470,151 499,295 542,417 606,370 629,285 649,123 648,098	% of Increase for 5 yr. period 17.34% 43.71% 44.53% 6.20% 8.64% 11.79% 3.78% 3.15%	Ave. inc. % per yr. or actual increase per yr. 3.47% 8.74% 8.90% 1.24% 1.73% 2.36% 0.76% 0.63%0.16% (Dec.)					
1941 1942	655,751 669,130	4.28% (1939-	1944) 1.18% 2.04%					
1943 1944 1945	674,285 676,887		0.77% 0.38%					
	680,000 (est.) e population was 645,4	162).	0.46% (est.)					

It is true that from 1914-1919 the population increased on the average only 1.24% per annum, but, unlike 1939, 1944, it was preceded by a semi-decade when the average annual percentage of increase was the highest since 1899, viz. 8.90%. As a matter of fact in the semi-decade before 1939 the population increased annually on the average only 0.63% and the semi-decade before that 0.76%.

2. The suburban area has more than doubled in population since 1926. It increased between 1926 and 1944, 127,303 or 101.2%, while the suburban municipalities increased in area only 4.2%. In the same period, the City increased by 120,196 or 21.6% while its land area has increased by 0.02%.

The meaning of the population figures for 1914 to 1919 and from 1940 to 1945 are somewhat obscured by two conflicting movements:

- (a) Decreases due to enlistments.
- (b) Increases due to influx of war workers.

The net result of these movements is difficult if not impossible to measure and their relative incidence inside and outside the municipal corporation is also obscure. If, however, history repeats itself, the figures for the post-war years 1919 to 1939 give no indication that the years following 1945 will be marked by any great acceleration of the percentage rate of population increase in the city proper.

- 3. If properly planned, the area of the Municipal corporation of Toronto, could accommodate—with dignity and the necessary amenities and with adequate provision for business and industry—a much larger population than at present. Toronto now has only slightly over 30 persons per acre of land area.
- 4. The metropolitan area outside Toronto now filling up with people who work in Toronto, has on the average 1.9 persons per acre. Some of this area is already fairly well filled, but there is still a very large reservoir of potentially residential land waiting to be filled by Toronto's overflow. For many years the city has facilitated and even compelled this exodus and is about to proceed to facilitate it further without reducing the compulsion by making residence within the City's boundaries more attractive for more people.

- 5. The assessed value of land in Toronto has gone down steadily for the last nine years. It is less than it was even in 1926. Apparently the ownership of land in Toronto is becoming progressively less desirable.
- 6. The assessment of buildings, with the exception of two years, has steadily increased since 1935. It is higher than in 1926 by 34%. The population has increased 22.1%.
- 7. The Toronto assessment of business has fluctuated during recent years. The business assessment was higher for the 1935 levy than for the 1945 levy. The 1945 business assessment was higher than that of 1931.
- 8. The Toronto assessment liable for general rates has also fluctuated, but the tendency is downward. That for 1945 is lower than that for 1931 by over \$100 million dollars or 11.82%.
- 9. The partial exemption of dwelling house property has increased steadily but slightly. It was higher for 1945 than for 1931 but somewhat lower on the per capita basis.
- 10. In the past decade (1934-1944) the net general and educational debt of Toronto decreased in total 52.77%, and on the per capita basis 56.09%. No similar figures are available for the suburban area. However, the per capita net debt of Toronto, not including public utilities, is less than half of the average among the suburban municipalities. No municipality in the suburban area has as low a per capita net debt (General School, L.I.R.S.) as has Toronto. This is due in part to different historical stages of development.
- 11. Per capita (on total population man, woman, child) taxation in Toronto in 1944 was about 37.3% higher than that of the average in suburban municipalities. The relation of this fact to the drift of city population to the suburban area is obvious.
- 12. While there is a concentration of business values of the metropolitan district in downtown Toronto, and while therefore assessed values for taxation in suburban municipalities would naturally be lower than those in Toronto, there seems to be a greater variation in per capita assessed values (1944) than would be accounted for by this fact. In the townships this varies between \$359 and \$627 and in the towns and villages between \$369 and \$1,197. Part of these variations may be due to actual differences, but some are almost certainly due to different standards. In Toronto the per capita assessed value (1944) is about \$1,406. Under such conditions tax rates mean nothing. The only cure for this condition would be setting of assessed values by a single authority for the whole Toronto area following a uniform method of valuation.

