

Issues, Priorities and Structure of the Canadian Voluntary Sector*

JACQUELYN WOLF

Director, School of Continuing Studies, University of Toronto

This article examines the economic and political importance of the voluntary sector in Canada and discusses the lack of co-ordination of political effort by voluntary organizations, in spite of widely shared views on the principal issues facing the sector today. (These views were elicited in a set of surveys conducted by the writer.) It concludes with a reflection on the political culture of the Canadian voluntary sector.

Background

Canada has a large and vibrant voluntary sector of more than 65,000 registered charities which engages in a wide range of religious, educational, human service, cultural and recreational activities. The number of active organizations increased significantly during the 1980s (up 43 per cent since 1982) with the largest increases estimated to be among self-help, community-based and grassroots coalition organizations.¹ Those numbers reflect only one measure of voluntary activity, since many organizations do not have charitable status as defined by Revenue Canada. A Statistics Canada survey of volunteer activity shows that seven out of 10 Canadians performed some type of volunteer service in 1987.²

In economic terms, few studies have attempted to document the full impact of the voluntary sector on the Canadian economy. Ross (1983) suggested a total sector flow-through equivalent to two per cent of GNP and 11 per cent of federal government revenues, based on 1980 figures which did not include hospitals and universities. The paid work force for this narrowly defined sector, he estimated, included 16 per cent of all Canadian workers—more than twice the total employed by the largest private sector industry, forestry, and 25 per cent of the total employed by all levels of government. Ross concluded that the sector contributed

*This article was developed from a presentation to the 1990 Spring Research Forum of Independent Sector and the United States Strategic Institute in Boston.

\$4.5 billion (1.7 per cent) to the GNP. In addition, Ross (1990) estimates that the annual dollar value of the volunteer work performed for groups and organizations in Canada was \$12 billion in 1986-87. Martin (1985) used different (and larger) aggregate assumptions, but agreed on the sector's major economic impact. More recently, Krashinsky (1989) examined only higher education and hospitals (all of which are non-profit) and arrived at a 4.7 per cent contribution to GNP, equal to the entire United States nonprofit sector. He also looked at employment (only in universities and colleges, hospitals and welfare organizations) and found 982,000 workers, or about 9.6 per cent of the work force, more than the United States employment estimate for its nonprofit sector.

While all registered charitable organizations are regulated federally, most of their funding is received from provincial ministries (which, in turn, may benefit from federal transfer payments to the provinces). No composite figures are available on the percentage of public versus private support of charities, but Krashinsky's selected examples are illustrative: universities receive about 80 per cent of revenues from public sources, hospitals 98.4 per cent. Martin found wide variation in levels of support for welfare organizations, though most received considerably more than half of their revenues from public agencies; cultural activity (defined to include recreation and religion, as well as the arts) was the only sub-sector where private dollars outweighed public funds (\$1.20 private for each public \$1), and the inclusion of religious charities probably tilted this balance significantly.

This predominant reliance on government funding is a phenomenon of the past half-century. Between the enactment of its first unemployment insurance legislation in 1940 and revisions to the same legislation in 1971, Canada built a comprehensive social security system. The guiding philosophy for this welfare state can be found in the *Green Book* proposals of the 1945 Federal Provincial Conference on Reconstruction: "... to ensure for all Canadians high and stable employment and income and, secondly, individual economic security and welfare."³ As Banting (1985) summarizes this social policy era, it was a "sustained flight from selectivity" with clearly defined goals of security, redistribution and social integration. Particularly since the 1960s, much of that national goal has been accomplished through the governmental funding of nonprofit voluntary organizations.

Krashinsky discusses at some length this conscious choice by governments to use nonprofits to provide services financed by taxation,⁴ and the implications of government involvement for the way nonprofit

institutions are managed, including pressure for formality in governance, a trend toward centralization, and the manipulative interplay between government and agencies using public information campaigns and cleverly constructed funding formulae. His discussion is of particular relevance as the national social welfare policy agenda since 1971 has not been homogeneous, and policy direction and approaches at the federal level virtually were stalled until the late 1980s. What Splane (1987) calls the “neo-conservative dismantlement approach”—whose advocates would like to see many income-support and social-service measures supported either by the market or by private charity—has dominated the policy arena during this past half decade and “both the doctrine and the practice of social program dismantlement have had nation-wide influence...under the rubric of restraint, many governments have been engaged in dismantlement by attrition” (284).

