

ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MAY 2ND

Plans are now being finalized for the 1950 annual meeting of the Bureau of Municipal Research. As in previous years, the occasion will be a combined luncheon with the companion organization, the Citizens Research Institute of Canada. The luncheon will be held on Tuesday, May 2nd at 12:30 p.m. in the King Edward Hotel in Toronto.

We have been most fortunate in securing as our luncheon speaker, Dr. W. A. Mackintosh, Vice-Principal of Queen's University and Professor of Political and Economic Science. During the recent war and in the reconstruction period, Dr. Mackintosh has held important posts in the Government at Ottawa. He is admirably equipped, from a rich experience, to discuss his subject "Government and Business".

An invitation and acknowledgement card will be sent to members and subscribers shortly. Meanwhile, it is suggested that you plan, if possible, to reserve May 2nd for this important meeting.

T G ROGERS
President

are qualified electors. All may vote for mayor, councilors but only public school supporters cast ballot for Board of Education candidates. The two separate school representatives to the Board of Education are appointed by the Toronto and Suburban Separate School Board. This Board, which holds office for a two-year term, was elected in January 1950.

Individuals Eligible to Vote

In each ward, the citizens who have the vote are those who are owners or tenants of property in that ward, whether resident there or in another ward or actually outside the City. One individual will be listed as non-resident owner or tenant in all those wards where he meets the property qualifications; but a voter's name cannot be listed twice for one ward even though he has residence there and is the owner or tenant of other property in the same ward.

	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>
Resident Owners	116,716	122,220	128,098
Total Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	308,019	327,033	318,679
Non-Resident Owners	29,267	30,890	29,373
Total Non-Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	59,368	60,565	59,949
Total Owners	<u>145,983</u>	<u>153,110</u>	<u>157,471</u>
Total Voters	<u>367,387</u>	<u>387,598</u>	<u>378,628</u>
Public School Supporters	341,440	361,179	352,848



TELEPHONE RANDOLPH 5444

An independent fact-finding organization reporting to the public on civic affairs.

CIVIC AFFAIRS

HOW TORONTO VOTED

April 6, 1950

Fellow Citizens:

Each year, the voters of the City of Toronto add a new chapter to the story of local democracy in action. Here, in the Bureau's annual analysis, are the returns for January 1950 compared with the record of earlier years. Highlights of the voting are considered in the commentary beginning on page five.

Voting Analysis

In Toronto civic elections, the vote is given under provincial law to individuals who are owners or tenants of real property assessed at not less than \$400. The wife or husband of such an owner or tenant is also entitled to vote. In every case, voters must be British subjects of the full age of twenty-one.

Individuals may vote for aldermen in each ward in which they are qualified electors. All may vote for mayor, controllers and aldermen, but only public school supporters cast ballot for Board of Education candidates. The two separate school representatives to the Board of Education are appointed by the Toronto and Suburban Separate School Board. This Board, which holds office for a two-year term, was elected in January 1950.

Individuals Eligible to Vote

In each ward, the citizens who have the vote are those who are owners or tenants of property in that ward, whether resident there or in another ward or actually outside the City. One individual will be listed as non-resident owner or tenant in all those wards where he meets the property qualifications; but a voter's name cannot be listed twice for one ward even though he has residence there and is the owner or tenant of other property in the same ward.

	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>
Resident Owners	116,716	122,220	128,098
Total Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	308,019	327,033	318,679
Non-Resident Owners	29,267	30,890	29,373
Total Non-Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	59,368	60,565	59,949
Total Owners	<u>145,983</u>	<u>153,110</u>	<u>157,471</u>
Total Voters	<u>367,387</u>	<u>387,598</u>	<u>378,628</u>
Public School Supporters	341,440	361,179	352,848

Individuals Who Voted in Each Ward

<u>Ward</u>	<u>1947</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>
1	10,625	15,013	13,272	19,807
2	9,977	11,750	10,391	13,734
3	5,238	7,107	6,313	8,435
4	10,512	14,332	12,839	15,819
5	14,966	20,766	17,833	23,464
6	17,882	24,982	21,718	30,349
7	8,606	11,260	10,302	14,641
8	15,116	19,277	17,983	25,598
9	17,003	21,472	18,646	24,408
	<u>109,925</u>	<u>145,959</u>	<u>129,297</u>	<u>176,255</u>

While the ward totals are correct, it should be remembered that this makes for some duplication in the aggregate figures because in each year a small proportion of those voters entitled to a franchise in more than one ward exercised this right. These multiple voters, then, show up as individuals in the voter-count of more than one ward and the aggregate of "individuals who voted" is therefore slightly higher than the actual number of people who turned out at the polls.

