



TELEPHONE RANDOLPH 5444

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

CIVIC AFFAIRS

May 23, 1951

HOW TORONTO VOTED

Fellow Citizens:

With this bulletin, the Bureau again presents its annual voting tabulation. The most striking fact about the City elections for 1951 is that for the second successive year better than fifty percent of the total eligible voters turned out at the polls. Compared with former years, the record for 1950 and 1951 is a good one. But in common with a great many municipalities, Toronto's showing leaves much to be desired. In contrast to Dominion and provincial elections, local electors take a decidedly casual attitude to this basic democratic responsibility at the municipal level.

There are many factors, both immediate and long-term, that discourage a large municipal vote:

- the fact that less than half the voters have a direct responsibility for municipal taxes;
- the restricted franchise which weakens the force of appeals for a large vote;
- the divided jurisdiction between City and suburbs which removes from many daytime inhabitants any voice in Toronto's elections;
- the host of separated authorities managing municipal services;
- the poorly-drawn ward boundaries;
- the lack of organized support for individual candidates;
- the variety of uncoordinated and often irrelevant election issues;
- the hit and run attitude to civic issues resulting from the one-year term;
- the frustrating effects of unsettled relationships with the Province on service responsibilities and financing;
- the difficulty of fixing the onus for shortcomings in civic management on particular elected representatives.

These are among the main problems which must be tackled in order to secure a lasting improvement in municipal voting in our City.

The main drawing card in the latest elections was the hotly contested mayoralty contest. As might be expected, this ballot drew the top poll among those who voted. Almost all voters recorded an opinion on the question of the two-year term, but the results were much less complete in the voting for controllers, aldermen and trustees, where percentages of actual votes to possible dropped sharply. Against a 53 percent tally for mayor, votes for controllers stood at only 38.7 percent of possible, for aldermen 37 percent, and for trustees under 36 percent.

Why the missing votes? No doubt, some of the electors marked less than the full slate in order to give one favoured candidate a particular advantage. But the drop in balloting is too great to be explained fully in this way. Based on returns in this year and previous contests, it seems reasonable to assume that many electors went to the polls with no knowledge whatsoever of the relative merits of many of the candidates. Attracted by the contest for mayor, a voter might be entirely unfamiliar with his own ward contestants or with a sufficient slate of Board of Control contenders.

It is true that quite a number of choices have to be made by each voter. Toronto citizens are ordinarily faced with rather a long ballot. For an intelligent vote, the elector last December had to be familiar, on the average, with the fitness for office of eighteen different candidates. This sounds like a sizeable assignment. Yet even one evening devoted to hearing the various candidates speak, would give the voter some basis for deciding on the person to represent him in each post in the local government. To carry it a stage further, a little time taken during the year to make himself conversant with the City's activities in Council, school board and related bodies would give the elector an adequate criterion for deciding who should oversee the affairs of the City.

The actions of local councillors and trustees affect the affairs of Toronto people much more than is generally appreciated. Take one example. This year the Commissioners who operate the T.T.C. come up for re-appointment for a three-year term and the occasion provides an opportunity for a general review of T.T.C. affairs. It is one of the relatively few constructive opportunities given the elected representatives to make the wishes of their constituents felt in regard to public transportation services. How important that we should have men in Council well qualified to speak for us!

The small interest in Board of Education contests has been a matter of continuing concern to the Bureau and the record at the last election is far from reassuring. One-third of the elected trustees went into office by acclamation. Contests for the candidates in the remaining six wards drew very light votes in all wards except Ward 9; and in every case the percentage turnout trailed behind the voting for aldermen.

