

DID YOU EVER STOP TO THINK—

TORONTO
CANADA



137 Wellington
Street West

Brief No. 2

January 7, 1937

HOW CIVIC EXPENDITURES IN TORONTO MAY BE REDUCED?

Story No. 2

By a thorough examination
of the civic organization and
personnel establishment.

Three phases of this would be studies of:

- I. The number of departments.
- II. The size of department staffs.
- III. Standardization of wages and salaries within civic departments (so far as this is necessary), between departments of the city and of outside boards, and with private employment.

I. The Number of Departments

In 1929 and 1930, which marked the beginning of the depression, the civic estimates listed 14 heads of departments. The 1936 estimates lists 16. In the period between, the two law departments were combined into one. The office of City Surveyor was separated from the Assessment Department and made the nucleus of the Town Planning Department with its own Commissioner. The Welfare Board* of the Department of Health was closed up and the imposing Department of Public Welfare estab-

*Branch

lished. The head of the Abattoir omitted in its 1929 and 1930 estimates, is included as a Commissioner in 1934 and succeeding years. The whole record has been one of expansion in the number of departments, although in the last five years there have been three magnificent opportunities to merge related departments without conflicting with vested interests. Why these opportunities were not seized we do not know. Those who know why have not informed the public. There may have been whispered conversations. Those who pay the bills can only guess. Just what public interest, for example, is served by the continued separation of Street Cleaning and Works and of Property from Public Buildings is hard to say. There must be a good reason, as no one could suspect the trustees of the citizens' interests of being swayed by other interests.

The merging of related departments would—

- a. Be a step toward centralized purchasing.
- b. Be a step toward centralized accounting.
- c. Minister to the convenience of the public in conducting business with departments.
- d. Through more unified control of united departmental staffs and equipment, make possible a more advantageous and more economic use of civic resources, resulting in a saving of time and money and the improvement of services.

\$1,000 SAVED BY THE CITY IS \$1,000
EARNED BY THE TAXPAYERS. LET'S
FIND OUT HOW MUCH CAN BE SAVED.

II. The Size of Department Staffs

A thorough study under this head, would probably show some under-staffed and some overstaffed. It would show what departments

are handicapped, and to what extent by employees who should have been superannuated for reasons of infirmity.

It would show for each department the basis of appointment to, promotion in and separation from, the service of the City and its Boards and Commissions.

The tendency of private business on the whole is to reduce personnel to the bearable minimum. The tendency in public affairs, unless modified by strict control is to increase the personnel to the bearable maximum. Probably both tendencies are carried too far from the standpoint of public interest.

\$1,000 SAVED BY THE CITY IN MONEY
OR SERVICE IS \$1,000 GAINED IN
MONEY OR SERVICE BY THE CITIZENS.
IF ANY SAVING CAN BE EFFECTED,
LET US HAVE THE ADVANTAGE OF IT.

III. Standardization of Wages and Salaries within civic Departments (so far as this is necessary), between departments of the City and of outside boards, and with private employment.

In 1927, civic salaries in some departments were standardized within these departments and in relation to outside rates. But rates of pay do not stay standardized unless a continuing body is set up with the duty of maintaining internal and external standardization, or unless rates move automatically up and down with changes in the index measuring the purchasing power of the dollar. It is important that employees of "outside" boards and commissions, paid out of public revenues other than taxation shall not be paid at higher or lower rates than those employed elsewhere in civic

departments. Citizens are anxious that they be good employers; but many feel that they should not be taxed to support public rates of pay at a much higher level than in the private business in which they are employed, by which they are paid and from which they derive the income out of which, directly or indirectly, public salaries and wages are paid. In making comparisons there should of course, be taken into consideration both the greater opportunity for large emoluments in private service, and the greater security of tenure in public service. To many it seems probable that the average pay in public employment is not lower than the average income of the citizens performing similar work. There is a widespread impression that in some grades the rates of pay are out of line with those in publicly owned utilities, and in private employment for similar work. Why not substitute knowledge of the facts for guesses and impressions?

Is it not obvious that if expenditures are to be reduced or even controlled attention must be paid to the local public salary and wage rolls, which in the case of the City approach in total 50% of the current net civic expenditure on general account.

\$1,000 SAVED IN THE CITY'S SALARY AND WAGE BILL—OVER \$18,000,000 ON THE CITY'S CURRENT GENERAL ACCOUNT ALONE — WOULD BE \$1,000 SAVED FOR THE CITIZENS, WITHOUT ANY CHANGE WHATEVER IN THE TOTAL PURCHASING POWER OF THE COMMUNITY.