VOTES CAST ON VARIOUS BALLOTS

Votes for Mayor

In the voting for mayor, each individual has only one vote as either resident or non-resident. Therefore, the highest number of votes is total residents plus non-residents who live outside Toronto. No figures are available on these non-residents but their number is small. Consequently, for "possible" votes we have used the total number of resident voters only. This method gives the closest practical calculation but percentages of actual to possible votes are slightly too high.

	<u>1947</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>
Actual	105,823	138,350	121,404	168,148
Possible	306,339	308,019	327,033	318,679

Actual as Percent of Possible

<u>Ward</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
1	29.5	40.5	33.6	52.5
2	36.7	42.5	35.0	48.8
3	30.1	40.7	34.8	52.3
4	37.4	49.3	39.3	51.6
5	34.1	44.9	35.7	50.7
6	30.9	42.4	34.0	50.3
7	35.4	45.8	38.8	54.1
8	34.9	44.1	38.5	54.8
9	42.3	53.2	44.9	59.1
All Wards	34.5	44.9	37.1	52.8

The same individuals may vote for candidates to the Board of Control as for mayor. Each person is entitled to vote for four candidates. The possible vote then is just four times the possible vote for mayor. However, some individuals who turn out may mark fewer than four names on the ballot. This largely accounts for the smaller actual vote, compared with the possible, than in the contest for mayor. Such incomplete voting indicates one of two things: 1) the elector does not know enough about the candidates or has not seen to it that four men he is prepared to support were nominated; or, 2) in order to assist a particular candidate, the elector has resorted to 'plumping'.

	<u>1947</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>
Actual	293,693	401,701	362,251	485,083
Possible	1,225,356	1,232,076	1,308,132	1,274,716

Actual as Percent of Possible

<u>Ward</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
1	20.7	29.2	25.3	37.9
2	25.1	31.0	25.8	35.4
3	22.4	31.8	27.6	39.4
4	21.4	30.2	25.3	32.8
5	19.1	27.2	22.4	31.3
6	21.2	30.2	24.9	35.3
7	26.3	34.6	30.3	40.2
8	25.7	33.6	30.3	41.6
9	34.0	44.8	38.3	48.4
All Wards	24.0	32.6	27.7	38.1

Votes Case for Ward Representatives

	<u>Aldermen</u>			<u>Trustees</u>			
	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1948</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>	
Actual	189,439	210,781	264,519	Actual	205,883	103,166	182,161
Possible	583,494	775,196	702,726	Possible	682,880	408,746	508,868

Actual as Percent of Possible

<u>Ward</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
1	29.9	25.3	37.4
2	27.8	25.7	34.0
3	*	18.9	*
4	30.0	25.0	31.7
5	31.1	25.1	33.9
6	30.6	25.3	36.3
7	32.5	29.0	37.7
8	*	31.1	41.9
9	42.0	36.8	46.3
All Wards	32.5	27.2	37.6

Actual as Percent of Possible

<u>Ward</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
1	27.9	*	*
2	29.2	24.6	31.5
3	21.9	*	*
4	28.3	23.9	*
5	27.2	*	30.3
6	29.5	22.8	33.6
7	31.2	26.6	36.2
8	32.0	29.1	38.9
9	40.5	*	43.9
All Wards	30.2	25.2	35.8

* Acclamation

(See following page)

In the elections of ward representatives, an individual may vote in each ward where, as resident or non-resident, he has the required qualifications. The wife or husband is also entitled to a multiple vote. As there are two aldermen to be chosen from each ward, the possible number of votes is twice the total voters (both resident and non-resident) on the lists. For trustees, the number is twice the total public school supporters (both resident and non-resident). Non-residents living outside Toronto are included in both these totals. Therefore figures on the possible vote are complete and a fully accurate analysis can be made. In arriving at the total possible vote for all wards, it should be remembered that the possible vote from those wards in which there have been acclamations has been excluded. With two candidates to be elected in each ward, voters may fail to exercise their full franchise by "plumping" or, for other reasons, voting for only one candidate.

Referendum Voting

As in the analysis of mayoralty returns, the figure used for "possible" is the total of resident voters only, so again the percentages of "actual" to "possible" are slightly too high.

	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Possible</u>	<u>Actual as Percent of Possible</u>
CHANGING ELECTION DAY	168,356	318,679	52.8
SUNDAY SPORT	170,075	318,679	53.4

COMPARISON WITH SUBURBAN VOTING

The basis of comparison used is the percentage of the actual votes to the possible number of votes that could have been cast for candidates contesting the CHIEF OFFICE in each of the thirteen municipalities of Greater Toronto. Because the chief office has been filled in some cases by acclamation, the comparison is made for the two most recent years in which the office was contested in each municipality. In the case of Mimico, the Mayor is elected every second year for a two-year term.

