The Alliance for Volunteerism

invites you to the

National Forum on a Commission on Volunteerism:
The Federal Government and the Future of Volunteering

March 26-28, 1980

- PROGRAM -

Wednesday, March 26

Chairperson - Bob Moffitt, Executive Committee, Alliance for Volunteerism

1:00-3:00 p.m.	Registration - Lobby
3:00 p.m.	Address: The Environment for Volunteerism *Waldemar Nielson*, Consultant, Writer, Author of The Endangered Sector - Auditorium
4:00 p.m.	Opinion Sharing on a Commission on Volunteerism *Jack Moskowitz*, Senior Vice President for Governmental Affairs, United Way of America *Kerry Kenn Allen*, Executive Vice President, Volunteer: National Center for Citizen Involvement
6:30 p.m.	Reception - Commonwealth Dining Room
7:30 p.m.	Dinner - Commonwealth Dining Room
	Address: Legislative Perspectives for Volunteerism *The Honorable Dave Durenberger*, United States Senator from Minnesota
9:30 p.m.	Informal Discussion with Resource Persons - *Refer to list of resource persons and room designations (white sheet)* Conference Room E

Thursday, March 27

Chairperson - Del Dyer, Director, Center for Volunteer Development, Virginia Tech

7:30 a.m.	Breakfast - Commonwealth Dining Room
8:30 a.m.	A Day of Examining Issues *Jon Van Til*, Chairman, Department of Urban Studies, Rutgers - Auditorium
9:00 a.m.	Small Group Issues Discussions: Defining the Issue Understanding the Issue Dealing With the Issue Developing Recommendations *(Consult the blue sheet in your packet for room assignment by name tag number)*

12:00 p.m.	Lunch - Squires Student Center (Rehearsal Room)
1:00 p.m.	Resume Discussions
4:00 p.m.	Break - Relax or Recreate
	Reporters meet with Dyer and Van Til in Conference Room A
6:00 p.m.	Dinner - Commonwealth Dining Room
	Dialogue with Congressional Representatives on Recommendations

Friday, March 28

Chairperson - Dorothy Height, President, Alliance for Volunteerism, President, National Council of Negro Women

8:00 a.m.	Breakfast - Commonwealth Dining Room
9:00 a.m.	Address: Challenge to Action *Landrum Bolling*, President, Council on Foundations, Vice President, Independent Sector - Commonwealth Dining Room
	Participants' Formulation of Action Plans - Conference Rooms
	Coalition Building
12:00 p.m.	Lunch
	Closing

NATIONAL FORUM ON A COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE FUTURE OF VOLUNTEERING

Meeting the Issue Paper Authors

Wednesday, March 26, 1980, 9:30 PM

LODGING ROOM

206	"The Federal Role in Resources for Volunteerism: Present and Future" *Mr. Tim Saasta*
207	"Mapping Volunteerism" *Dr. David Horton Smith*
208	"Legislative Update and Analysis" *Mr. Harry J. Hogan*
209	"What Are Appropriate Roles for Citizen Volunteers in the Federal System?" *Professor Hans Spiegel*
210	"Who Speaks for Volunteers and the Voluntary Sector and Who In Government Listens?" *Ms. Bobbie Kilberg*
211	"Government Domination/Government Support and Encouragement of Volunteer Programs" *Mr. Jack Moskowitz*
212	"Commission on Volunteerism: Pro and Con" *Mr. Stephen McCurley*
213	"National Service and Its Impact on the Volunteer System" *Mr. Roger Landrum*

ISSUE GROUPS - MARCH 27, 1980

National Forum on a Commission on Volunteerism

Consult the numbers on your name tag and go to the room assigned to your group number at 9:00 a.m., or as soon as the opening session is concluded in the auditorium.

Group #	Room	Facilitator
1	Committee Room	~~Lu Zurcher~~ Susan Greene
2	Board Room	Charles Tildon
3	Conference Room C	Milton Boyce
4	Conference Room F-1	Katherine Noyes
5	Conference Room F-2	Richard Rich
6	Conference Room G-1	Els Culver
7	Conference Room G-2	Sarah Jane Rehnberg

THE NATIONAL FORUM ON A COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM

March 26-28, 1980

Blacksburg, Virginia

COMMISSIONED PAPERS

1. MAPPING VOLUNTEERISM: WHAT SHOULD WE PUT ON THE MAP? Research

   - David Horton Smith

2. APPROPRIATE ROLE OF CITIZEN VOLUNTEERS IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM Cit. Part. in Govt.

   - Hans B. C. Spiegel

3. METAMORPHOSIS: FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS Fed. Funding

   - Timothy Saasta

4. GOVERNMENTAL LISTENING POSTS How To Impact

   - Bobbie Greene Kilberg
     and
     John J. Milliken

5. NATIONAL YOUTH SERVICE: IS IT AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME? NYS

   - Roger L. Landrum

6. THE COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM: PROS AND CONS Commission

   - Stephen McCurley

7. THE PRIVATE-PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP: PERSPECTIVES FOR THE EIGHTIES

   - Jack Moskowitz
     and
     Ellen Witman

MAPPING VOLUNTEERISM:

WHAT SHOULD WE PUT ON THE MAP?

David Horton Smith*

To attempt rational policy planning and action in any realm of human activity without adequate and relevant information to guide these processes is at best foolhardy and at worst harmful. Such information may be thought of as a kind of map, a simplified perspective on reality. Maps simplify reality in various ways, always reducing the amount of available information and usually highlighting certain features of reality while ignoring others. Volunteerism has yet to be mapped adequately. In this paper I will raise some questions that must precede such a mapping process. Different kinds of maps are needed for different purposes, and the use to which a map is to be put should determine the kinds of features included and excluded. If we are to understand volunteerism, what are the key elements or features for inclusion to produce an adequate map? One could discuss this question endlessly. Many do. Based on existing research as well as practical considerations, I think there are four main categories of crucial features of volunteerism: volunteers, individual volunteerism resources, volunteer groups, and collective volunteerism resources.

(1) Volunteers. Most people take some vague and amorphous definition of the term "volunteer" for granted, convinced that they know one when they see one. But when one tries to be precise, defining what a volunteer is becomes unexpectedly difficult. Is someone who enlists in our U.S. "Volunteer" Army really a volunteer, or just someone freely choosing a paying job? Is a VISTA or stipended (partially or meagerly paid) volunteer really a volunteer, or more accurately a "quasi-volunteer," a person working for low pay and expense reimbursement but with some significant commitment to a goal in the public interest? Does the provision of expense reimbursements to a volunteer make that person any less a volunteer than a person wealthy enough not to need such reimbursements? Perhaps the hardest kind of questions here involve the overlap of paid work and volunteer activities. Is there not

---

*Professor of Sociology, Boston College; Secretary General, International Voluntary Action and Voluntary Association Research Organization (IVAR); Vice-President for Research, Association of Voluntary Action Scholars (AVAS), of North America.

a volunteer component in many paid occupations, for instance a lawyer teaching full time rather than pursuing a more lucrative private practice, or a top corporation executive who accepts a poorly paid government or nonprofit organization job?

A volunteer is best defined as someone who is currently doing volunteer work. Volunteer work is best defined as non-coerced, non-obligatory, societally useful activities performed for intended beneficiaries other than kin and motivated primarily by the expectation of psychic or interpersonal satisfactions rather than the expectation of direct, high probability, appropriate remuneration for services performed. Using this definition, U.S. Army "volunteers" are actually paid workers, except when off-duty and possibly engaged in volunteer work, as defined here. Stipended volunteers and people who take lower paying jobs or careers because of commitment to the public interest are "quasi-volunteers." Expense-reimbursed volunteers are as much volunteers as the non-reimbursed, assuming they qualify as true volunteers as defined above.

Several other distinctions among volunteers can be useful. Too often informal volunteering is overlooked. Formal volunteers are affiliated with some program, organization, or agency that coordinates their work. Informal volunteers do volunteer work either on their own (as in helping a neighbor in need) or as part of informal groups of friends. Because they are ubiquitous, informal volunteers may be overlooked, but full-time volunteers are usually overlooked because they are so rare. Yet full-time volunteers, performing 30 or more hours a week of volunteer work, are the central mobilizing forces of perhaps tens of thousands of volunteer groups and programs in this country. Part-time volunteers---the active, regular volunteers who put in their few hours each week---are the norm. Their far greater numbers make their total contribution to volunteerism very large indeed. Nominal volunteers officially belong to some voluntary group without doing any volunteer work, even though they may be contributors of money or goods to volunteerism.

Adequate mapping of volunteers should also identify volunteers by levels of responsibility (policy volunteers such as board members; management volunteers' operative volunteers such as campaign workers or therapeutic companions), by programmatic type of activity, by the type of voluntary group affiliation if any, by the social and physical work setting, by the clients or targets of activity (group members themselves; clients; the general welfare), by domestic vs. transnational orientation, and by degree of societal change orientation (from status quo to radical change-oriented), and possibly by several other characteristics (such as training/education, skill level/competence, prior volunteer experiences, and range of a person's current volunteer involvements).