Thus, since the mid-1970s, Canada’s voluntary organizations have been beset by a wide array of environmental changes, ranging from funding cutbacks and shifting social conditions to increased demands of accountability.

As the 1990s begin, additional challenges for the sector have emerged including among others the free trade agreement with the United States, which is said already to be causing dramatic structural adjustments in the economy; a national constitutional malaise in the wake of the failure of the Meech Lake Accord; and the federal Goods and Services Tax, which is expected to affect the general economy and the financial management capacity of nonprofits.

Structure and Co-ordination

During this lengthy period of turbulence, only one national group has emerged to attempt to provide linkage across human service, arts/multi-cultural, and sport/recreational groups in the sector. (Note: No provincial sector-wide coalitions emerged, either). The Coalition of National Voluntary Organizations (NVO), a network of nearly 120 organizations with a national or regional interest or charter, was founded in 1974 with the active encouragement of the federal government. The NVO has had no constitution, no elected hierarchy of officers, no permanent national secretariat, and its members have not taken formal votes to establish policy directions but act only on intuited consensus. Nearly all of its annual budget comes from the federal Secretary of State’s voluntary action program. General meetings (called “Consultations”) are held approximately every two years. At each, a Committee of 10 is elected (the only voting the organization has done) to provide leadership

between Consultations. The organization and its Committee operated on three principles: *consensus* (not majority rule) in identifying areas in which the Committee will act on behalf of members, *participation* on task forces established to examine particular issues, and *representation* on the NVO Committee of varying interests (geographical, cultural, sectoral, gender, volunteer/staff).

According to early documents, the priorities of NVO include: developing and promoting a policy framework at the federal level to implement the government's expressed intention to promote voluntary initiative; reforming the *Income Tax Act* to encourage individual and corporate support of charitable organizations and to overcome inequities in the cost of giving among income groups; improving the capacity of NVO to function in both official languages; building effective channels of communication among national voluntary organizations and developing traffic on these channels; and interpreting the network's role to the government and participating organizations.⁵

During its 16-year history, the NVO made some progress in its efforts to reform the practices of Revenue Canada and the government has agreed to experiment with a "hands-off" policy toward charities which engage in non-partisan political activity.

A universal individual tax deduction of \$100 was eliminated in accordance with an NVO proposal. Some years later a tax credit was introduced for charitable donations, though it was not as generous as NVO had proposed. Recent tax reforms have arguably made charitable contributions more costly for rich individuals and for profitable corporations with a previous history of giving. While the NVO has promoted other policies during this period, non has resulted in national policy or program changes.

Given this environment the sector's dependence on public funds, and its strong mediating tradition, why haven't Canadian voluntary coalesced more aggressively to pursue a common macro-policy agenda, or to develop a more formal sector-wide coalition structure for common action? To answer this, and other pressing questions, a substantial survey of leaders of the sector has been undertaken, in consultation with the NVO Committee. The findings reported in this article are built on three questions the survey was designed to answer: (a) Does a common macro-policy agenda for the 1990s exist within the charitable sector? (b) At what policy levels should such an agenda be pursued? and (c) What organizational structures are required to implement any national agenda?

The Survey

The NVO's first questionnaire, a lengthy and totally open-ended document, was sent to 238 senior staff members or senior policy volunteers of NVO member organizations. While the total number of member organizations may appear small to the outside observer, given 65,000 registered charities, it should be noted that most NVO members represent coalition or national-interest organizations. For example, a religious denomination might have hundreds of individual congregations/parishes, each registered as a separate charity, but "their" NVO member might be the national office of the denomination. Similarly, medical research charities have local and provincial branches, each individually registered, but represented in NVO by the national office. An NVO member like the Canadian Council for the Arts may represent dozens of its affiliated members. Thus, while nominally small, the NVO's membership includes formal representation of a significant percentage of Canada's major charities.