If a per capita tax level is maintained or increased in comparison with tax levels in suburban municipalities and if transportation between the city and suburban communities are still further improved, how long will it be before Toronto will no longer be a city of homes? What is being done to make home ownership in the city area so attractive that adverse conditions will be overcome?

STATEMENT TO READER

Based on these and other facts the Bureau of Municipal Research has come to certain conclusions. These are contained in the series of three White Papers on Community Planning, February 23rd, 1944, March 1st, 1944 and April 1st, 1944. In the second of this series are listed as metropolitan services the following:—

- 1. Education
- 2. Transportation
- 3. Police
- 4. Fire
- 5. Public Health
- 6. Water Service
- 7. Sewers and Sewage Disposal
- 8. Traffic Arteries
- 9. Community Planning

The 1944-45 Annual Report of the Bureau contained the following passages:—

Planning for the Toronto Economic and Community Area

The boundaries of the Municipality of the City of Toronto are purely artificial political boundaries, having no relation whatever to the boundaries of the Toronto economic area or to those of the Toronto community. The real Toronto is made up of those who live and work in what is often called metropolitan Toronto. This is the real unit with which the community must concern itself.

There is little doubt that a rapid transit system would tend to increase down-town business values, at least until important business centres are developed outside the city boundaries, but in the opinion of some, it might tend to accelerate the decline of residential values within the city,

if other developments are not undertaken at the same time tending to enhance the value of Toronto as a residential centre.

- (1) the annexation of satellite municipalities to the city, or
- (2) the equalization of assessment and local taxation throughout the Toronto area by the establishment of an overriding municipality governed by an elective Council similar to the London County Council and having the administration of such obviously metropolitan services as education, police, fire, traffic arteries, etc., and having the responsibility for City Planning through a single Board.

The chief arguments against a borough system such as is suggested in the second alternative are:

- (1) That it would involve the insertion between the Provincial and the existing City governments of an additional "level" of local government, already too complex and expensive.
- (2) That local Councils within the metropolitan system would have so little to do that they would further decline in prestige and efficiency and attract a poorer type of candidate. It is well known that as the functions of elective bodies become less important, the quality of their personnel tends to decline.

There seems no good reason why the greater Toronto area needs more than one Local Government. If the various municipalities in the area had had independent existence for 200 or 300 years, the objection to unification might be understood. No doubt vested interests—real or fancied—lack of imagination and inertia will prevent at least for a time the establishment of a unitary local government for the Toronto area. A second best solution of the problem of local government in the Toronto area, that of a borough system, would be better than no solution at all.



QUESTION TO READERS

ARE THESE CONCLUSIONS JUSTIFIED IN THE LIGHT OF THE FACTS PRESENTED AND OF ANY OTHER RELEVENT FACTS AVAILABLE TO THE READER?

Following are some tables which are drawn from official sources but the meticulous accuracy of which is not guaranteed. They may, however, provide a fact basis on which the citizen may arrive at his or her opinion as to what should be done.

There is no doubt that:

- Metropolitan areas in Canada are not adequately administered having grown up after existing municipal acts were passed.
- That something drastic needs to be done if local government in metropolitan areas is to function in the interests of citizens and taxpayers as a whole.

SOME COMPARATIVE REVISED ASSESSMENT FACTS COMPILED FROM THE ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT OF TORONTO