(2) Individual Volunteerism Resources. To understand and map volunteerism adequately, one must be able to identify the principal

types of resources provided by volunteers and others involved in volunteerism as individuals. Some important elements here are amounts of volunteer time, of paid staff time, of contributed funds, property, or facilities, of lent funds, property, or facilities, and of total expenditures by individuals on volunteer groups or endeavors (including subscription fees, for example).

(3) Volunteer Groups. As with defining volunteers, it is impossible to define volunteer groups in a way that all will accept. For instance, is a group a volunteer group if it has any paid staff? What if the paid staff in a nonprofit organization outnumber the volunteers? What if the only volunteers in a nonprofit organization are its board of directors or equivalent? What if the volunteers are working for a government agency (as with the I.R.S. volunteers) or even constitute a government agency (as with the Environmental Commission of a small town government)---are they a governmental group or a volunteer group?

I have found it useful to deal with such questions by defining a volunteer group as a group (organization, agency, association, etc.) the majority of whose active, service-producing (more than nominal) members and staff are volunteers. Volunteer groups can certainly have some paid staff, but they will be a minority in relation to the bombined staff plus membership. When paid staff outnumber volunteers in a nonprofit organization, it is often useful to refer to the organization (providing it is not a government agency) as a "paid-staff nonprofit organization" (abbreviated as "PSNPO"). The term "voluntary group" can be used to refer to the whole range of nonprofit groups, both volunteer groups and PSNPOs. A PSNPO will almost always have a volunteer board of directors (sometimes expense-reimbursed), and sometimes will have other volunteers associated with it. The latter volunteers may be termed the volunteer component or "volunteer program" of the PSNPO. The volunteer program of some PSNPO, such as a hospital, however, is itself a volunteer group when considered as analytically separate from the larger PSNPO. Most voluntary associations or volunteer membership organizations are thus volunteer groups, as are the volunteer programs affiliated with many PSNPOs or with government agencies. In smaller towns and cities, planning boards, school boards, and the like can be local government units and volunteer groups simultaneously.

There are many important differences among volunteer groups worthy of mapping, only a few of which can be touched on here.* One can disdistinguish volunteer groups as being informal or formal, informal volunteer groups being groups of friends, co-workers, neighbors and the

---

*For more extensive discussion of these differences, see "Dimensions and Categories of Voluntary Organizations/NGOs," by myself and two colleagues, in the Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 2 (2), 1973: 116-120.

like who lack a unique group name, clear group membership boundaries, and a clear leadership structure; while formal volunteer groups have at least the latter three characteristics. Like informal volunteers, informal volunteer groups are widely ignored but widespread and important. Another key distinction among volunteer groups is whether or not they are formally related to some other, usually larger, group or organization. There are two different types of relationship here, called vertical and horizontal integration. A vertically integrated volunteer group is part of some larger organization that covers more territory (as a Girl Scout troop is part of the Girl Scouts of America). A horizontally integrated volunteer group is part of some larger organization at the same territorial level (as a hospital volunteer program is part of the hospital in a given town). Independent volunteer groups stand alone, with neither type of relationship. Such groups are usually the smallest, least known, shortest lived, and poorest, but also the most innovative and need-responsive volunteer groups.

The most common way of distinguishing among volunteer groups is in terms of their goals and purposes, especially their primary purposes. There are many different schemes for classifying volunteer groups into what may be called "programmatic types." After many years of empirical research in which different classification schemes were used, I have found the following one to be the most analytically useful:

community service/community action groups
other-helping health groups
other-helping educational groups
personal growth/self-development/self-improvement groups
communication/information dissemination groups
scientific/technical/engineering/learned groups
other-helping social welfare groups
self-help disadvantaged/minority groups
political action groups
environmental/ecological welfare groups
consumer welfare groups
international/transnational welfare groups
occupation-related groups (business-trade-professional associations; farmers' and ranchers' associations; labor unions and employee associations)
expressive leisure groups (sports and recreational groups; hobbies and games groups; entertainment and spectatorship groups; cultural and artistic groups; sociability and fellowship groups)
religious/ideological-ethical groups
deviant/criminal groups
fund-raising/fund-distribution groups
multipurpose/general groups*

---

*For more detail and examples, see my article, with two colleagues, entitled "The Nonprofit Sector" in the Nonprofit Organization Handbook (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1978), edited by Tracy Connors.

Many other important distinctions among volunteer groups also come to mind, of course, particularly size, wealth, power, age, public familiarity, geographic scope, societal change orientation, etc. Each of these can be important in one context or another, but for general purposes the prior distinctions seem more important to grasp and take into account.

(4) Collective Volunteerism Resources. There are collective or group resources for volunteerism that are crucial to a mapping of volunteerism. There are at least three main types of these support groups: cooperation facilitation, leadership development, and operating-resources provision groups. In fact, these three types may be thought of most accurately as functions, with some support groups engaged in only a single function and others involved in two or even all three.

Cooperation facilitation groups are alliances, coalitions, confederations, councils, and similar bodies that bring together two or more volunteer groups in a temporary or permanent attempt to bring about collaboration, cooperation, and sometimes coordination or even merger between these groups. A good example would be the Alliance for Volunteerism that is convening the forthcoming National Forum, but a few other examples are the National Assembly, Independent Sector, AFL-CIO, the National Council of Churches, and the National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth. These groups are very important for understanding volunteerism because they constitute the formal networks and the superstructure. Two questions about such groups immediately arise, when they are viewed in this light: (1) How much breadth of coverage is there for volunteer groups in general by one or another of these cooperation facilitation groups? That is, what types of volunteerism have no such groups, and which such groups include only a small proportion of the total set of relevant potential members? (2) Could there be some kind of useful cooperation facilitation group for volunteerism as a whole to link together the many existing specialized groups that facilitate cooperation in one or another area of the field?

Leadership development groups are organizations of and for different kinds of leaders, paid and volunteer, of voluntary groups. A good example would be the American Society of Association Executives, one of the Co-Sponsors of the National Forum. But again there are many other possible examples. The aim of such groups is to develop the skills, competence, and personal qualities of leaders of voluntary groups through meetings, training, publications, and the like. A question worth pondering is whether all areas of volunteerism are adequately served at present by some kind of leadership development group. If not, what are the gap areas and how could they be filled?

Operating-resources provision groups are organizations that try to provide such operating resources as recruitment of volunteers, training, evaluation, research, fund raising, funding, technical consultation, and/or other services to outside volunteer groups (that is, not

merely to local or other lower territorial level units or chapters of their own organization) of one kind or all kinds for some defined geographical territory. Such a group would be Volunteer: The National Center for Citizen Involvement, as a general national operating-resources provision group, or the Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, as a national group specializing in research on volunteerism ---both groups being Co-Sponsors of the National Forum. Private foundations are good examples of local or national specialists in fund-raising training and consultation. Volunteer Bureaus around the nation are examples of local specialists in volunteer recruitment and sometimes technical consultations and training. Again the question arises regarding how well do the existing operational-resources provision groups meet the very real needs of America's volunteer groups. Where are the gaps---by type of operational-resource, by area of the country, and by type of volunteer group---and how can these gaps be filled? How can volunteer groups be helped to more readily find the kind of support group and help that they need?

Conclusion

There are good maps and bad maps. In volunteerism, we have few good ones, with some notable exceptions (some national directories of national organizations). At the local and state levels, maps of volunteerism are almost uniformly inadequate; yet this is where most of volunteering takes place. We may now be able to develop some consensus on what should be put on our maps of volunteerism, but how can the data be gathered and updated regularly, who should do so for what territorial levels and types of volunteerism, and how should the information, the resulting maps, be disseminated in order to be of maximum benefit to volunteerism?

APPROPRIATE ROLE OF CITIZEN-VOLUNTEERS IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Hans B. C. Spiegel *

The following discussion deals with voluntary activies of citizens vis-a-vis their government above and beyond voting, party politics, and other more structured participatory opportunities in a representative democracy. It might nevertheless be appropriate at the outside to mention the obvious: the voluntary activities of citizens will be drastically eroded if the subtle hand of oligarchical manipulation dictates the decisions. The formal political process has to function if voluntarism is to be consequential, otherwise those in power can be tempted to engage in friendly fascism (Bertram Gross' term) in which citizen volunteers are regarded as children keeping busy in a sandbox (George Sternlieb's imagery).

A second caveat may be in order. "The Federal system" is not a monolithic and permanently rigid structure. It is, rather, a system of many parts that are in flux. Like the term "community" or "volunteer" "the federal system" is a unitary term denoting, in reality, a pluralistic, dynamic, and difficult-to-pin-down phenomenon of many sub-parts.

The topic of this paper, then, is not as simple as speculating about the relationship between the federal government and the volunteer. Which volunteer, doing what kind of volunteering, vis-a-vis what governmental entity, and for what purpose? are some of the pertinant questions. The "appropriateness" of the volunteer's role must be seen in the context of these variables and, therefore, I will stay away from making prescriptive generalizations. Instead, let me raise a few questions about this elusive and dynamic issue.

Two principal areas where volunteers are used in the federal system are service delivery and decision making.