The first-round questionnaire was sent out in September–October, 1989. Twenty-four respondents completed the 11-page questionnaire—four volunteers and 20 staff members—for a response rate of approximately 10 per cent. While small in number, the responses were extremely rich in information. In Part I, respondents had been asked to identify the five *external* environmental factors anticipated to have the most direct or profound influence on their organizations in the next decade and to explain why and how each variable was likely to affect the organization. They were also asked to do the same for the five most important factors in the organization's *internal* environment. Next, they were asked to rank the 10 variables they had identified in order of importance with comments explaining the ranking. In Part II, respondents were asked to return to their external-internal lists and to identify how and why they would spend \$10 for action to address each variable, either at the local level of the individual organization, or through issue-based service coalitions, or on sector-wide collective action. In addition, they were asked to provide demographic information about themselves and their organization: age, sex, years of experience in the sector or sub-sector, type of organization (human service, arts/multicultural, sport/recreational), size of membership and operating budgets, regional concentration, and membership in other interorganizational groups of voluntary organizations.

From these complex and thoughtful replies a shorter second-round questionnaire was developed and sent to the same total mailing list. In essence, it revealed the results of the first round and asked similar

questions, to see if knowing what others thought would influence the answers and whether a wider group would share the perceptions of the original respondents.

Sixty-one responses were received to the second-round survey, including 19 of the first-round respondents. About 20 per cent were senior volunteers and the balance senior staff members. Most were from human service agencies. Statistical analysis has shown very little difference between the results of rounds one and two, and very little movement by the first round participants when they were informed of the group results of that round.

Policy Priorities for the 1990s

There is, indeed, a strong macro-policy agenda identified for the voluntary sector by these influential respondents, who averaged 16+ years of experience. They identified their top 10 issues as follows:

1. *Funding*—Public funding for agency programs is inadequate; social service, educational programs rank well below direct health care services in funding priorities. There is pressure to privatize and contract out services, to increase fee-for-service activities and private fund raising. No source of funding seems stable and increased private funding can't close the gap to meet increased demands for service.
2. *Financial Pressures*—Much staff and volunteer energy is going into fund raising to find alternative sources to replace cutbacks, consequently, less time is being spent on service provision, our primary purpose. We need to find innovative ways to reallocate resources internally. Will that be enough? We're not sure.
3. *Political Support*—The political environment is less sympathetic than it was five to 10 years ago. The federal and provincial governments seem less concerned about economic disparities and social injustice, both within Canada and globally.
4. *Public Attitudes*—General public attitudes toward many of our clients and social problems also seem to be changing and are more conservative. There is not widespread awareness of concern about *systemic* problems of economic inequality and social justice, and yet the needs grow.
5. *Strategic Planning*—We need to convince our boards and staff that good strategic planning is required to survive the next decade with all of its resource and service challenges.

6. *Economy*—The entire economy seems shaky. We're just beginning to feel the impact of free trade; the proposed GST presents new threats to agencies and their clients. There will probably be significant economic dislocation for many Canadians in the next few years which will place higher demands on agencies, requiring innovative approaches and new programs. Education and training programs will be increasingly important.

7. *Human Resources Scarcity*—Good volunteers and staff are harder to find and retain. Our low wage scales mean we are increasingly priced out of the market, especially in expensive urban areas.

8. *Changing Roles: Women*—As more women enter the workforce, both service needs and the shape of volunteer jobs change. More service supports are required for families (child day care, help with elderly relatives, counselling, etc.). Women are still volunteering, but they are more demanding as volunteers—they give less time, and want the work to be more meaningful—which means agencies have to change the way they recruit and retain good volunteers.

9. *Organizational Conflicts*—Too much conflict between members, chapters, regions is wasting organizational energy and keeping us from "getting on with it". We need help with a solution.

10. *Changing Roles: Multiculturalism*—The influx of different cultures into Canada has placed new service and governance demands on agencies. We must change many programs and how they are delivered and we need to involve other cultural groups in planning and governing agencies.

These top 10 issues were followed closely by a cluster of internal variables related to lack of role clarity between board and staff, need to readjust service focus and to revise organizational structure, and problems with volunteer recruitment.