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Date Last Contested</u>	<u>Actual as % of Possible</u>	<u>Previously Contested</u>	<u>Actual as % of Possible</u>
North York	Reeve	Dec./49	16.5	Dec./40	23.0
East York	Reeve	Dec./49	20.7	Dec./48	24.3
York	Reeve	Jan./50	21.4	Jan./49	21.5
Scarborough	Reeve	Dec./48	30.2	Dec./47	26.4
Leaside	Mayor	Dec./49	35.0	Dec./48	34.9
Forest Hill	Reeve	Dec./49	35.1	Dec./48	42.5
Etobicoke	Reeve	Dec./46	38.1	Dec./44	24.1
Swansea	Reeve	Jan./48	38.2	Jan./45	46.1
New Toronto	Mayor	Dec./48	42.5	Dec./47	47.3
Long Branch	Reeve	Dec./49	43.8	Dec./48	48.6
Weston	Mayor	Dec./49	51.9	Dec./48	51.5
TORONTO	Mayor	Jan./50	52.8	Jan./49	37.1
Mimico	Mayor	Dec./48	66.5	Dec./46	60.3*
Suburban average.....			27.4%28.3%	

* Estimated

A peak turnout of more than 170,000 voters is without doubt the most striking fact coming out of the City's 1950 elections. This year, by chalking up a forty percent improvement over 1949, Toronto citizens proved that the local elections can still draw a good house. Not only against the 1949 showing, which was weak, but in comparison with earlier returns, the vote in 1950 set a record. In relation to the possible poll, actual voting was the heaviest in any recent year.

A lively contest for Board of Control seats was one reason for the large vote. Additionally, some people were probably concerned over the higher tax levy or the effects of re-assessment. Yet finance did not loom large in the campaign and the conduct of civic business generally came in for little serious criticism. Moreover, there were the usual number of acclamations; trustees in three wards and aldermen in one.

Following a pattern which is becoming much too common, the real drawing card was an issue quite outside the every-day problems of local government. The ballot which received the most attention was the one dealing with Sunday sport. By actual count, there were nearly 2,000 voters on this question who did not even trouble to register an opinion on the choice of mayor.

In civic elections, habitual light voting has long been a cause for alarm among thinking citizens. It would be encouraging to believe that Toronto has now turned the corner and that voter apathy is a thing of the past. But unfortunately, the record hardly suggests this; the large vote in January 1950 is by no means certain to be repeated. Perhaps some new and exciting issue can be developed before the next polling day. Yet the success of such campaigns is too uncertain to trade on for future elections. There is, we believe, no good substitute for the slow and painstaking job of developing a sustained interest in the broader problems of civic administration.

MISSING VOTES While each Toronto elector has the right to vote for four candidates seeking a seat on the Board of Control, there are always a large number of missing votes. On the average, those who do vote, mark fewer than three names on the ballot, and since many vote for less than three. There is no way of determining just how often the missing votes are the result of plumping--a deliberate plan to restrict support at the polls to one or more favoured candidates. While there is a natural tendency to adopt such tactics in a contest where feelings run high, it is well to remember that they go against the successful operation of the present voting system.

The alternative cause of missing votes is that electors are unable to select the required number of suitable names. In the election of trustees, there is good reason to believe this is a common explanation. For in each ward contested in 1950, there were less votes for trustees than for aldermen. A year ago, the Bureau urged that more taxpayers take an interest in the selection and support of candidates for this important body. The fact that the major share of this year's tax increase will go for educational expenditures underlines the need to give full attention to this civic responsibility.

SUBURBAN VOTING With attention focussed strongly on the metropolitan problem, a comparison with voting in suburban municipalities holds special interest. Precise conclusions cannot always be drawn from the returns in any one year; for neither personalities nor issues fall into a stereotyped pattern. At the same time, sparse voting in two successive elections, such as occurred in the three York municipalities, is not without its meaning.

Interest in civic elections depends heavily on the development of a strong sense of community. Looking at both the election turnout and the number of acclamations, there is much evidence to suggest that the residents of our suburban townships have not developed throughout their sprawling acres a closely-knit body of citizens. Indeed, the voting record in these municipalities stands in sharp contrast to the frequent insistence from township residents on 'local autonomy'. Toronto electors, on the other hand, might well take a leaf from the voting records in Weston and the Lakeshore municipalities.

In large urban centres, the very fact of bigness is apt to have a deadening effect on the interest of local citizens in elections and in civic business. As the metropolitan area fills out, indifference can become a disease affecting urban residents everywhere. Whether by maintaining small independent municipalities, or active neighbourhood areas joined as wards in a common city, the need is growing to build and maintain interest in civic affairs by a conscious constructive programme. It is no longer something to be left to chance.

J G Rogers
President

Eric Hardy
Director