A. Volunteers in Service Delivery

1. Off-loading of vital services. In a period of budgetary constraints, what essential governmental services can best be "off-loaded" to citizen volunteers? By off-loading is meant the turning over to citizen volunteer groups and individuals whole chunks of service delivery functions.

In many Third World countries citizen volunteers build schools, pay teachers, build roads and water systems, and disinfect cattle. The US equivalent perhaps is the extensive system of volunteer fire departments manned by 2 million volunteers, ambulance corps, blood banks, auxilliary police, etc. These are unpaid services performed under the direction of governmental personnel, but that enjoy a certain degree of autonomy. These are the categories of services that are vital to the health and safety of the community. If they were not performed, presumably government would have to step in and pay for the whole freight. These functions cannot be left unattended.

---

* Professor of Urban Affairs and Director of The Graduate Program in Urban Affairs, Hunter College of the City University of New York.

What additional functions can or should be off-loaded to volunteers? Public health services? Waste recycling? Volunteer teachers in public education? Child care? Small scale experiences are available in all of these. The questions that might concern us about the volunteer's appropriate role in this category include (a) what system of accountability will best serve the volunteer and the government? How much autonomy of function is desirable workable? Can a voluntary organization be sufficiently accountable to the electorate? (b) What payments of public funds should/can be made to the volunteer and his organization for rendering the off-loaded service? If there are no financial rewards, should such services be rewarded with at least governmentally provided insurance, tax deductability, etc.? (c) How will present civil servants react to volunteers entering their traditional turf? What will trade unions, professional associations, and the feminist movement have to say about this?

2. Co-production of services. Under the banner of "partnership" or "private-public collaboration", the "New Federalism" is attempting to weld together the efforts of government and the private-for-profit and private-voluntary sectors. Co-production implies more than joint planning; it involves active collaboration and joint investments (of money, facilities, and labor) in the implementation of a project. A symbiosis is involved here in which the resulting "greater third" can only come about with the commitment of all parties involved. Housing is a good example.

Nothing would please the President (regardless of party) and HUD more than to see whole neighborhoods renewed through a comprehensive strategy that includes public housing for the poor, privately developed and publicly subsidized housing for moderate income families, privately developed and federally guaranteed housing for the upper middle and luxury classes (unassisted, that is, except for the considerable tax credits permitted), government directly building public facilities, etc. And into this mix of housing is added a goodly pinch of governmentally encouraged volunteer activity by individuals and not-for-profit groups. Individuals can engage in sweat-equity programs, churches can help to sponsor Section 8 housing, tenant organizations can obtain community management contracts, and, of course, the planning and oversight of such housing will have volunteers participating as members of planning boards, decentralized neighborhood development groups, and as consumer representatives.

The idea behind all this co-production is that everybody will be involved and everybody will profit: the private housing developer will be doing well by doing good, the building trades will get much needed employment, CETA workers can be cranked into the scheme, the banks and insurance companies will engage in corporate social responsibility, and the resident will get a new or rehabilitated dwelling unit (although inevitably it will cost him more to live in than before), and he will have had meaningful involvement, and presumably satisfaction, because of personal involvement in the reshaping of his environment.

The idea of co-production raises a host of questions that should concern the advocates of volunteerism in the federal system: (a) Who usually profits most in such relationships? Do all parties profit? How can principles of equity be assured, especially for the low and moderate income resident who

is asked to volunteer his services? (b) Who calls the shots in the often incredibly complicated mechanisms for co-production? Since public, private, and voluntary sectors are involved, who coordinates whom? Could government achieve production of goods and services with a more favorable cost-benefit ratio if it did the job alone, not bothering about partners, especially not volunteer partners?

3. Assigning governmentally supported volunteers. Still another role of volunteers in the federal system is the direct provision of volunteers or quasi-volunteers (stipended volunteers) such as VISTA and Peace Corps volunteers who are assigned by the government (which recruits, trains, and modestly finances them) to private non-profit or public endeavors, at home and abroad. These volunteers are usually operating under governmental rules, but their roles as governmental operatives is not very visible. Indeed, it is sometimes difficult to tell VISTA volunteer from a CETA worker or field work student or private volunteer as they work shoulder to shoulder in urban poverty areas.

This category of volunteerism raises the question whether federal funds are better allocated directly to national and international non-military service corps or to private, non-profit agencies with volunteer programs. Put another way, should government recruit, train, and assign "its" volunteers to a private non-profit project, thus indirectly supporting it, or would it be more beneficial to give such private programs outright subsidy and let them recruit, train, assign, and control the volunteer? Is it not government encroachment on volunteerism and the voluntary sector to serve as the "middle man" or "volunteer-broker" when the volunteers ultimately come from and end up working for the private voluntary sector? When is government direct recruitment, training, support, assignment, and control of volunteers or quasi-volunteers appropriate? Should this occur only when the volunteers are used directly in on-going government programs with a separate mandate (for instance, volunteer tax consultants for the I.R.S.)? And what is the relative cost-effectiveness of government recruited, trained, allocated or controlled volunteers or quasi-volunteers as contrasted with privately recruited, trained, and assigned volunteers in non-profit agencies providing the same kinds of services with a government subsidy or grant?

B. Volunteers in Governmental Decision Making

An amazing thing happened to administrative processes in the federal system in America during the past 15 years: citizen volunteers are increasingly represented at a number of decision points. "Today virtually all programs in which federally appropriated funds are used," says a recent government publication, "require access to the decision making process." We are familiar with the administrative regulations that mandate and encourage citizen participation with its public hearings, advisory councils, planning boards, consumer councils, resident representatives, etc. These bodies have actual or potential power and their political muscle cannot be ignored by the various levels of government, especially by local government.

Ms. Murphy is no longer volunteering her services only to the church women's organization, but now is also making decisions about the flow of federal CDBG funds to the improvement of her neighborhood.

Here are just a few of the issues that have to be addressed in discussing decision making roles of volunteers in projects that involve the federal system.

1. Institutionalization of volunteerism and citizen participation. The mechanisms for involving citizens in decision making (and in service delivery, of course) revolve, for the most part, around organizations. Voluntarism in America has created an impressive national superstructure of which this conference is an example. On the local level, too, citizens don't participate only as autonomous individuals, but through their own interest groupings (block organizations, consumer associations) or joint government-citizen panels (neighborhood planning boards, for example). This institutionalization (and the concurrent professionalization) often creates oligarchical tendencies involving an unintended distancing of the grassroots from the people who now operate the participatory machinery.

How can a truly broad participatory base be assured as volunteers engage in communal decision making? Who represents the community? What "due process" should be followed in selecting grassroots and consumer spokespeople to the various boards? Who is accountable to whom? How can professionalization in volunteerism be appropriately restrained from squeezing out the amateur citizen volunteer?

2. Preserving the volunteer advocacy role. In any joint government-citizen decision making, the volunteer citizen must be free to take a strong advocacy role. He or she must not be unduly restrained from kicking government's shins. Indeed, many community based citizens organizations are born out of a sense of protest. But as the organization becomes older and especially after it acquires a staff (and engages in the previously discussed institutionalization), this advocacy role is often compromised. The organization of volunteers becomes financially vulnerable. A subtle change often takes place when the organization, scurrying around for funds, finds refuge in an LEAA or CDBG grant and now delivers services at the behest and through the funding of the same government against which it protests. Few organizations, I think, can walk that tight rope with integrity.

Is there need, then, for preserving arm's length relationships between explicitly advocacy oriented volunteer groups and government? If some distancing between the two is deemed functional, how can advocacy groups best go about seeking funds, especially when its constituency is poor? Could a National Endowment for Volunteerism, modeled after the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities, fill this important gap, among its other possible functions?

3. Appropriate information for the volunteer. Decision makers up and down the ladder of the Federal system need to have access to appropriate information. How can such information similarly be brought to citizen volunteers involved in decision making?

My own experiences suggest that volunteers are often subjected, on the one hand, to irrelevant information and overkill of technical data or, on the other hand, to inadequate and only sporadic information. What is "appropriate information?" Who should control the flow of information to the volunteer? Who should do the "filtering in" and "filtering out" of information? And what about the reverse flow of information from the grassroots volunteers up through the various level of the federal system?

METAMORPHOSIS

Federal Support for Voluntary Organizations

by
Timothy Saasta *

In the mid-seventies, the Filer Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs uncovered some facts about the relationship between the federal government and private voluntary organizations that surprised most people and alarmed some. One fact was that the federal government's support of voluntary organizations totalled $23.2 billion in 1974, nearly $10 billion more than the total given that year by private philanthropy to all areas except religion. A second fact was that government support accounted for more than a third of all revenue received by voluntary organizations.

These statistics confirmed a trend many had been noticing for years: the increasing role of the federal government in the activities of voluntary organizations.

The relationship between government and the voluntary sector is certainly not new, extending well back into the last century. And, as Robert Bremmer states in his Filer Commission study of the history of philanthropy, that relationship has usually not been an adversarial one: "Through the greater part of American history, government and voluntary forces have cooperated and collaborated in meeting public needs."