As can be seen, funding and financial pressures dominate the replies. But when, the reader might ask, would they not? Voluntary agencies always seem to be moaning about lack of resources. What is striking is the weight of the replies and the added comments of many round-one respondents in the following vein: I know we always say we're short of money, but I've been in this field for a long time and it's never been this bad—I've never had to be worried before whether I could meet the payroll at the end of the month or whether we would be in business when our current grant runs out. Were there differences among respondents regarding the pre-eminence of these issues? Experience made no

difference (nor did it to any other survey response; almost all had been working at their present levels five years or more), nor were there differences between volunteer or staff status or types of organizational activity. Round-one respondents had ranked these issues highly, and continued to do so in round two.

Of even greater interest are the natural clusters of variables which emerged. External priorities appeared to be split between two clusters, socio-political concerns and service-related issues. To explore this, two external clusters were grouped: *Funding, Political Support, the Economy, Public Attitudes*, in the first, and *Women, Multiculturalism, Social Problems, Consumer Awareness and Aging* in the second (note: *Social Problems* and *Aging* did not make it into the final top 20; *Consumer Awareness* was ranked 16th). Similarly, internal variables emerged in some natural clusters with *Financial Pressures, Strategic Planning, Human Resources Scarcity* being the one of primary interest to this discussion.

How many respondents ranked all, or almost all, the variables in a single cluster among their top five external or top five internal issues? How many continued to cluster these when they combined their internal and external priorities into a single list?

The first external cluster represented four of the top six issues overall and respondents felt quite strongly about them. Some 24 of the 61 ranked all four in their top five issues; another 20 ranked three of the four. In their combined list, nine respondents continued to rank these four variables among the top five; 15 ranked three of the four this high. Why do these issues form a natural cluster? They are all inter-related, representing respondents' discomfort with the changing shape of the Canadian socio-political environment. The issue of funding shortages is, in their minds, very closely linked to lack of political support for social programs, increased negative public attitudes toward client groups and (less strongly) society's general preoccupation with the economy.

The second cluster of external issues was related to service populations and the anticipated impact of social problems and changing demographics. Only one respondent listed all five variables in the top five external list and another two listed four of the five. But 10 respondents included three of these issues in their top five. When developing a combined list, one respondent listed the three top 20 surviving variables (*Women, Multiculturalism, Consumer Awareness*) in the top five, but seven included two of the three variables in the top five. While this cluster had strength, it was not nearly so robust as the first one.

The cluster of internal variables considered here contained “big picture” and “survival” issues—financial pressures, the need for strategic planning to meet perceived challenges, the scarcity of skilled volunteer and staff resources to do the job. Some 19 respondents listed all three in their list of top five internal variables; 30 listed two of the three. When lists were combined to discuss the top 10, two respondents continued to list all three in the top five and 19 listed two of the three in the final top five.

The surveys showed no significant difference in perception between volunteers and staff. Direct-service groups were slightly more likely than others (lobbying, education, and umbrella service groups, and fund raisers) to believe that public attitudes toward human service clients have worsened in recent years. Direct-service groups seem less likely to believe that instability in the economy will profoundly affect their organizations in the coming decade.

Future analysis will be directed to cross-checking the relationships among the views and organizations of the participants. For example, do members of national voluntary health agencies think similarly about issues and action? Are their perspectives different from those of members of national youth service agencies? More data are required on the views of arts organizations and francophones (the surveys were all available in French where appropriate, but the number of francophone respondents was not statistically significant.)

Implementing the Policy Agenda

If there is such strong and uniform consensus on a policy agenda, where and how should action be taken? As mentioned above, respondents were asked to allocate resources for action among local organizations, issue-based service coalitions, and sector-wide vehicles. With regard to that principal external cluster of variables, respondents indicated a strong preference for spending the greatest proportion of dollars on sector-wide action (*Funding 55%, Public Attitudes 70%; Economy 68%*). Only for tackling the issue of *Political Support* did they recommend otherwise (28 per cent sector-wide, 42 per cent issue-based service coalitions, 30 per cent at local organizational level). This expressed preference for sector-wide action is at odds with spending practices by these organizations during the past 15 years, since at no time have organizational membership contributions to the NVO exceeded a total of \$40,000 a year. Such a gap between preference and practice might be explained in several ways: lack of funds for action (more likely now than in previous years), lack of confidence in the effectiveness of NVO (no comparative com-

posite data are available to measure confidence in issue-based service coalitions during this period), or a new sense of urgency about the socio-political policy agenda.

