



CIVIC AFFAIRS

June 30, 1954

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

THE RECORD SHOWS - - -

Fellow Citizens:

On the following pages, the Bureau presents its twelfth consecutive analysis of the voting turnout and the sixth comparison between City and suburbs. The record is far from a good one, especially in view of the new metropolitan responsibilities that were to be taken on by many of the successful candidates. In only one of the seven municipalities where elections took place for the chief municipal office was there an improvement over the previous contest. And in that municipality--East York--the percentage turnout was actually less than one in four.

In the Bureau's opinion, there is no simple way by which the absent electors can be inspired, cajoled or shocked into action. As this is written, we are reminded by the press that our representatives are charged with responsibility for a number of important appointments. A little earlier, citizens learned that this year's metropolitan budget was to be set at over \$56 million on current account. In addition, the local municipalities have their own expenditures to look after. In the City's case, the total bill, metropolitan and local, comes close to \$90 million. Yet the interest which these matters have recently inspired is not duplicated at election time. The apparent conclusion is that people can only be made to see and accept their democratic responsibilities through a slow process of education in citizenship.

While there may not be any easy way to obtain an enduring increase in interest and participation in elections, the Bureau would suggest the need for improvements in the electoral system. Whether or not electors take advantage of the fact, they should at least have the opportunity for proper representation.

During council consideration of the metropolitan budget, the chairman used a phrase which might well be applied both to the city and to the larger municipality. In terms of their respective budgets, both have now achieved the status of "major league" teams in the field of municipal government.

Whether the idea of team organization is properly applied in the structure of the city and metropolitan councils and school boards is more debatable. Are the councils or school boards of the City or the Metropolitan Municipality organized as major league teams should be? To what

extent can either the individual suburban representatives or the group of city representatives on the metropolitan bodies claim equality of status in relation to population? And within the city framework, does each ward representative speak on behalf of a roughly equal share of the City's total population? Answers to these questions are suggested by the information provided in the following tables.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

POPULATION AND REPRESENTATION OF AREA MUNICIPALITIES*

Municipality	Percentage Distribution of Metro Population	Percentage of Elective Seats on Metro	
		Council	School Board
CITY OF TORONTO	56.8	50.0	50.0
TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK	9.4	4.2	5.0
TOWNSHIP OF YORK	8.6	4.2	5.0
TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH	6.7	4.2	5.0
TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE	6.0	4.2	5.0
TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK	5.6	4.2	5.0
VILLAGE OF FOREST HILL	1.5	4.2	5.0
TOWN OF LEASIDE	1.4	4.2	5.0
TOWN OF MIMICO	1.1	4.2	} 5.0**
TOWN OF NEW TORONTO	.8	4.2	
VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH	.8	4.2	
VILLAGE OF SWANSEA	.7	4.2	5.0
TOWN OF WESTON	.7	4.2	5.0

*The first and second columns do not total an exact 100% because figures have been rounded.

**Mimico, New Toronto and Long Branch, with 2.7% of the metropolitan population, are jointly represented through the Lakeshore District Board of Education.

CITY OF TORONTO

POPULATION BY WARDS - 1953

Ward	Population
1	72,701
2	65,370
3	45,989
4	70,098
5	90,480
6	118,563
7	50,406
8	82,013
9	69,882
Average	73,945

Before the metropolitan federation was brought into being, the province undertook to equalize assessments in the thirteen area municipalities. Although some adjustments in valuations may still be required, the essential point is that a calculated change in the assessment base was introduced in order to put the distribution of the metropolitan tax bill on a fair and equitable basis. The approach taken on the question of council and school board representation was quite different. The scheme of representation which was incorporated in Bill 80 may have had the advantage of ensuring a carry-over of experienced representatives during the formative period

of the new metropolitan federation. If the metropolitan council and school board are to function without developing friction and discord, however, the inequalities which are inherent in the present system of indirect representation should surely receive early attention.

The inequalities in Toronto's ward representation lack even the justification of a transitional arrangement. In April, 1946, City Council established a Special Committee to consider possible improvements in municipal election procedures. A sub-committee which was set up in 1948 agreed unanimously that the desirability of a closer approximation to equal representation by population justified a redrawing of the existing ward boundaries. Before the Committee could bring in a recommendation, the Controller who had been acting as chairman met defeat at the polls. By that time, consideration of alternative forms of government for the metropolitan area had raised the possibility that Toronto's present wards would be abandoned entirely as a basis of representation. And in the circumstances the work on ward boundaries was not completed.

Whether the present system of indirect representation survives at the metropolitan level or not, the City will continue to need a plan of its own for membership on the Council and Board of Education. In 1953, ward population fluctuated between a low of some 46,000 in Ward 3 and a high of 118,500 in Ward 6. It would appear that readjustment of Toronto's ward boundaries should be delayed no longer.

Eric Hardy
Director

[Faint, mostly illegible text from the reverse side of the page, including a table of population figures.]

[Faint header text: POPULATION BY WARD - 1951]

Ward	Population
1	42,701
2	42,710
3	46,249
4	70,708
5	92,480
6	118,500
7	80,100
8	82,011
9	82,082
10	73,011

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 Metropolitan Separate School Board. This Board, which holds office for a two-year term, was elected in December 1953.