But the rapid expansion of government support for nonprofits during the past few decades, and, possibly, the rapid contraction of support during the next decade, raises a number of important, provocative questions:

* Is the federal government in a sense taking over the private, voluntary sector?

* Does the government exert too much control over the activities of voluntary organizations?

* Is so much government support changing the roles of voluntary organizations, perhaps diverting them from their advocacy role into more of a service role?

* Is all of that money being used effectively by voluntary organizations?

* Is much of it going into the kinds of organizations that exemplify what "voluntary action" is supposed to be about?

---

* Assistant Director of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy; formerly, Editor, Grantsmanship Center News; writer on issues affecting voluntary organizations. The views expressed in this paper are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.

* Is the government superceding voluntary organizations as a source of innovation and a force for social change?

* If so, is that because the government wishes to take over all the functions of the voluntary sector or because the voluntary sector has been defaulting in fulfilling some of its functions?

This impressionistic paper will quickly review the myriad ways the government supports various types of voluntary organizations (defined broadly), discuss the many problems associated with this support (it will suggest that the most important problems are not the ones most people talk about) and then offer some concluding thoughts.

TYPES OF GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Grants and Contracts: The largest amount of federal support for voluntary organizations comes through grants and contracts, most of which are for providing health or welfare services (i.e., the Title XX Social Services program), conducting research or educating people. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance lists hundreds of programs for which "nonprofit organizations and institutions" are eligible.

Indirect Support: The federal government supports nonprofit organizations in a number of other less direct ways. A critical source of support --particularly for voluntary organizations that rely on direct mail to raise money -- is the large discount for sending bulk mail and periodicals by nonprofits. In 1977, this "discount" cost the government $473 million. Gradually however, most of this subsidy is being phased out.

A similar form of federal support for nonprofits involves exemptions from federal taxes on things like telephone usage and aircraft fuel(!).

A far more significant form of assistance involves 'subsidies' for those using the services of nonprofits, such as federal student aid and Medicare. Related to this, the federal food and stamp program has helped a few community organizations which have contracts to 'sell' the stamps.

"Indirect cost" reimbursement on many federal grants and contracts of another source of support for many nonprofit organizations, especially the larger ones.

A few nonprofits have benefitted from federal funds for the lease or acquisition of public lands for recreation or historic monuments. Others have benefitted from donations of (or enormous discounts on) surplus federal property.

Other government services which have benefitted nonprofits (though they're usually not restricted to nonprofits) involve the dissemination of information through NTIS (National Technical Information Service), government publications and FAPRS (Federal Assistance Program Retrieval System), which is a computerized

source of information about federal assistance programs. Several federal agencies have established clearinghouses for information; one of the most recent (which is specifically for neighborhood-based voluntary organizations) is HUD's NISE (Neighborhood Information Sharing Exchange).

In relation to this, several federal agencies have provided nonprofits with some form of assistance in the grant process, either in applying for funds or in meeting federal requirements in those funds. A few federal agencies -- the Administration for Native Americans is one -- go even further, providing substantial management assistance to voluntary organizations.

Another type of "support" is the Federal Communication Commission's requirement that broadcasters devote at least some time to public affairs. One result of this is the Public Service Announcement, which has given many voluntary organizations some valuable public exposure.

Support Through the Tax System: One of the oldest and most obvious sources of federal support for voluntary organizations is the charitable deduction, which encourages contributions by offering the contributor a tax deduction. This is a major "tax expenditure": in 1979 the amount of taxes foregone by the government because of the deduction totaled $7.3 billion.

Another major tax benefit is the property tax exemption provided to various types of nonprofits by state and local governments. The Filer Commission said that was worth $5 billion in 1974.

The federal tax system also supports nonprofits in many other, less widely-known ways. For example, interest income on bonds sold to finance the construction of nonprofit hospitals in tax exempt.

Federal Government's Charity Drive: A direct source of federal support for voluntary organizations is the Combined Federal Campaign, which raises about $80 million a year for four groups of charities. The money comes from individual federal employees, but a significant amount of governmental resources are committed to raising and distributing the money; the Campaign's staff in the D.C. area, for example, consists of more than 30 federal employees.

PROBLEMS WITH GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

A survey done for the Filer Commission found that the foremost concern of leaders of voluntary organizations was "government relations." No doubt the main reason for the prominence of this concern is the prominence of governmental funds in their organizations' budgets and the problems they have in getting and administering those funds. It is that area which most people talk about when addressing "the problems of government funding."

But while the bureaucratic burden of governmental support is certainly an important concern, it is but one facet of a much more significant problem with the government's support of voluntary organizations. What that problem involves is how government funding has fundamentally changed what the voluntary sector is about.

Transforming the Voluntary Sector: One way it has done this is through government grants and contracts, which have turned many voluntary social welfare organizations into almost exclusively service providers rather than advocates for those being "serviced." A 1977 report on voluntary action in Canada explained how this happens: "Community groups appear to lose a great deal of their effectiveness once they become grant recipients. They can become excessively cautious about antagonizing granting agencies and losing future grants. So much time and energy can be spent on administration and accounting for grant money that the commitment of these groups to social action begins to wane."

The cause? The Canadian study suggests it's not "conscious co-optation" by government but that the organization "has placed itself in a position where it must, sometimes unconsciously and gradually, accommodate to changes in order to remain acceptable and keep being funded."

To keep being funded, it must do what the government wants done. This is put very bluntly in a study of federal assistance just completed by the Office of Management and Budget: "The promise of available money is expected to lure recipients into actions they otherwise would not take. . .". The effects of this are a decrease in flexibility, creativity and advocacy; a departure from an organization's motivating sense of purpose; an increase in size and timidity. . . all trends that are antithetical to voluntary action.

Government grants and contracts also affect the nature of the voluntary sector by strongly favoring the largest, oldest and generally most traditional organizations. This happens because most grant decisions are based primarily on a voluntary organization's credibility, which is mostly related to its age, contacts, existing resources and ability to keep its books clean. One source of credibility for many voluntary organizations is their affiliation with the local United Way, and thus billions of dollars of federal support go each year to United Way agencies. The problem with this is that most United Way's let in very few new agencies, almost none of which are at all controversial or advocacy-oriented.

The voluntary sector has also been transformed by indirect government support. For example, grants for hospital construction combined with things like the tax exemption on construction bonds, mortgage insurance, hefty "indirect cost" rates on other grants (which help pay for building maintenance), Medicare of course, and, the property tax exemption, have turned many voluntary organizations into physical institutions. And just as buying a house can sometimes subtly neutralize an individual, "buying" a building can often subtly neutralize a voluntary organization. Columbia University professor Bruce Vladeck calls this the "Oedifice Complex," saying that one effect has often been to lower the quality of service while increasing the cost. Organization theorist C. Northcote Parkinson wrote many years ago that one could identify with precision the point at which an important institution began to slide downhill: when it opened its beautiful new facility.

Other forms of government support have similar effects on the voluntary sector. The charitable deduction, by giving most of the tax incentive for deductions to the very rich, has helped foster support from the wealthy, with many consequences.

One is the development of large institutions in culture, education and health, the three areas favored by the wealthy. Another consequence is to exacerbate the "ultimately paternal" nature of most voluntary organizations (in the words of a Filer Commission study) by making those who benefit from those organizations dependent on the wealthier people who provide most of their support. Finally, the present system for encouraging donations also favors the existing de-facto system of allocating charity dollars, which is based far more on an organization's emotional appeal, public abilities and longevity than it is on any assessment of social needs that approaches being rational.

The government's on-the-job charity drive is one more example of how government support has helped transform the voluntary sector. It channels all of its proceeds only to long-established charities involved in relatively traditional activities.

Taking Over the Voluntary Sector? Another often expressed concern about the relationship between government and the voluntary sector involves the relatively sudden ascension of government funding in many fields that were once the domain of private philanthropy. For example, while private philanthropy once provided most of the funding for science, in 1973 it provided just 2% of the amount the federal government allocated for science.

For many, statistics like this illustrate the government's forceful takeover of areas that have been and should be -- at least to some extent -- the domain of private philanthropy. This takeover is often loudly decried. But this "take-over" argument is simplistic because it ignores the fact that much of the increase in government funding has gone to expand the activities of private voluntary organizations, "simply helping to pay the bills" in the Filer Commission's words.

The important comparison between public and private expenditures concerns support for newly-perceived social problems and for new approaches to confronting old problems. It is here that one steeped in the rhetoric about the innovation and foresight of philanthropy would expect to find private support far exceeding public support. But the few statistics available suggest that this is simply not the case. In funding for women's projects, for instance, a recent Ford Foundation study sound that governmental funding for women's organizations exceeds foundation funding ($35.5 million vs. $33.5 million for a six-year period during the early 70s). Government funding has also been an important source of support for many other organizations that are a part of relatively new voluntary movements, including environmental organizations, groups concerned with worker safety (through OSHA's New Directions grants), community-based

organizations (through LEAA's community crime prevention program, HUD's Office of Neighborhood Development and the various programs of the Community Service Administration). Also, some public interest organizations have gotten funds allowing them to prepare and deliver testimony to regulatory bodies or Congress.