	Ruildinás	Business	Income	Total (Liable to School Rates)	Partial Exemption Re Dwelling Houses	Balance Liable for General Rates	Exemptions	Total Assessment (Liable to Rates Exemptions)
Gear Land 945 \$ 330,434,877 944 332,292,809 943 334,460,561 942 338,141,773 941 347,034,556 1939 355,019,713 1938 362,683,789 1937 368,002,040 1938 373,398,205 1935 370,547,921 Percentage —13.975% 1931 384,117,167 1926 350,415,346 1921 314,966,347 1916 290,787,560 1991 128,958,769 1906 65,410,655	\$ 502,225,891 502,258,621 500,614,771 499,501,540 495,247,677 495,151,680 495,768,152 493,687,652 492,037,142 490,781,118 489,905,548 of increase or decreas +5.8% 474,664,446 374,597,273 253,457,518 213,799,460 131,876,120 75,538,283	\$ 117,214,185 117,211,135 116,978,823 113,984,281 111,852,200 112,361,967 114,703,789 112,307,916 111,032,908 110,098,016 117,303,350	\$7,746,643 6,289,104 6,586,203 8,682,469 4,171,130 3,703,356 4,113,745 3,892,887 41,700,859‡ 79,933,958 71,648,289 51,563,448 19,400,361 12,232,965 8,100,573 1925—\$62,234,038 So	\$ 949,874,953 951,762,565 959,800,798 957,916,698 952,671,220 963,230,672 969,662,784 972,382,713 975,185,835 978,170,266 1,019,457,678 -9.55% 1,050,204,868 886,839,808 697,418,435 585,936,141 306,751,673 167,861,755	\$ 72,911,386 72,553,826 72,302,963 (a) 72,107,941* 71,933,472* 71,657,694* 71,632,713* 71,524,436* 71,279,749* 71,122,200* +4.6% 69,607,215* 64,335,443* 51,869,467*	\$ 876,963,567 879,208,739 887,497,835 (a) 885,808,757† 880,737,748† 891,487,050† 898,005,090† 900,750,000† 903,661,399† 906,890,517† 948,335,478† -10.587% 980,597,653* 822,504,365* 643,548,968* 585,936,141 306,751,673 167,861,755	\$ 155,371,680 153,937,885 157,544,857 156,476,799 157,025,358 158,398,022 160,292,899 159,997,507 159,844,013 158,481,708 157,130,692 +7.471% 144,396,776 120,399,278 98,291,695 81,494,089 40,729,905 25,501,639	\$1,105,246,63 1,105,700,45 1,117,345,65 1,114,393,49 1,109,696,57 1,121,628,69 1,129,955,68 1,132,380,22 1,135,029,84 1,136,651,97 1,176,588,37 -7.48% 1,194,601,64 1,007,239,08 795,710,13 667,430,23 347,481,52 193,363,39

^{*}Approximate.

Last year when full municipal income tax was levied. Small amounts in succeeding years only corporation income tax on investments left with City when the Province took over the income tax. Absence of income tax assessment during last two years due to arrangement by which City gets from the Province in lieu of taxes on this assessment.

⁽a) Including Income assessment later abandoned.

SOME COMPARATIVE POPULATION AND AREA FACTS. (COMPILED FROM ANNUAL REPORTS OF TORONTO'S ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT).

	1926		1931		1936		1941		1942		1943		1944		% of Increase		Popu- lation
	Popu- lation	Area in Acres	Popu- lation	Area	per acre at Present												
York Township	46,564	5,049	66,383	5,050	73,286	5,050	78,581	5,050	79,485	5,050	80,248	5,050	81,652	5,050	75.4	Same	16.2
East York	21,434	3,694	33,030	3,647	37,898	3,647	39,638	3,747	40,364	3,747	41,578	3,747	42,485	3,747	98.2	1.4	11.3
Scarborough Twp	15,325	40,785	18,982	40,785	21,834	40,785	23,584	45,012	23,847	45,012	24,480	45,012	24,142	45,012	57.5	10.6 Dec.	.5
Etobicoke	13,744	27,971	12,276	27,312	14,803	27,312	17,684	27,312	19,500	27,312	19,632	27,312	20,390	27,312	48.3	None	.7
North York Twp	8,800	43,965	12,263	43,959	15,464	44,689	21,962	44,689	22,953	44,689	24,528	44,689	25,100	44,689	185.2	1.6	. 6
Mimico	5,244	500	7,270	644	6,876	500	7,641	500	8,075	500	8,354	500	8,354	500	59.3	Same	16.7
New Toronto	4,503	500	6,454	504	8,320	659	7,780	659	9,801	659	10,008	659	9,893	659	12	31.8	15
Weston	4,002	616	4,618	622	5,058	622	5,784	622	6,165	622	6,333	622	6,214	622	55.3	1	10
Swansea	3,225	605	4,780	601	5,504	601	6,872	682	7,033	682	7,110	682	7,142	682	121.5	12.7	10.5
Forest Hill	2,531	739	5,494	739	9,174	739	12,779	739	12,954	739	13,339	739	13,484	739	432.8	Same	18.2
Leaside	457	1,025	1,005	1,025	1,965	1,025	6,687	1,025	7,750	1,025	8,310	1,025	9,227	1,025	1,919.8	Same (Since	
Long Branch	*		3,537	720	4,100	740	4,453	740	5,320	740	5,186	740	5,049	740	42.7	Same	6.8
Total Suburban	125,829	125,449	176,092	125,608	204,282	126,369	233,445	130,777	243,247	130,777	249,106	130,777	253,132	130,777	217 101	24.2	1.9
Toronto	556,691	22,282.4*	627,231	22,286.5	645,462	22,286.9	655,571	22,286.9	669,130	22,286.9	674,285	22,286.9	676,887	22,286.9	21.6		er ac.
Total Metropolitan	682,520	147,731.4	803,323	147,894.5	849,744	148,655.9	889,016	153,063.9	912,377	153,063.9	923,391	153,063.9	930,019	153,063.9	36.3	3.6	6.1

*Land only.