The Board of Education budget for 1951 reached a new high of \$25 million; the Separate School budget is additional. Local property taxpayers must supply \$21.4 million, while more than \$3 million will be met from Provincial revenues--and this merely means from a different group of taxpayers. Administratively, local educational services are much more neatly coordinated than the services coming under supervision of the City Council. The academic responsibilities are centralized under a Director of Education and the physical operations under a Business Administrator. Sometimes the situation has been compared with the City-manager system of local government and the analogy has its point. So long as honest and capable men are occupying these positions, the efficiency and integrity of

school operations is reasonably well assured. But the concern of the elected body is mainly with plotting the broad objectives of the local school system and with setting the limits on the total operation. It is in these very fields that from time to time there is evidence of weakness. To illustrate: in recent years, a shrinking school population was allowed to result in smaller classes at a time when the problem of inadequate teachers' salaries had not been faced. So far as the Board was concerned, the reduced teacher load came about more by drift than design. It was only later that the salary problem demanded and obtained attention, and the question of pupil-load has yet to be fully debated.

The Bureau has recommended legislation to permit trustees a modest remuneration, has called for closer informal cooperation between Council and school boards, and has advocated a longer term for trustees than a single year. To secure changes of this sort and to ensure that a responsive and responsible body governs the Toronto schools, a stronger public interest must be developed than now exists.

A good approach to the problem can be made at the ward and neighbourhood level. Indeed, it is at this level that we must seek to inject livelier participation into the whole range of civic affairs. In school management, recreational facilities, operation of local parks, neighbourhood planning and in many other branches of local government, the opinions of active groups of electors can assist in developing sound administration. The boards or departments charged with such services should welcome the views of local groups and might well assign them some definite advisory responsibilities. The first move, however, must come from the citizens themselves if this development is to be recognized and is to succeed. We can only come to grips with the problem of civic apathy when an interest is developed in practical questions of local government extending far beyond the selection of candidates and municipal voting.

Suburban Voting

While the percentage turnout in Toronto's last election was not of the highest order, a comparison with the record in the suburbs indicates that a similar indifference corrodes their municipal voting. Elections were called in all twelve suburbs at the 1950 year-end but the chief office was contested in only six suburban municipalities. Looking at the latest year in which the mayor or reeve faced a contest, the showing was impressive only in the case of Mimico. In most suburbs the turnout was better in comparison with the next earlier year but, otherwise, quite unsatisfactory.

While, in a single election, a heavy vote may be developed by sensational campaigning, sustained interest depends on sounder methods. A strong sense of community usually makes itself felt in good attendance at the polls and, throughout greater Toronto, this consideration should dictate our first line of attack.

Ward	1948	1950	1951
1	12,839	15,017	15,806
2	20,766	22,464	22,353
3	24,982	30,349	30,852
4	11,260	14,641	14,717
5	19,277	25,598	26,005
6	21,472	24,408	25,182
7	145,959	176,255	177,371

E. J. ...
President

Eric Hardy
Director

While the ward totals are ... should be remembered that this makes for some duplication in the figures because in each year a small proportion of these voters entitled to a franchise in more

The main drawing card in the latest elections was the highly contested mayoralty contest. As might be expected, this ballot drew the top poll among those who voted. Almost all voters recorded an opinion on the question of the two-year term, but the results were much less complete in the voting for controllers, aldermen and trustees, where percentages of actual votes to possible dropped sharply. Against a 53 percent tally for Mayor, votes for controllers stood at only 38.7 percent of possible, for aldermen 37 percent, and for trustees under 36 percent.

Why the missing votes? No doubt, some of the electors marked less than the full state in order to give one favoured candidate a particular advantage. But the drop in balloting is too great to be explained fully in this way. Based on returns in this year and previous contests, it seems reasonable to assume that many electors went to the polls with no knowledge whatsoever of the relative merits of many of the candidates. Attached by the contest for mayor, a voter might be entirely unfamiliar with his own ward contestants or with a sufficient state of Board of Control candidates.

It is true that quite a number of choices have to be made by each voter. Toronto citizens are ordinarily faced with rather a long ballot. For an intelligent vote, the elector last December had to be familiar, on the average, with the fitness for office of eighteen different candidates. This sounds like a sizeable assignment. Yet even one evening devoted to hearing the various candidates speak, would give the voter some basis for deciding on the person to represent him in each post in the local government. To carry it a stage further, a little time taken during the year to make himself conversant with the City's activities in Council, school board and related bodies would give the elector an adequate criterion for deciding who should oversee the affairs of the City.