The total of government support for new voluntary movements is tiny relative to overall federal support for voluntary organizations. But relative to philanthropic support, this funding is quite significant, and it is in this area that one should be concerned about the relationship between private and public funding. To some extent, the roles have been reversed. Whereas voluntary organizations once worked to stimulate government (the enormous increase in government funding is a testiment to their success), some federal agencies are now working to stimulate philanthropy. For example, the Community Services Administration is funding an effort to study the priorities and accountability of local philanthropies. Also, the National Endowment for the Arts' matching grants program, by insisting that its grants be matched by private funds, has had a major impact on the distribution of private support for the arts.

The Bureaucratic Burden: Saying that paperwork is not the most important problem with government support is not to say that it isn't an important problem. As many have pointed out, applying for and administering government funds takes many resources. One recent study of a relatively small government research program found that the applicants' cost of applying for and administering the grants combined with the agency's costs of reviewing those applications and administering the program exceeded the total amount of funds awarded. One effect of the complexity and expense involved in government grant programs is, again, to limit government funding to certain types of voluntary organizations.

Other Process-Related Problems: The recent Office of Management and Budget study of federal assistance noted a number of problems experienced by "voluntary social welfare organizations" that receive government funds. These problems include a lack of predictability and uniformity in indirect costs, certain costs not being included in a grant, audits done by a variety of levels and agencies of government, payments of grant funds being delayed, a lack of clarity in how a budget can be changed, an excessive amount of time to renew a grant (an average of 2.3 months) and inadequate procedures for dealing with "high-risk" grantees.

Overdependence: One of the conditions that allow government funding to control an organization is when that funding constitutes a large part of the organization's budget. When that happens, the organization often looses its ability to refuse funding that is too conditional. And, if its government money is cut off, the organization will be confronted with a major funding crisis. The potential for such a crisis is particularly high now for two reasons. First, the country is in a budget-trimming mood and funds for voluntary organizations are often the easiest money for a federal agency to eliminate. Second, New Federalism has coused an increasing amount of federal money to go to state and local governments rather than private organizations; the OMB study said the cities' share of federal funding has risen from 10 to 30 percent.

Transitory Nature of Funding: Related to this problem, many voluntary organizations have gotten funding for too short a period of time to be effective, particularly if they are experimenting with a new approach and trying to get that approach more widely implemented. New ideas take time to develop into effective programs.

Related to this is the transitory nature of other sources of support such as CETA employees and VISTA "volunteers." The limit is usually one year, which is only enough time for a person to become effective at what they are doing.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Underlying most of this paper is, of course, an assumption that action is what "voluntary action" is supposed to be about; that innovating, overseeing and redressing are what voluntary action organizations should be doing. Unfortunately, much of the public has lost a sense that these are critical roles for voluntary organizations; many people now equate voluntary action with "charity," which they conceive of simply as the provision of welfare services. As this paper has argued, much of the reason for this is that government funding has blurred the distinctions between voluntary organizations and public agencies.

The problem is that the case for voluntary action organizations is not being made effectively, either to the public or to the government. Certainly, the rhetoric is there: for example, United Way National Executive William Aramony states that United Ways "are always searching for ways to respond to the struggling new agencies that are often the catalysts in the voluntary sector." But the reality often doesn't correspond to the rhetoric: in United Way's case, 294 of the largest United Ways support only an average of 1.5 new agencies a year, and those newly-supported agencies are often not even new agencies. The reality is that there is a tiny amount of private funding available for anything that is new or innovative or challenging or run by minorities, something every recent study of philanthropic giving has documented.

The result is that the public doesn't see very many voluntary organizations that are really trying alternatives, or that are making government and business more responsive, or that are representing the interests of the powerless. Certainly those groups exist, but their effectiveness is extremely limited because philanthropic resources are dominated by the more traditional voluntary organizations.

One effect of this gradual loss of the meaning of voluntary action is that voluntary organizations are becoming increasingly irrelevant to government officials, who see them mainly as the providers of government-funded services. The best illustration of this can be seen in OMB's seven-volume study of federal assistance, which devoted only one small section of one volume to the concerns of "voluntary social service organizations," a section that didn't even broach the questions like why voluntary organizations should be funded. Even the writers of the study commented on the absence of representatives from voluntary organizations, saying (in a classic understatement) that the "degree of protection and concern for the sector is less than it should be..."

The only way to change this is to begin a massive campaign to reeducate both government officials and the public (and perhaps some voluntary organization officials themselves) about the importance of voluntary action organizations.

To make that case effectively, a distinction needs to be made between voluntary organizations that are service-oriented and those that are cause-oriented. Putting such a diversity of organizations with such often conflicting interests together under the heading of the "Third Sector" is inappropriate and misleading. Perhaps people committed to voluntary action should begin talking about the "Fourth Sector" which, like the "Fourth Estate," would be conceived as being outside the other sectors.

Whatever, a campaign to promote voluntary action organizations should emphasize that government has a responsibility to and a need for voluntary organizations, which implies that government "ensure that these associations have equal access to grants and other means of support" (in the words of the Canadian report on voluntary action).

To make this case effectively, certain things need to be emphasized about the potential of voluntary organizations. First, their potential for helping make government work effectively needs to be communicated. The OMB study of federal assistance talked extensively about achieving accountability, noting that it is the search for accountability that generates so many regulations and so much frustration, (and often, so little accountability). But the study came up with no new ideas on how to make government funding programs more accountable. What needs to be tried is a new approach which would emphasize achieving accountability not by imposing it from above but by balancing "political" forces that impact a particular funding program. This can be done by supporting voluntary organizations which would monitor the use of government funds and challenge misuses of those funds. The underlying idea is that a balance of power should exist not only within government but outside of government. The Canadian study put this well, saying that the voluntary organizations should be supported not so much "because they represent the public interest, but because it is in the public interest that they participate."

It must also be made clear that the only way to achieve meaningful citizen participation--an expressed goal of many government programs--is by supporting citizen-run organizations which have the resources needed to participate meaningfully.

The corollary role of such organizations--which is to act as "mediating structures" that stand between an individual and the "large institutions of public life" (in the words of an American Enterprise Institute study)--also needs to be emphasized.

Finally, the potential of voluntary organizations for experimenting with and nurturing new ideas must be communicated more convincingly. First, the need for social innovation should be made clear. Developing an analogy between the importance of investing in things like alternative energy technology and investing in alternative approaches to social problems is one approach. Another is emphasizing the need for societies (and institutions) to evolve, and the historical role that voluntary action organizations have played in stimulating this society's evolution.

Second, the fact that smaller, newer, independent (e.g., private) organizations are to most creative should be stressed. Voluntary sector researchers could begin

to generate some persuasive facts to bolster the sector's less than persuasive rhetoric; a good example of what's needed is the statistic that small businesses involved in research and development activities produce 24 times as many major innovations as large firms per R & D dollar expended (according to a paper prepared for the White House Conference on Small Business).

Third, much more of the voluntary sector needs to be about innovation. It's very easy to be deceived into seeing small changes as being much more significant than they are. A recreation agency, for instance, may think it is making significant changes when it begins a special program for inner city kids, or when it begins to emphasize soccer rather than football. But the most significant innovations in recreation involve entirely new approaches to teaching people about their bodies and movement and play, and the relationship of that to things like mental health and creativity. But very few voluntary organizations involved in recreation are experimenting with these new approaches and the ones that will get precious little philanthropic funding. One could say something similar about most other areas in which voluntary agencies are involved.

The primary point of all this is that there are certain aspects of voluntary organizations that can be "sold" both to the public and to government, but to do so is going to demand more clarity about what the strengths of the sector are, more commitment to making more of the voluntary sector reflect those strengths, and much more effort at communicating those strengths.

In relation to this, my recent experience at working with the media on issues involving philanthropy has shown me that most reporters have very little understanding of and interest in voluntary organizations. To generalize, they have an extremely narrow view of what voluntary action is, no sense of the potential and historical importance of voluntary organizations and, as a result, little interest in covering the activities of voluntary organizations. To most of them, "charity" is boring, and thus their coverage is perfunctory. Part of the reason is the somewhat jaded attitude developed by most reporters; part of it is the lack of attention most voluntary organizations have paid to understanding and working with the media; part of it is the institutional factors within the media that cause it to focus mostly on the sensational (which in charity means scandals); and part of it is that much of "charity" really has become boring. The result is a lack of understanding of voluntary action by the public and by public officials.

Assuming that a case for the support of voluntary organizations can be made effectively (a very large assumption), what forms should governmental support take?

The obvious key concerns the nature of the relationship between government and the voluntary sector. As I've argued, that relationship has of late been dominated by government. How can that be changed?

One suggestion advanced by Boston College professor David Horton Smith (and more recently by Waldemar Nielson) is a National Endowment for Volunteerism which would be a "quasi-governmental" body much like the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities and the National Science Foundation. The idea is that, just as the arts, humanities and the sciences are important national resources that need to be encouraged, so too is volunteerism. The endowment would be a center for

information about, assistance to, and advocacy for voluntary organizations. Presumably, part of the assistance would be in the form of grants. One of the most important elements of the "endowment model," according to Smith, involves who decides how those grants are distributed. It would be a committee of peers--people from the voluntary fields itself--rather than government bureaucrats. Presumably, such people would be much more sensitive to the needs, realities and abilities of voluntary organizations.