When asked if they saw a need for a national umbrella coalition of all types of voluntary organizations to tackle sector-wide issues, the answer was overwhelmingly yes (88.5 per cent total; staff 88.4 per cent, volunteers 72.7 per cent). However, they would like to be more formal in structure than the present NVO: 82.4 per cent felt it needed a constitution (93.8 per cent of direct-service organizations agreed), 92.5 per cent felt it should elect a slate of officers, 84.9 per cent wanted a permanent (but modest) office secretariat, and 71.2 per cent desired formal votes on policy issues (86.7 per cent of direct-service organizations agreed), although only 22.6 per cent wanted those policy votes to be binding on members.

Sufficient financial resources would remain a problem for any refurbished national coalition. Respondents were asked what percentage of their organization's annual operating budget they would allocate to an effective coalition: 28.8 per cent were willing to give 1 per cent or more, 30.5 per cent offered less than 1 per cent, and 40.7 per cent wrote that, much as they would like to contribute, they were so stretched they could not give more than currently paid to NVO. When asked if they would be willing to double their contribution if the federal government cut back its support of any national coalition, 46.7 per cent said yes, and many of the 53.3 per cent replying no explained this was only because they didn't have the money to give. On the other hand, if the coalition offered services for purchase, 61.7 per cent said they would agree *not* to purchase from other suppliers if prices were roughly comparable.

In round two, respondents were asked to rank perceived benefits (drawn from the literature noted above) of belonging to an effective sector-wide national coalition. Heaviest weightings were giving to "access to resources"—opening new sources of funding, lobbying for more resources or more favourable legislation, or providing access to specialized staff (44 per cent ranked it first, 20 per cent second, 8 per cent third, 10 per cent fourth). This was closely followed by "information"—a means of communicating and sharing data with other voluntary organizations (36 per cent first, 31 per cent second, 11 per cent third, 3 per cent fourth). Both "access to resources" and "information" were ranked by 82 per cent of respondents "Programs", offering services (e.g., research, conferences, etc.) which aren't otherwise available or are too costly for individual organizations to provide, was mostly ranked third

or fourth by the 72 per cent of respondents who ranked it at all. “Image”, being seen as cooperative organizational citizens, was ranked lowest (79 per cent ranking), with 2 per cent placing it first, 11 per cent second, 16 per cent third and 49 per cent fourth. There were no statistically significant differences in rankings of benefits among those who participated in round one and those who did not, between volunteers and staff, or direct-service and other organizations.

Preliminary analysis of these results seems to indicate that Canadian voluntary sector organizations do not appear to differ significantly in their motivations for linkage from the United States public-sector networks upon which most of the interorganizational linkage and decision-making research is based. While the historic pattern of NVO activities has fulfilled mostly “information” and “program” roles, the strong preference expressed for increased access to resources through coalition membership—and the preference for a more formal and structured organization—is consistent with the sense of urgency in the policy agenda.

A Sector in Crisis⁶

This survey is the first to question Canadian voluntary sector leaders about their future policy agenda on their opinions about what would be appropriate interorganizational decision-making mechanisms to achieve agreement for action. As well, the investigator has been unable to find comparable studies in other national jurisdictions. While small in number, the respondents include a significant proportion of national voluntary sector opinion leaders. Among the 58/61 who identified themselves, non had delegated the task of completing the questionnaires.

Originally, the study was primarily intended to explore interorganizational linkage and decision-making variables in the sector. It hoped to find answers to such questions as: Given an opportunity to identify future policy issues for their organizations, which would opinion leaders identify as being of national consequence? Would they see need for a sector-wide coalition, and how formal did they think it should be? To what other types of coalition did the polled organizations belong? The NVO’s unique status in Canada, and its lengthy history as a highly unstructured and informal coalition, raised interesting questions about the role and structure of the voluntary sector in Canada since NVO had no sector-wide competitors and no history of membership revolt. Are motivations for linkage different in the Canadian context? Does the structure of federal-provincial funding of human services argue for policy action at levels other than national coalitions? The survey results

provide a starting point from which to address those, and other, issues of interorganizational theory and practice.

