

201-5

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. 307

February 18, 1946

Non-Voting on January 1st, 1946

We would have liked to head this bulletin "Voting on January 1st, 1946". But the non-voters outnumbered the voters for aldermen by from about 2 to 1, to about 7 to 1 in different parts of the city. For the Board of Education it fell lower in one ward than 8 to 1. The most startling phenomenon therefore about the 1946 election was not voting, but non-voting. In some sense, the non-voters are more responsible for the quality of civic government than the voters. It is quite unusual for one not to use his ticket to a ringside seat at a hockey game, but not at a civic election. But then the standing of the Maple Leafs may be at stake in the former case, and only the selection of men and women to supervise the expenditure of \$35,000,000 in the second.

THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS WHO MAY VOTE AT CIVIC ELECTIONS

The duplication of names within wards has been reduced to minimum, but a voter may have by law nine votes for aldermen and only one for the mayor and one for each of four controllers. So the total vote that may be cast for aldermen is considerably larger than the total vote which may be cast for controllers or mayor. Just how much duplication is involved is not known. The Bureau, in order to establish a trend, has assumed that the duplication is $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. This is probably under present conditions much too large. In order, therefore, to give a more complete picture, figures on the basis of $33\frac{1}{3}\%$ and 15% duplication are given on the enclosed table for January 1st, 1946.

COMMENTS

1. The total vote for alderman on the percentage basis was the lowest in a decade except in 1942 and 1943, when there were also no contests for the mayoralty. The 1946 vote for alderman was considerably higher than those of 1942 and 1943.
2. The vote for controller was also the lowest in a decade except for 1942 and 1943, although it was considerably higher than in those years.
3. There were acclamations for the mayoralty, and for aldermen in two wards. This always has a marked effect in Toronto, although why it should is not based on reason. In United States cities which operate under the "strong mayor" system, it would be understandable, as the mayor, himself an executive officer, makes many important appointments, and does not sit in the council at all. In Toronto the mayor has only one vote like any other member of the Board of Control. The position carries more influence, but not apparently more power.
4. In one ward the vote for members of the Board of Education fell as low as 11.80% of the possible.
5. There are 136,922 persons in Toronto eligible to vote on money by-laws. Of these, 43,649, or less than 32%, voted on the Don Valley and Belt Line Traffic Artery Question,

and 43,587, or less than 32%, on the Clifton Road Subway Question. There was an impression in the minds of voters, and one of the controllers is quoted in the Press as being of a similar opinion with regard to the Clifton Road question, that there had been inadequate previous consideration of the plans on which these questions were based. This may partly explain the fact that less than one-third of the property owners thought it worth while to do something to protect their own direct interests.

QUERIES

1. Are acclamations a healthy sign?
2. Is participation in voting without participation in nomination really exercising the franchise at least effectively?
3. Would not a three-year term bring out more candidates?
4. Would "staggered" long terms help continuity of policy and long range planning while making more difficult putting over policies promoted by special interests?
5. Would equalizing wards and cutting down their number make "ward politics" more difficult?

TORONTO CIVIC ELECTIONS

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

(On basis of 33 1/3% duplication)

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	569,722a	115,539a	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	674,285	361,342	240,895	73,083	722,684	112,973	15.63	963,580	199,076	20.66	Acclamation		
Jan. 1, 1944	1944	676,887	363,185	242,123	143,110	726,370	223,911	32.20	968,492	379,552	39.19	242,123	138,037	57.01
Jan. 1, 1945	1945	680,000 (Est.)	363,949	242,632	107,790	608,530b	139,774	22.96	970,528	286,820	29.55	242,632	105,381	43.43
Jan. 1, 1946	1946		363,475	242,316	93,069	566,942c	114,019	20.11	969,264	237,285	24.48	Acclamation		

(On basis of 15% duplication)

Jan. 1, 1946	363,475	308,954	93,069	566,942c	114,019	20.11	1,235,816	237,285	19.2	Acclamation
--------------	---------	---------	--------	----------	---------	-------	-----------	---------	------	-------------

** Estimated, twice number on Voters' List.

*** Estimated, four times net individuals.

† Estimated, net individuals on list.

a Acclamation in Ward 3 (25,361 names) and Ward 9 (42,469 names). 705,382 less twice 67,830. = No. of possible votes for aldermen.

b Acclamation in Ward 4 (32,073 names) and Ward 7 (27,611 names) 727,898 less twice 59,684. = No. of possible votes for aldermen.

c Acclamation in Ward 4 (32,554 names) and Ward 5 (49,450 names) 26,950 less twice 80,004 = No. of possible votes for aldermen.

On basis of 300,000 possible voters:

for 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.
 January 1, 1944—46.01% voted.
 January 1, 1945—35.12% voted.
 January 1, 1946—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 1944—126,662
 1945—131,527 1946—136,922

VOTING PERCENTAGE FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ward	Vote Percent of Possible 1946
I.	Acclamation
II.	19.83%
III.	11.80%
IV.	14.66%
V.	Acclamation
VI.	16.01%
VII.	18.18%
XIII.	19.11%
IX.	Acclamation

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 co-operation.