The actions of local councillors and trustees affect the affairs of Toronto people much more than is generally appreciated. Take one example. This year the Commissioners who operate the T.T.C. come up for re-appointment for a three-year term and the occasion provides an opportunity for a general review of T.T.C. affairs. It is one of the relatively few constructive opportunities given the elected representatives to make the wishes of their constituents felt in regard to public transportation services. How important that we should have men in Council well qualified to speak for us!

The small interest in Board of Education contests has been a matter of continuing concern to the Bureau and the record at the last election is far from reassuring. One-third of the elected trustees went into office by acclamation. Contests for the candidates in the remaining six wards drew very light votes in all wards except Ward 9; and in every case the percentage turnout trailed behind the voting for aldermen.

The Board of Education budget for 1951 reached a new high of \$25 million; the separate School budget is additional. Local property tax-payers must supply \$21.4 million, while more than \$3 million will be met from Provincial revenues--and this merely means from a different group of taxpayers. Administratively, local educational services are much more neatly coordinated than the services coming under supervision of the City Council. The academic responsibilities are centralized under a Director of Education and the physical operations under a Business Administrator. Sometimes the situation has been compared with the City-manager system of local government and the analogy has its point. So long as honest and capable men are occupying these positions, the efficiency and integrity of

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 ballots 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.

	1949	1950	1951*
Resident Owners	122,220	128,098	134,348
Total Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	327,033	318,679	323,163
Non-Resident Owners	30,890	29,373	26,078
Total Non-Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	60,565	59,949	55,884
Total Owners	153,110	157,471	160,426
Total Voters	387,598	378,628	379,047
Public School Supporters	361,179	352,848	351,228

Individuals Who Voted in Each Ward

Ward	1948	1949	1950	1951*
1	15,013	13,272	19,807	19,283
2	11,750	10,391	13,734	13,286
3	7,107	6,313	8,435	9,586
4	14,332	12,839	15,819	15,966
5	20,766	17,833	23,464	22,353
6	24,982	21,718	30,349	30,852
7	11,260	10,302	14,641	14,717
8	19,277	17,983	25,598	26,005
9	21,472	18,646	24,408	25,323
	145,959	129,297	176,255	177,371

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

school operations is reasonably well assured. But the concern of the elected body is mainly with plotting the broad objectives of the local school system and with setting the limits on the total operation. It is in these very fields that from time to time there is evidence of weakness. To illustrate: in recent years, a spinning school population was allowed to result in smaller classes at a time when the problem of inadequate teachers' salaries had not been faced. So far as the Board was concerned, the reduced teacher load came about more by drift than design. It was only later that the salary problem demanded and obtained attention and the question of pupil-load has yet to be fully debated.

The Bureau has recommended legislation to permit trustees a modest remuneration, has called for closer informal cooperation between Council and school boards, and has advocated a longer term for trustees than a single year. To secure changes of this sort and to ensure that a responsive and responsible body governs the Toronto schools, a stronger public interest must be developed than now exists.

A good approach to the problem can be made at the ward and neighborhood level. Indeed, it is at this level that we must seek to inject livelier participation into the whole range of civic affairs. In school management, recreational facilities, operation of local parks, neighborhood planning and in many other branches of local government, the opinions of active groups of electors can assist in developing sound administration. The boards or departments charged with such services should welcome the views of local groups and might well assign them some definite advisory responsibilities. The first move, however, must come from the citizens themselves if this development is to be recognized and is to succeed. We can only come to grips with the problem of civic apathy when an interest is developed in practical questions of local government extending far beyond the selection of candidates and municipal voting.

Suburban Voting

While the percentage turnout in Toronto's last election was not of the highest order, a comparison with the record in the suburbs indicates that a similar indifference characterizes their municipal voting. Elections were called in all twelve suburbs at the 1950 year-end but the chief office was contested in only six suburban municipalities. Looking at the latest year in which the mayor or trustee faced a contest, the showing was impressive only in the case of Mimico. In most suburbs the turnout was better in comparison with the next earlier year but, otherwise, quite unsatisfactory.