The idea is appealing. The problem is that so much would depend on who the "peers" are. The main criticism of peer review in the other endowments is that the peers, because they're normally chosen on the basis of their accomplishments in a field, generally represent established perspectives within that field. But established perspectives is precisely what voluntary action doesn't need more of. One way to resolve this problem is to acknowledge the basic differences within the voluntary sector and create at least two sources of funding within the endowment. One would be controlled by the more established voluntary organizations, the other would be controlled by the newer organizations.

The other major problem with the notion of an endowment for volunteerism is that it could become the only source of federal support for voluntary organizations, and that would be a mistake because it would potentially allow a far greater degree of governmental control than is exercised even now. Holland distributes all of its governmental funding for voluntary organizations through one governmental agency (the Ministry of Cultural and Social Welfare), and 99 percent of all Dutch voluntary organizations that meet broad government criteria receive grants from the Ministry. According to the Canadian study, some Dutch voluntary organizations (like the YMCA, which gets 90 percent of its staff salaries paid for by the Ministry) are now considering whether they should withdraw from the arrangement because of the power it gives the government over their policies. As the Canadian study states, "the very diversity of the federal government may well insure a higher level of responsiveness to voluntary action in all of its diversity."

What is really needed is a focus for voluntary organizations within each federal agency, which would both advocate for such organizations within the agency and help them in their dealings with the agency. Something like this exists in Britian, where there is someone responsible for voluntary organizations at the assistant secretary level in all major governmental departments. Something similar to this exists in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, where the Office of Neighborhood Development is attempting "to be on top of the federal agencies and their roles in regards to neighborhoods so that community groups which come to us can get some of the information they need."

For this to be meaningful, these "voluntary organization advocates" would have to have positions of power within their agencies and there would have to be a similar advocate with OMB, as there now is for state and local governments.

In terms of the type of support, several things should be advocated. The most important is that federal agencies (or the new "endowment") create grant programs specifically for voluntary organizations, with the stipulation that at least some of those funds go to smaller, newer organizations. The amount of money wouldn't have to be great; indeed, one of the selling points would be that

there could be a tremendous return on this money. Politically, the argument for such funds would have to be based on anti-bureaucracy sentiment.

It would be ideal if the grants were primarily to support the organization. A few Canadian government agencies provide relatively small "sustaining grants" to voluntary organizations. The idea is that the existence of the organization is as important as the projects they're involved in. To state the obvious, the political feasibility of this idea is questionable.

What might make it more politically palatable is to combine such grants with an infusion of funds for management assistance activities. Going north once again, the Canadian study cites a case where a federal agency supported a voluntary organization's internal management study which enabled the organization to "improve the efficiency of their operations and become more responsive." Such support could stimulate some needed changes in older voluntary organizations and some needed management improvements in newer groups. One of the concluding observations in Bremmer's Filer Commission paper on the history of philanthropy is interesting in relation to this. He wondered that, if philanthropy seeks to monitor and stimulate government, "does not government have a corresponding right to watch, prod, stop and support philanthropic activities?" The bothersome word is "stop."

Another way of providing support for voluntary organizations, one that doesn't involve too much overt control, is by funding some of their employees. CETA and VISTA have greatly helped at least some voluntary organizations. Both are regulated by the government, but voluntary organizations have been able to exert much control over what these people actually do. The main problem has been the transience of CETAs and VISTAs. To alleviate this problem with CETA employees, the government could provide half of their salaries the second year. With VISTAs, the government could provide a higher stipend and give VISTAs some opportunity to earn additional money through part-time jobs.

Another way the federal government could encourage useful volunteering and at the same time begin confronting the insulation of government employees is to encourage its employees to spend a certain amount of time working for voluntary organizations. For each hour volunteered, the employee could get credit for a half hour worked, up to a certain maximum. The precedent for such an exchange is the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, which allows federal employees to be "loaned" to other branches of government.

Perhaps by making federal employees volunteers, federal employees will begin to understand the need for and the potential of voluntary action. Provided, of course, that they work for a voluntary <u>action</u> organization.

GOVERNMENTAL LISTENING POSTS

Bobbie Greene Kilberg*
and
John G. Milliken**

This paper is an effort to answer the question, "who in the federal government listens and who should listen" to the concerns of the private, non-profit sector. The flip answer is that, of course, everyone does. Every official, elected, appointed or career, professes to care about the sector, the volunteer and social and community issues. But for government to be effective it must listen institutionally as well as personally. This paper then is a search for those institutional listening posts. We have divided our inquiry into two logical parts, the executive and the legislative branches of government, and have sought to provide an explanatory and useful roadmap.

An Introductory Word About Names and Titles

Private, non-profit organizations arise from the concerns of people seeking solutions to community problems or finding ways to accomplish shared projects. It is often difficult to determine what to collectively call these associations whose diversity is as great as the ingenuity of those who founded them. Spiritually, they are voluntary associations relying on individual volunteers for support, energy and legitimacy. Legally, they are private, non-profit organizations, categorized and defined in the Internal Revenue Code under Section 501(c)(3). Collectively, they are a third sector if one considers the for-profit world and government to be sectors one and two. For this paper, we choose to call these associations the independent sector, in reaffirmation of their most important, and threatened, characteristic--their freedom from governmental constraints.

---

*Director, Committee for the Third Sector, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies; Associate Consel to President Gerald Ford; White House Fellow, Class of 1969-70.

**Attorney-at-law with the firm of Winston & Strawn, representing non-profit, charitable organizations; former Executive Assistant to Congressman Joseph L. Fisher; writer and speaker on voluntary organizations.

The Executive Branch

In general, the executive branch views the independent sector as it does all supplicants. For the most part, they are seen as a series of special interest groups seeking "special considerations" from the federal establishment. There has been little effort to look at the sector as a whole and to understand the importance of the dynamism, diversity and pluralism it embodies. John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, former Chairman of Common Cause and now Chairperson of the newly formed Independent Sector, has characterized the creativity of this sector as being based on "its freedom from constraints, its pluralism, its habit of being hospitable to non-majoritarian ideas, and the opportunities it provides the individual for initiative, participation, a sense of community and grassroots action." He also has warned of the danger to the sector from "central bureaucratic definition of goals and prescription of rules." And he has observed that there seems to be little governmental cognizance of a sector sincerely concerned with "private initiatives for the public good" rather than with presentation of narrow interests in a specific set of institutions. However, the import of his comments has not penetrated the collective federal consciousness.

Because the independent sector is viewed by government as a series of special interests, there has been no specific place for it to bring concerns that apply to a range of groups within it and little recognition of the potential political clout it could possess. For example, individual staff members in the White House have specific responsibility for issues of concern to women, to minorities, to senior citizens, and for specific areas such as energy, transportation, health. But no one has the portfolio to worry about the independent sector. This pattern is repeated on the departmental level throughout government and is reinforced by the committee structure in Congress. Thus, independent sector concerns are not represented at the table when important program initiatives are developed and policy decisions made. Most governmental officials think of independent sector organizations only in terms of specific grant and contract seekers, tax-exempt entities and volunteers. In this view, the funding program office within a department, the IRS and ACTION are the only relevant base points.

It is our premise for this paper that issues of autonomy and independence, financing, management and accountability cut across the independent sector in such a major way as to necessitate governmental responsiveness above the single department, administrative and implemental level. At the same time, it is crucial that this government attention be focused in a manner that does not further threaten or destroy the diverse, pluralistic and independent nature of the sector and that does not slowly squeeze the sector out of existence or essentially absorb it into the governmental labyrinth.

The matter of legitimacy for the independent sector within the body politic is very serious. The credibility of the sector, its

continuing contribution to society, and its need for both support and independence have increasingly been called into question. Yet to date, the sector has not effectively communicated its importance and strengths to the executive branch and Congress, to the for-profit sector or to the public. The establishment on March 5 of this year of the new organization, Independent Sector, the activities of the Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, and the agendas of other groups, such as the Center for Community Change, all indicate that there certainly are issues of overriding concern to the sector which necessitate coalition building on its part, a large scale educational and communication effort, and appropriate attention from the government. More prevalent to date, however, within the independent sector has been the proliferation of numerous "trade associations" representing different organizations and groups. These trade associations have been notorious in their ability to ignore any other than their own narrow interests and thus to reinforce the government's special interest perspective. How the overview and the narrow view will be reconciled, if at all, remains to be seen.