For more than 10 years, both students and clients of the charitable sector have been primarily concerned with service or management issues. Typical questions discussed have been: How can we deliver service more effectively? Can we manage more effectively? This two-pronged emphasis has been reflected in NVO's activities. Consultations have dealt with staff and board training and development, service implications of the recession of the early 1980s, and such "non-political" policy issues as improved tax policy respecting charitable deductions and revisions to charitable regulations so charities might engage in limited non-partisan lobbying on behalf of client groups. Broader socio-political concerns have emerged more strongly in both the classroom and the NVO Committee's agenda only in the past year or so.

It is as if an assortment of disparate issues suddenly reformed into a collage with a pattern: continued cutbacks in federal funding to the provinces from human services, new restrictions on universal social programs, free trade and its fallout, the implications of the constitutional debates, the GST, the dominance of "market" imagery and ideas in the federal political arena (and some provinces). These respondents believe Canada's voluntary sector is in crisis. The collectivity of their concerns and desire for action represents a distinctive change from previous concerns and patterns of action. The policy issues they identify, the impact of those issues they describe, and the stronger, more formal and national sector-wide action they recommend focus on concern for survival in a hostile environment. They sense that the public philosophy of the state is changing, and that those changes are inimical to their role and values.

Lowi (1967) and Beer (1978) have both used the term "public philosophy" in an analytical way to describe an orientation to public affairs which is widely accepted within a nation and which serves to define problems and direct government policy toward dealing with them.⁷ A public philosophy is not necessarily logical and may contain inconsistencies and contradictions across (and even within) policy areas. It does not eliminate conflict but provides a pragmatic framework for getting on with the work of governance. Political ideology is a key component: it can be formed from a single ideological position, or it might be created through compromise and conflict among competing ideologies. Manzer (1985) reviewed attempts to determine Canadian public philosophy and identified three broad schools of thought. Liber-

alism, wherein the state's role in social welfare is to create conditions for equality of opportunity so individuals can compete freely, is a central component to all three schools.

Certainly in the post-World War II period, Canadian public philosophy contained strong elements of "developmental" liberalism,⁸ with its moral vision of the potential for human improvement, a view strongly linked to the construction of Canada's welfare state. In the late 1980s, the surviving strands of liberalism in federal governance appear to be of the "protective" variant,⁹ more closely akin to conservatism in its heavy emphasis on the solely economic role of the state. The difference between these two perspectives, to paraphrase M. Anandakrishnan, is whether criteria for distributive justice should be based on considerations of charity, or on improving the quality of life of the majority of people.¹⁰ Do the alarms raised by these respondents, and the new voices of criticism emerging in other parts of Canadian society (accompanied by record-low popularity polls for the current federal government), signal that many politicians have moved too far or too fast in their attempts to shift the public philosophy? Only time will tell.

Little if any research outlines the implications of differing public philosophies for the role of the voluntary sector. Canada seems about to explore those implications in practice in the 1990s, with or without the guidance of theory.

FOOTNOTES

1. Revenue Canada has no reported taxonomy for classification of types of charities. The suggested sub-categories of increase are based upon my own observations and consultation with a number of voluntary sector leaders.
2. Statistics Canada, *Survey of Volunteer Activity*, data published in Government of Canada news release, 30 May 1988.
3. Quoted in Dobell, A.R. and Mansbridge, S.H., *The Social Policy Process in Canada* (Halifax: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1986), p. 6.
4. In previous work I have discussed a corollary of Krashinsky's thesis regarding the utility of voluntary organizations to the state, namely the strong mediating role played by Canadian voluntary organizations between government and community. See Wolf, J. "A Comparison of the Role of the Voluntary Sector in Canada and the United States," *5 Philanthrop.* No. 3, p. 16.
5. Statements of purpose are from an undated background sheet published by NVO in the late 1970s.
6. I would like to thank Ronald Manzer, Jon Van Til, Michael Krashinsky and Lloyd Burton for their comments and suggestions regarding the conceptualization of a sector in crisis. They are, of course, not responsible for any of the views I have expressed.