While, in a single election, a heavy vote may be developed by national campaigning, sustained interest depends on constant methods. A strong sense of community usually makes itself felt in good attendance at the polls and, throughout Greater Toronto, this consideration should dictate our first line of attack.

Handwritten signatures and titles:
President
Director

VOYING 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 \$100. 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 ballots 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.

Ward	1948	1949	1950	1951*
Total Owners	122,110	122,110	122,110	122,110
Total Voters	387,226	387,226	387,226	387,226
Public School Supporters	361,179	361,179	361,179	361,179
Total Non-Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	60,252	60,252	60,252	60,252
Total Non-Resident Owners (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	30,890	30,890	30,890	30,890
Total Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	327,033	327,033	327,033	327,033
Total Resident Owners	122,220	122,220	122,220	122,220
Total Voters	128,098	128,098	128,098	128,098
Total Owners	131,348	131,348	131,348	131,348

Individuals Who Voted in Each Ward

Ward	1948	1949	1950	1951*
1	12,013	12,013	12,013	12,013
2	11,750	11,750	11,750	11,750
3	7,107	7,107	7,107	7,107
4	14,332	14,332	14,332	14,332
5	20,766	20,766	20,766	20,766
6	21,982	21,982	21,982	21,982
7	11,260	11,260	11,260	11,260
8	19,277	19,277	19,277	19,277
9	21,472	21,472	21,472	21,472
Total	122,110	122,110	122,110	122,110

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.

	1948	1949	1950	1951*
Actual	138,350	121,404	168,148	171,737
Possible	308,019	327,033	318,679	323,163
<u>Actual as Percent of Possible</u>				
Ward	%	%	%	%
1	40.5	33.6	52.5	50.0
2	42.5	35.0	48.8	47.0
3	40.7	34.8	52.3	52.2
4	49.3	39.3	51.6	53.0
5	44.9	35.7	50.7	50.8
6	42.4	34.0	50.3	51.1
7	45.8	38.8	54.1	54.9
8	44.1	38.5	54.8	56.1
9	53.2	44.9	59.1	61.1
All Wards	44.9	37.1	52.8	53.1

The same individuals may vote for candidates to the Board of Control as for mayor. Each person is entitled to vote for four candidates. 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'.

Votes for Controllers

	1948	1949	1950	1951*
Actual	401,701	362,251	485,083	500,832
Possible	1,232,076	1,308,132	1,274,716	1,292,652

* Election held on December 4th, 1950

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.

Ward	1948	1949	1950	1951*
1	138,350	151,404	168,146	171,737
2	308,019	327,033	318,679	323,163
3	40.2	39.3	38.8	37.0
4	40.7	39.3	38.8	37.0
5	41.2	39.7	38.7	37.0
6	42.4	39.0	38.0	37.1
7	42.8	38.8	38.2	37.1
8	41.1	38.2	37.1	37.1
9	43.2	41.9	39.1	37.1
All Wards	41.9	37.1	35.8	33.1

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 be prepared to support were nominated; or, (2) in order to assist a particular candidate, the elector has resorted to "plumping".

Votes for Controllers

Ward	1948	1949	1950	1951*
1	1,335,076	1,401,701	1,521,083	1,592,632
2	1,308,132	1,362,221	1,482,083	1,520,832
All Wards	1,321,604	1,381,961	1,501,583	1,556,732

* Election held on December 4th, 1950

Actual as Percent of Possible

Ward	1948	1949	1950	1951*
1	29.2	25.3	37.9	36.1
2	31.0	25.8	35.4	34.6
3	31.8	27.6	39.4	40.0
4	30.2	25.3	32.8	34.0
5	27.2	22.4	31.3	31.3
6	30.2	24.9	35.3	36.6
7	34.6	30.3	40.2	41.0
8	33.6	30.3	41.6	43.2
9	44.8	38.3	48.4	51.1
All Wards	32.6	27.7	38.1	38.7

Votes Cast for Ward Representatives

	Aldermen			Trustees		
	1949	1950	1951	1949	1950	1951*
Actual	210,781	264,519	280,483	103,166	182,161	182,355
Possible	775,196	702,726	758,094	408,746	508,868	510,344