Given the independent sector's present status and the importance of issues central to its survival, the logical answer to who in the executive branch should listen is the Executive Office of the President --specifically the White House Domestic Policy staff, the Office of Management and Budget and the U.S. Regulatory Council. The only indication of any responsiveness within these entities is found in an incipient stage at OMB within a new Office of Assistant Director for Regulatory and Information Policy and a new Assistance Policy Branch, both on the management side of OMB. The new Assistant Director's office will bring together three elements of importance to the independent sector: Information systems, regulatory reform and reports management. Though the Assistant Director is classified as a non-career and "general position," it is being filled by a career official, James Tozzi, a member of the new senior executive service. This can have the positive attribute of helping to institutionalize the Office's function at its inception, but also can have the possible negative aspect of lacking political clout. The Assistance Policy Branch will have government-wide responsibility for all assistance policy relating to all classes of federal funding recipients, and thus could be of major importance to the independent sector. On the OMB charts, the Branch will, for the present time, report to the Deputy Associate Director for Intergovernmental Affairs, an office whose charter is directed at state and local governments. This is unfortunate since the mandate of the Assistance Policy Branch extends well beyond governmental entities and clearly includes private, non-profit organizations. The next formal step in that line of command will be to Wayne Granquist, Associate Director for Management and Regulatory Policy, though the Branch will operate in close relationship with the Assistant Director for Regulatory and Information Policy and with the Financial Management Division on the budget side of OMB. It is obviously impossible to forecast at this time whether the shifting of functions and resoponsibilities within OMB will actually improve policy formation or management capabilities and thus

be beneficial to the independent sector. However, the initial possibilities for access to policy formation and implementation that it affords to the sector should be positively explored.

The area of deregulation may be symptomatic of both the problem and the subtle shift that may be taking place. The government's regulatory reform efforts, in theory, have included the private, non-profit community. However, in reality the attention of government policymakers has been riveted almost exclusively on the for-profit, business sector and more recently on the state and loval governmental apparatus. The impact of regulation directly on private, non-profit groups has been at best a peripheral concern. And even when the intent on the part of officials was good, the political power of the state and local governments quickly intervened to refocus the emphasis of the reform to the governmental units, often to the detriment of independent sector groups. Recently, however, OMB officials are beginning to realize that the independent sector has legitimate reasons for separate consideration of its problems in the regulatory area, though these problems are often similar to what is being faced by state and local governments and business. To a certain extent, OMB has been propelled into this understanding by the requirements of the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977 which was authored by Senator Chiles (D. Fla.), and which required OMB, in cooperation with the executive agencies, to undertake a "study to develop a better understanding of alternative means of implementing Federal assistance programs, and to determine the feasibility of developing a comprehensive system of guidance for Federal assistance programs." OMB was required by that Act to present a report on the study to Congress and that report is due to be released to the public on March 13. Hopefully, it will contain findings, actions and recommendations of particular interest to the independent sector.

In a broader arena, President Carter has recently appointed a 50-member President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties, which is chaired by William McGill, President of Columbia University. A substantial number of the members of the Commission have independent sector backgrounds. The senior staff person at the White House responsible for the Commission is Hedley Donovan, though there seems to be political input from others. The Commission's staff has a strong academic perspective and is not politically very sophisticated. Whether the Commission will actually accomplish anything or whether its members will be able to insist on a non-political environment in which to do so cannot be assessed at this point. Nor is it all clear whether an examination of the independent sector will occupy a significant place on its agenda. However, this may well be a forum where the sector should seek input.

The Legislative Branch

If the question is who in the legislative branch cares about and listens to the independent sector, then the answer is easy--everyone does. Most Members of Congress currently serve or have in the past

served on one or more boards of voluntary organizations. By definition, they are politicians, active in their community and, in most cases, active in a voluntary organization.

But if the question is who is institutionally responsible by committee or other assignment to listen to the sector, then the answer is more difficult, due both to the highly structured nature of the Congress and to the diverse nature of the independent sector.

The Tax Writing Committees

One deals first with the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees. Voluntary organizations share the common blessing of exemption from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Since it is from the tax code that their status is derived, it is the tax writing committees who have legislative responsibility for that status. Whether the proposed change affects lobbying, unrelated business income, coverage by social security, voter education or charitable contributions, it must come to the Congress through the Ways and Means and Finance Committees. One consequence of this is to place perhaps undue emphasis on the revenue effect of a change in the law rather than on the often broader social policy issues that give rise to a proposed change. Legislation affecting voluntary organizations often gets buffeted about in the more powerful winds of balanced budgets, sunset proposals and tax cuts.

Nominally at least the Senate Finance Committee has a Subcommittee on Foundations (Chairman, Mike Gravel (D. Alaska); ranking minority member, Malcolm Wallop (R. Wyo.)), but legislation affecting public charities originates in the Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management generally (Chairman, Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (I. Va.); ranking minority member, Bob Packwood (R. Ore.)). The Ways and Means Committee has a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures (Chairman, Dan Rostenkowski (D. Ill.); ranking minority member, John J. Duncan (R. Tenn.)). However, that subcommittee is relatively new and the scope of its jurisdiction unclear. Historically, tax matters have been dealt with by the committee as a whole.

Within those committees, five members have proven to be the most consistent supporters of the independent sector and volunteerism. In the House, they are Congressmen Joseph L. Fisher (D. Va.) and Barber B. Conable (R. N.Y.). These two Members are not only the primary sponsors of legislation to allow persons who use the standard deduction to specifically deduct their charitable contributions as well, H.R. 1785, but were also the primary supporters of the changes in the lobbying laws in 1976 and the reduction in the excise tax on private foundation investment income in 1978.

The same may be said for Senators Bob Packwood (R. Ore.) and Daniel P. Moynihan (D. N.Y.), the chief sponsors of S. 219, the charitable contributions legislation in the Senate. There are other champions

in the Senate. Certainly Senator David Durenburger (R. Minn.) who was active in voluntary organizations in his own state would be one. No doubt there are more, but these five are Members who understand the independent sector, share its concerns, and watch out for its interests in the legislative arena.

The Social Program Committees

Increasingly over the past two decades, voluntary organizations have become the recipients of federal dollars through contracts, grants and other agreements to carry out federal programs at the local level. This is especially true of the social welfare agencies. Committees in the House and Senate responsible for authorizing legislation for programs such as Head Start, Community Services and the Older Americans Act make decisions which affect millions of dollars and tens of thousands of volunteers. Yet it is not our impression that the perspective of the volunteer is specifically taken into account. Increasingly the voluntary agencies have become participatns in the lobbying process leading up to the passage of legislation. But often, and properly, the voluntary agencies speak for their clients and are viewed by Congress as organizations concerned about the continuing flow of federal dollars to those who need assistance. The role and status of the volunteer is not often considered in the debate over the size and shape of federal programs.

In the Senate, many of these programs come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, chaired by Harrison A. Williams (D. N.J.) (Ranking minority member, Richard S. Schweiker (R. Pa.)). Several of the subcommittees have a role. They are:

Subcommittee on Aging: Older Americans Act of 1965, senior activity centers and volunteer programs.
Chairman: Thomas F. Eagleton (D. Mo.)
Ranking Minority Member: William L. Armstrong (R. Colo.)

Subcommittee on Alcoholism & Drug Abuse:
Chairman: Donald W. Riegle (D. Mich.)
Ranking Minority Member: Orrin Hatch (R. Utah)

Subcommittee on Child & Human Development: Programs authorized by the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 and carried out by the ACTION agency.
Chairman: Alan D. Cranston (D. Calif.)
Ranking Minority Member: Gordon J. Humphrey (R. N.H.)

Subcommittee on Education, Arts & the Humanities:
Chairman: Claiborne Fell (D. R.I.)
Ranking Minority Member: Robert T. Stafford (R. Vt.)

Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor: Head Start, Emergency Food and Medical Services, and Legal Services.

Chairman: Gaylord Nelson (D. Wis.)
Ranking Minority Member: Jacob Javits (R. N.Y.)

Subcommittee on the Handicapped:
Chairman: Jennings Randolph (D. W.Va.)
Ranking Minority Member: Robert T. Stafford (R. Vt.)

Subcommittee on Health & Scientific Research:
Chairman: Edward M. Kennedy (D. Mass.)
Ranking Minority Member: Richard S. Schweiker (R. Pa.)

In the House, the Education and Labor Committee has primary jurisdiction over social service programs. The Subcommittee on Human Resources (Chairman, Ike Andrews (D. N.C.); ranking minority member, E. Thomas Coleman (R. Mo.)) has responsibility for Community Services, Head Start, Nutrition Programs for the Elderly and the Older Americans Act. The Subcommittee on Select Education (Chairman, Paul Simon (D. Ill.); ranking minority member, Kenneth Kramer (R. Colo.)) has responsibility for the Child and Family Services Act, the Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments of 1975 and legislation affecting education of the handicapped.

Once a statute is in place which establishes and defines a program, it still must be funded through the annual appropriation process. The Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate each have subcommittees dealing with general social services. In the Senate, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare (Chairman, Warren G. Magnuson (D. Wash.); ranking minority member, Richard S. Schweiker (R. Pa.)) has jurisdiction over all programs in what was formerly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, over the domestic programs of the ACTION Agency, over the Community Services Administration and others. Other subcommittees providing funds for the dozens of departments, agencies, bureaus and commissions pass on monies which sometimes find their way to grantee voluntary organizations.

In the House, the Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education and Welfare of the Appropriations Committee (Chairman, William H. Natcher (D. Ky.); ranking minority member, Robert H. Michel (R. Ill.)), has jurisdiction similar to its Senate counterpart.

