

**How a similar situation has been,
at least partially, remedied
in other communities :**

Results obtained by an Alliance of Charitable and Social Agencies in one city, during its first year :

1. On January 18, 1916, it had 7,587 contributors, a gain of 3,832 over the total period prior to the formation of the Alliance ;
2. Pledges obtained totalled \$137,472 (not including \$30,000 of renewed or renewable subscriptions) instead of the previous year's total of \$92,416.

What happened in still another community after federation :

In October, 1915, at the beginning of the present fiscal year, a ten-day campaign for money was undertaken, only two months after the city had been visited by a disastrous flood and had contributed \$55,000 for the relief of those who suffered. Yet in this campaign over \$65,000 was pledged, and much more has come in since then. This was an increase of 200 per cent. over the total that the federated charities had received from donations the year previous, and an increase of 100 per cent. over what they had received from donations, fairs, balls and other benefits. The number of givers has been increased from 2,190 to 4,110. The average contribution under the old plan, was less than \$10.00; under the new, nearly \$17.00. Before federation 47 contributors gave more than \$100 each; after federation, 151.

EFFECTIVE CITIZEN CO-OPERATION

WHAT IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS SHOULD
BE EACH BODY'S BUSINESS

Issued by the
BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH
813-820 Traders Bank Building, Toronto
Telephone: Main 3620

Bulletin No. 60

October 3, 1917

"TORONTO GIVES"—Story No. 4

In 1915

**14 Representative Toronto
Philanthropies received
gifts from 6,567 persons,**

Of This Number

- 35 givers each made aggregate gifts amounting to \$100 or over, while
58 made gifts which aggregated \$50 to \$100 each.

The names of these 93 individuals or firms would probably coincide quite closely with the names of the chief givers to the larger benevolences of the city, to which, on the average, they, of course, make much larger contributions.

Distribution of Gifts

Of the 6,567 subscribers and donors mentioned on the preceding page

3,214	or 49%	gave to some one institution.
725	" 11%	" " 2 institutions.
328	" 5%	" " 3 "
171	" 2.6%	" " 4 "
126	" 2%	" " 5 "
94	" 1.4%	" " 6 "
75	" 1.1%	" " 7 "
41	" .62%	" " 8 "
31	" .47%	" " 9 "
18	" .27%	" " 10 "
11	" .16%	" " 11 "
1	" .01%	" " 12 "

In addition to these there were 1,732 cases, or 26.37% of the total, where surnames only were given. If initials had been given, many of these names would undoubtedly have appeared as duplicates.

Including anonymous subscriptions and gifts from churches and societies, 12,459 separate gifts were received by the fourteen institutions.

Out of 12,459 gifts, 11,578 or 92.9% were for five dollars or less. The most typical subscription was between fifty cents and one dollar. There were 4,654 such gifts, or 37.3% of the total number. Gifts over \$100 were 12 in number, or .069 of 1% of the total.

The Present Situation

Among others the following conclusions would seem to be warranted by the facts as known :

1. Even including comparatively small gifts, the burden of benevolences and the opportunities for service which philanthropy offers seem to fall to the lot of a somewhat restricted and comparatively unvarying list of givers ;
2. The greater part of this burden seems to be borne by a still more restricted list of givers who are evidently solicited by almost every benevolent institution in the city ;
3. A tremendous amount of waste energy and time, both on the part of the giver and solicitor, must be expended in obtaining thousands of small gifts which, under a systematic method, backed up by intelligent co-operative and educative cultivation of the field, should be obtained in greater number with greater ease.
4. Although great headway has undoubtedly been made in recent years in cutting down that part of overhead which goes to expenses of collection, there must still be great room for improvement.
5. A great deal of giving must have been done mechanically without any real appreciation of the needs of the whole social service field in Toronto.