7. For more expansive discussions on public philosophy or the importance to governance of aggregate public ideas, see also Manzer (1985), Robert B. Reich (ed.), *The Power of Public Ideas* (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1988) and Robert N. Bellah, et al., *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).
8. C.B. Macpherson, in *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), affixes the label of "developmental" liberalism to the philosophy of John Stuart Mill, which advanced the theory of a capitalist market economy combined with a democratic political system.
9. Similarly, Macpherson (op. cit.) labels as "protective" liberalism the earlier views of Jeremy Bentham and James Mill, who held to a capitalist market but added a limited democratic franchise to protect against governmental oppression.
10. Anandakrishnan's views are most interestingly developed in "Equity and Distribution: Social Values and Technological options," in Nef, J., Vanderkop, J. and Wiseman, H. (eds.), *Ethics and Technology: Ethical Choices in the Age of Pervasive Technology* (Toronto: Wall & Thompson, 1989), 105-112.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aiken, M. and Hage, J. "Organizational Interdependence and Interorganizational Structure", *American Sociological Review* 33, 1968, 912-930.
- Banting, K. "The Role of Universality in the Canadian Welfare State", in Green, A. and Olewiler, N. (eds.), *Report of the Policy Forum on universality and Social Policies in the 1980s* (Kingston, Ont.: John Deutsch Institute for the Study of Economic Policy, Queen's University, 1985).
- Beer, S.H. "In Search of a New Public Philosophy", in King, A. (ed.), *The New American Political System* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1978).
- Benson, J.K. "The Interorganizational Network as a Political Economy", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 1975, 22-9.
- Galaskiewicz, J. "Interorganizational Relations", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 1985, 281-304.
- Gray, B. "Conditions Facilitating Interorganizational Collaboration", *Human Relations*, 38(10), 1985, 911-936.
- Hall, R.H., et al. "Patterns of Interorganizational Relationships", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 1977, 457-474.
- Inzerilli, G. "The Organization-Client Relationship as an Aspect of Inter-organizational Analysis", *Human Relations*, 32(5), 1979, 419-437.
- Krashinsky, M. 1989. "U.S. and Canadian perspectives on nonprofit management and governance". University of Toronto. Photocopy (publication pending).
- Laumann, E.O., Galaskiewicz, J. and Marsden, P.V. "Community Structure as Interorganizational Linkages", *Annual Review of Sociology* (Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1978).

- Lowi, T.J. "The Public Philosophy: Interest Group Liberalism", *American Political Science Review*, 61, 1967, 5-24.
- Manzer, R. *Public Policies and Political Development in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).
- Martin, S.A. *An Essential Grace: Funding Canada's Health Care, Education, Welfare, Religion and Culture* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985).
- Metcalf, J.L. "Organizational Strategies and Interorganizational Networks", *Human Relations*, 29(4), 1976, 327-343.
- Ross, D.P. *Some Financial and Economic Dimensions of Registered Charities and Voluntary Activity in Canada* (Ottawa: Secretary of State, Queen's Printer, 1983).
- Ross, D.P. *Economic Dimensions of Volunteer Work in Canada* (Ottawa: Secretary of State, Queen's Printer, 1990).
- Schemerhorn, J. Jr. "Determinance of Interorganizational Cooperation", *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 1975, 846-856.
- Schmidt, S.M. and Kochan, T.A. "Interorganizational Relationships: Patterns and Motivations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 1977, 24-36.
- Splane, R. "Social Policy-Making in the Government of Canada", in Yelaja, S.A. (ed.), *Canadian Social Policy*, 2d ed. (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1987).
- Van de Ven, A.H. "On the Nature, Formation and Maintenance of Relations among Organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 1976, 24-36.
- Van de Ven, A.H. and Walker, G. "The Dynamics of Interorganizational Coordination", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(4), 1984, 598-621.
- Van Til, J. "Volunteering and Democratic Theory", in Harman, J.D. (ed.), *Volunteerism in the Eighties: Fundamental Issues in Voluntary Action* (New York: University press of America, 1982).
- Whetten, D. and Leung, T. "The Instrumental Value of Interorganizational Relations: Antecedents and Consequences of Linkage Formation", *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 1979, 325-344.