Toronto land area (1944).... 22,286.9

Population (1944)..... 676,887

Persons per acre (1944)..... 30.4

ERRATUM, WHITE PAPER NO. 305

IN LAST TABLE, % OF INCREASE, (SUBURBAN)
POPULATION, 217 SHOULD BE 101.2, AS ON
SECOND PAGE OF CONTEXT, PARAGRAPH 9

CHANGES IN CENTRE OF GRAVITY OF ASSESSMENT. (COMPILED FROM TORONTO'S ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORTS OVER A TWELVE YEAR PERIOD).

Valuations as Reported by Assessors

Year	Ward	Land	Buildings	Business	Income	Partial Exemption Dwellings	General Rates Assessment	School Rates Assessment	Exemptions	Total Overall Assessed Values	Popu- lation
1945	1	\$ 20,001,777	\$ 43,244,670	\$ 7,636,984		\$ 10,410,391	\$ 60,473,040	\$ 70,883,431	\$ 9,952,696	\$ 80,836,127	73,599
1933	1	21,906,523	42,595,715	6,734,944	\$ 1,437,436	10,452,687	62,224,931	72,677,618	9,858,194	82,535,812	72,250
1945	2	32,903,840	48,217,330	10,389,136	Managemen	3,895,081	77,226,089	81,121,170	13,139,354	94,260,524	65,991
1933	2	38,299,662	50,540,874	9,216,925	4,941,960	3,970,724	99,028,697	102,999,421	13,674,739	116,674,160	60,283
1945	3	113,259,924	87,798,840	53,545,258	assessment of the second	2,411,769	252,192,253	254,604,022	45,692,049	300,296,071	48,648
1933	3	137,648,864	93,226,871	58,435,044	38,805,723	2,498,086	325,618,416	328,116,502	46,756,530	374,873,032	42,727
1945	4	41,225,918	58,434,376	17,027,935	-	4,491,535	112,196,694	116,688,229	33,142,023	149,830,252	72,589
1933	4	52,213,561	60,209,940	16,137,212	11,625,780	4,391,442	135,795,051	140,186,493	31,694,504	171,880,997	67,029
1945	5	25,723,713	43,954,774	7,517,074	week	9,391,302	67,804,259	77,195,561	15,402,972	92,598,533	92,162
1933	5	30,090,741	43,498,125	6,581,249	1,588,985	9,345,363	72,413,737	81,759,100	14,614,205	96,373,305	88,230
1945	6	36,766,279	70,616,005	11,785,461	Management	13,987,111	105,180,634	119,167,745	19,850,922	139,018,667	118,500
1933	6	40,336,136	70,031,554	10,766,354	2,473,587	13,894,623	109,713,008	123,607,631	20,896,897	144,504,528	111,506
1945	7	16,038,917	33,904,419	4,559,998		6,532,090	47,971,244	54,503,334	4,544,963	59,048,297	48,155
1933	7	17,155,209	32,791,275	3,974,979	1,303,271	6,341,489	48,883,245	55,224,734	4,446,197	59,670,931	46,913
1945	8	20,532,460	47,808,315	2,673,844	-	12,603,842	58,411,777	71,014,619	6,604,840	77,619,459	83,006
1933	8	21,827,497	47,669,120	2,516,075	516,779	12,244,617	60,284,854	72,529,471	6,903,559	79,433,030	80,022
1945	9	24,426,263	68,169,340	1,918,809	_	9,092,060	85,422,352	94,514,412	6,871,867	101,386,279	74,237
1933	9	25,586,271	54,791,725	1,579,225	674,662	7,608,270	75,023,613	82,631,883	5,511,740	88,143,623	57,708
1945	City	330,879,091	502,148,069	117,054,499		72,815,181	877,266,478	950,081,659	155,201,686	1,105,283,345	676,887
1933	City	385,064,464	495,355,199	115,945,007	63,368,183	70,747,301	988,985,552	1,059,732,853	154,356,565	1,214,089,418	626,674

^{*}One year back (1934-1944)