Actual as Percent of Possible

Ward	1949	1950	1951	Ward	1949	1950	1951*
1	25.3	37.4	34.2	1	**	**	**
2	25.7	34.0	31.5	2	24.6	31.5	**
3	18.9	**	28.5	3	**	**	26.3
4	25.0	31.7	33.4	4	23.9	**	31.2
5	25.1	33.9	34.0	5	**	30.3	31.7
6	25.3	36.3	36.7	6	22.8	33.6	34.1
7	29.0	37.7	38.6	7	26.6	36.2	**
8	31.1	41.9	42.3	8	29.1	38.9	39.3
9	36.8	46.3	48.4	9	**	43.9	47.7
All Wards	27.2	37.6	37.0	All Wards	25.2	35.8	35.7

**Acclamation

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.

* Election held on December 4th, 1950

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.

	Actual	Possible	Actual as Percent of Possible
Two-year Term	1951* 167,972	323,163	52.0%
	1948 123,690	327,033	37.8%

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.

Municipality	Office	Date Last Contested	Actual as % of Possible	Previously Contested	Actual as % of Possible
East York	Reeve	Dec./49	20.7	Dec./48	24.3
York	Reeve	Jan./51	25.9	Jan./50	21.4
North York	Reeve	Dec.-50	30.9	Dec./49	16.5
Forest Hill	Reeve	Dec./49	35.1	Dec./48	42.5
Leaside	Mayor	Dec./50	35.2	Dec./49	35.0
Scarborough	Reeve	Dec./50	36.7	Dec./48	30.2
Etobicoke	Reeve	Dec./46	38.1	Dec./44	24.1
Swansea	Reeve	Jan./48	38.2	Jan./45	46.1
Long Branch	Reeve	Dec./50	49.4	Dec./49	43.8
New Toronto	Mayor	Dec./50	50.9	Dec./48	42.5
Weston	Mayor	Dec./49	51.9	Dec./48	51.5
Mimico	Mayor	Dec./48	66.5	Dec./46	60.3
TORONTO	Mayor	Dec./50	53.1	Jan./50	52.8
Suburban Average			32.1		27.1

*Estimated
*Election held December 4th, 1950

*Election held on December 4th, 1950

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.

**Acclamation

Actual as Percent of Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible	
Ward	%	Ward	%	Ward	%
1	31.2	1	25.3	1	31.2
2	31.2	2	25.7	2	31.0
3	**	3	18.2	3	**
4	33.1	4	22.0	4	33.1
5	34.0	5	22.1	5	34.0
6	36.7	6	22.3	6	36.7
7	38.6	7	22.7	7	38.6
8	39.1	8	22.0	8	39.1
9	43.9	9	31.1	9	43.9
ALL Wards	32.8	ALL Wards	27.2	ALL Wards	32.8

Actual as Percent of Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible	
Ward	%	Ward	%	Ward	%
1	29.2	1	22.3	1	29.2
2	31.0	2	22.8	2	31.0
3	31.8	3	27.6	3	31.8
4	30.2	4	22.3	4	30.2
5	27.2	5	22.4	5	27.2
6	30.2	6	21.9	6	30.2
7	34.6	7	30.3	7	34.6
8	33.6	8	30.3	8	33.6
9	41.8	9	38.3	9	41.8
ALL Wards	32.6	ALL Wards	27.7	ALL Wards	32.6

Votes Cast for Ward Representatives

Actual		Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible	
1951	1950	1951	1950	1951	1950
210,781	204,212	280,483	264,212	75.2%	77.3%
182,352	182,161	208,746	208,868	87.4%	87.2%

Trustees

Actual as Percent of Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible		Actual as Percent of Possible	
Ward	%	Ward	%	Ward	%
1	**	1	**	1	**
2	31.2	2	21.6	2	31.2
3	**	3	**	3	**
4	30.3	4	23.9	4	30.3
5	31.1	5	22.8	5	31.1
6	**	6	26.6	6	**
7	39.3	7	29.1	7	39.3
8	47.7	8	**	8	47.7
9	32.7	9	32.8	9	32.7

Actual as Percent of Possible