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>1951</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>
Resident Owners	132,394	138,120	135,710
Total Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	317,186	312,628	301,024
Non-Resident Owners	26,557	22,842	22,766
Total Non-Resident Voters (Owners, tenants; their wives or husbands)	57,008	51,572	50,149
Total Owners	<u>158,951</u>	<u>160,962</u>	<u>158,476</u>
Total Voters	<u>374,194</u>	<u>364,200</u>	<u>351,173</u>
Public School Supporters	346,423	336,003	323,236

Individuals Who Voted in Each Ward

<u>Ward</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>
1	19,283	17,697	14,026	10,549
2	13,286	12,059	10,396	8,584
3	9,586	8,590	6,513	5,901
4	15,966	14,586	11,036	9,252
5	22,253	19,865	15,466	12,712
6	30,852	27,759	20,874	16,957
7	14,717	13,510	10,779	9,202
8	26,005	23,927	18,946	15,186
9	25,323	22,515	19,845	18,053
Total	<u>177,371</u>	<u>160,508</u>	<u>127,881</u>	<u>106,411</u>

While these 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>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>
Actual	171,737	156,924	123,375	101,195
Possible	323,163	317,186	312,628	301,024

Actual as % of Possible

<u>Ward</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
1	50.0	46.0	36.1	27.8
2	47.0	43.2	36.6	31.0
3	52.2	51.1	38.6	34.6
4	53.0	50.7	39.2	34.1
5	50.8	47.5	38.1	31.9
6	51.1	48.4	36.6	30.7
7	54.9	50.7	40.4	35.4
8	56.1	52.0	40.7	33.5
9	61.6	55.2	48.4	44.6
All Wards	53.1	49.5	39.4	33.6

Votes for Controllers

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>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>
Actual	500,832	419,188	372,570	305,632
Possible	1,292,652	1,268,744	1,250,512	1,204,096

Actual as % of Possible

Ward	%	%	%	%
1	36.1	31.0	27.6	21.5
2	34.6	29.0	27.4	23.2
3	40.0	35.9	31.0	27.0
4	34.0	29.9	26.6	23.2
5	31.3	26.3	24.3	21.2
6	36.6	31.0	26.4	22.4
7	41.0	34.5	30.6	26.8
8	43.2	36.7	32.6	26.4
9	51.1	43.2	41.4	36.9
All Wards	38.7	33.0	29.8	25.4

Votes for Ward Representatives

	<u>Aldermen</u>				<u>Trustees</u>		
	1951	1952	1953		1951	1952	1953
Actual	184,768	206,624	154,870	Actual	143,103	153,660	134,913
Possible	572,670	728,400	619,192	Possible	474,042	569,420	595,114

Actual as % of Possible

Ward	%	%	%	Ward	%	%	%
1	*	26.6	*	1	*	24.8	18.9
2	28.5	26.5	21.8	2	28.1	25.2	20.1
3	24.7	19.3	17.4	3	23.9	*	17.7
4	30.4	24.4	22.3	4	28.5	22.3	18.6
5	30.2	25.6	22.4	5	28.9	23.4	21.0
6	33.5	26.9	22.4	6	30.8	25.2	21.2
7	34.9	30.3	26.8	7	*	*	*
8	38.7	32.0	26.5	8	36.5	29.3	24.5
9	*	39.3	37.1	9	*	37.3	35.3
All Wards	32.3	28.4	25.0	All Wards	31.7	27.0	22.7

*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.

COMPARATIVE RETURNS - CITY AND 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 area municipalities which go to make up the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Because the chief office has been filled in some cases by acclamation, the comparison is made with 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>
Mimico	Mayor	Dec./48	66.5	Dec./46	60.3*
Long Branch	Reeve	Dec./52	46.2	Dec./50	49.4
Weston	Mayor	Dec./53 -	43.6	Dec./51	51.5
Swansea	Reeve	Jan./48	38.2	Jan./45	46.1
Etobicoke	Reeve	Dec./46	38.1	Dec./44	24.1
Leaside	Mayor	Dec./53 -	37.8	Dec./52	39.9
New Toronto	Mayor	Dec./53 -	36.4	Dec./51	55.2
Forest Hill	Reeve	Dec./49	35.1	Dec./48	42.5
TORONTO	Mayor	Dec./53	33.6	Dec./52	39.4
Scarborough	Reeve	Dec./53 -	32.0	Dec./52	32.3
North York	Reeve	Dec./52	29.1	Dec./51	22.0
East York	Reeve	Dec./53 -	23.5	Dec./49	20.7
York	Reeve	Dec./53 -	21.8	Dec./52	26.8
Suburban Average			29.9		29.3

*Estimated

POLLING ON THE TWO-YEAR TERM

	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
<u>If Approved, to Commence in 1954</u>		
Village of Long Branch	678	965
<u>If Approved, to Commence in 1955</u>		
Township of East York	4,515	4,399
Township of Etobicoke	3,698	2,522
Village of Forest Hill	502	236
Township of York	5,426	7,458