The International Voluntary Agencies

Many of the international voluntary agencies receive funds for their relief work from the Agency for International Development. The Subcommittee on International Organizations of the House Foreign Affairs Committee (Chairman, Don Bonker (D. Wash.); ranking minority member, Edward Derwinski (R. Ill.)) and the Subcommittee on International Operations (Chairman, Dante B. Fascell (D. Fla.); ranking minority member, John H. Buchana, Jr. (R. Ala.)) are the primary authorizing committees, though the several subcommittees dealing with specific geographic areas have a role to play as well.

"Who Should Listen"

A number of approaches can be taken to the question of who in the legislative branch should listen to the concerns of the independent sector. The options include: (1) recognition by the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees of a central role as the legislative committees with oversight responsibility in this area; (2) recognition by the appropriate authorization and appropriation committees of the institutional importance of the independent sector and formal inclusion of the sector when considering and reviewing programs; or (3) continuation of the system as it presently functions.

There are advantages and disadvantages to each of these approaches which could affect the independent sector in critical ways. Thus, each should be scrutinized very carefully, as should other options, before determining which avenue will be most beneficial.

Summary

This paper has presented a summary description of executive branch and congressional relationships with the independent sector. It is as accurate a roadmap as we can draw and it leads to a rather simple conclusion, i.e., that for the foreseeable future it is likely that the governmental listening posts will be scattered and will not be located at very powerful political levels. As the independent sector coalesces more effectively, the federal government, in general, may seem to listen more attentively. However, the basic question of "who specifically listens and who should listen" -- along with the corollary question of "with what impact" -- will remain in a state of flux for some time to come.

NATIONAL YOUTH SERVICE:

IS IT AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME?

Roger L. Landrum*

Debate over the question of whether to institute a form of National Service in the United States has been heating up rapidly in recent months. It is one of the major decisions before the American people and their political institutions for the decade of the 1980's. One perspective on this issue was presented with exceptional clarity by Neal R. Peirce in a recent column. By way of introduction, I quote him at some length:

> If there ever was an idea whose time had come, the decades-old proposal for universal youth service in America should now qualify.
>
> International tension, the problems of the all-volunteer Army and President Carter's call for registration as a possible prelude to resumption of the draft all point in that direction.
>
> So do our domestic problems. Young people's services are needed more than ever in every field from reforestation to care for the elderly, from neighborhood energy-saving programs to park maintenance, from day-care centers to tutoring of low-achievement students.
>
> Rather than being victims of universal service, America's youth might benefit most of all. They have grown up in the disillusioning times of Vietnam and Watergate. Little is asked of them now, except that they be consumers of goods and services. The inevitable results: political cynicism, feelings of powerlessness and the corrosive "I'll get mine" materialism so rampant on college campuses today.
>
> Universal service, by making it clear that every American has an obligation to his or her country, and that his or her services are needed by nation and community, might go far to shatter young people's self-absorption and tap the latent pool of idealism within them. . . .
>
> The draft has suddenly become a clear and present threat for young people. And a strong case can be made that a well-conceived national service plan could avert -- rather than cause -- forced military conscription. (The Washington Post, 1980)

---

* Study Director, Committee for the Study of National Service, Potomac Institute. Dr. Landrum has taught at the University of Nigeria, Harvard, and Yale, was founder and President of Teachers Incorporated, and served as a Peace Crops Volunteer. Dr. Landrum is presently working on a study of national service in European countries.

From these and other considerations, a number of actions have followed. Senators Tsongas and Cranston have introduced legislation (S. 2159) to establish a Presidential Commission on National Service, with 10 co-sponsoring Senators. This Commission would hold hearings around the country and seek out the opinions of young people and other groups and organizations likely to be most affected by some form of National Service. Within 18 months, the Commission would give the President a report and recommendations, and within another 180 days, the President must submit to Congress a report on "the desireability, feasibility, and cost of implementing each of the Commission's recommendations and the actions taken or planned with respect to their implementation."

On the House side, Representative McCloskey has introduced a National Service bill that went nowhere last year. It is receiving serious consideration this year. Meanwhile, in addition to President Carter's call for draft resignation, the Administration's thinking about the most desireable type of draft, in the event a draft becomes necessary, has been outlined for Congress in an Office of Management and Budget document. (Presidential Recommendations for Selective Service Reform, A Report to Congress, Feb. 11 1980).

The President's actions are a response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and more broadly to our defensive posture in Iran and elsewhere. But the interest in National Youth Service taken by Tsongas, Cranston, McCloskey, and others came many months earlier and represents a much broader approach to national interest than the narrow focus on national defense.

In January 1979, a blue-ribbon Committee for the Study of National Service issued a 134 page report on National Service titled Youth and the Needs of the Nation (The Potomac Institute, 1979). Members of The Committee included co-chairs Harris Wofford and Jacqueline G. Wexler, Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, Willard Wirtz, Mildred Jeffrey, Bernard Anderson, Eddie Williams, Edythe Gaines, and several others. The report analyzed the case for National Youth Service and offered 16 recommendations for shaping a large-scale voluntary system. A number of college presidents -- Muller of Johns Hopkins, Hesburgh of Notre Dame, Swearer of Brown, Wexler of Hunter, Wofford of Bryn Mawr -- began talking up the concept of National Service as early as 1978. Vernon Jordan of the National Urban League, Eddie Williams of the Joint Center for Political Studies, Andrew Young, and other black leaders spoke out for National Service long before the hostages were seized in Iran and the Soviets sobered Carter. The range of thoughtful people who see National Service as part of the solution to problems of young people and American society indicates the weight of the idea.

The interest is not limited to a leadership elite. Last year Gallup Polls found 71% of teenagers (agest 13-18) in support of the concept of voluntary National Service, and equally high percentages of support among young adults (ages 18-24) and college students. These levels of support

were almost equally distributed between regions of the country, economic groups, whites and non-whites, and males and females.

However, a thicket of issues can be located inside the National Service debate, particularly over the questions of compulsion and federal or local control of implementation. Questions related to cost, potential benefits to chronically unemployed youth, and effects on service-sector jobs and traditional supplies of volunteers also bring a lot of people to pause before jumping on a National Service bandwagon. Some highly significant distinctions regarding structure and implications must be sorted out before one can gain clarity on the answers to these and other questions.

In my own view, the country faces a choice from among four basic options:

One option is a selective draft for the armed forces. Existing personnel shortages are expected to become more severe within several years because the number of youth turning 18 each year is dropping significantly. But unless fiscal and other considerations lead to a redefinition of the necessary mix of short-term volunteer military personnel, the numbers required from a military draft are not very large compared to the size of the pool of eligible young males. A selective military draft would probably reach only about 1 in 10. Considerations of equity would probably give us a lottery from which few, if any, would be exempted for other than physical reasons. The lottery would reach rich and poor, whites and non-whites, college-going and blue-collar youth equally -- although there would be some bitter irony in selection by Russian roulette. The Carter Administration is currently on record favoring this approach as the most efficient should the need become compelling for national defense considerations. Non-military service by youth receives no consideration in this option except for the nagging problem of conscientious objection, for which some form of alternative service would presumably be required. This may be no small consideration for a post-Vietnam generation of youth.

The second option is universal, compulsory National Service for both males and females, with both military and non-military components. This option gives weight to community and national needs beyond those of the military services, and also to considerations of the optimal human development of the youth population of the country. The numbers to be contemplated are very large. An age cohort ranges between three and four million, and the armed services would only absorb several hundred thousand a year. If males only were compelled to serve, as in European democracies, which seems to me unlikely here, the numbers would still be around two million. Questions about the fields of non-military service, cost, implementation machinery, political risk and constitutionality become compelling -- though advocates of this option can make some powerful arguments in answer to these questions. The problems of meeting military responsibility in the mainstream of social institutions beyond the schools are settled by this option.

A third option is creating a much larger-scale system of voluntary National Service. Strategies would be developed to increase voluntary participation in the existing programs of service to the country and community. If successful, the all-volunteer Army could be preserved and a military draft avoided. There would be much broader participation in existing non-military forms of service, such as the Young Adult Conservation Corps, the Peace Corps, VISTA, the California Conservation Corps, and so on. New forms of non-military service would have to be created to accomodate on the order of a million or more participants, most probably at the level of local organizations. Needs of the elderly, the handicapped, day-care centers, low-achieving school children, energy conservation, housing rehabilitation, environmental protection, and so on would be defined in such a way to attract the full-time, voluntary participation of many young people before they take up their careers or complete their educations. The pressing questions about this option are whether it would be made to work on a large scale through a web of social incentives and sanctions, and how broadly the varied segments of the youth population would participate and benefit. The great advantage, aside from the creation of a system that might serve the national interest in multiple ways, is avoiding the introduction of a new form of compulsion.

The fourth option is the status quo. Perhaps a military draft can be avoided through new enticements to draw young men into the armed services or perhaps we do not require so large a standing army in peacetime. Perhaps the existing opportunities for youth service are adequate, while the priority goes to the Carter Administration's initiatives with narrowly-targeted employment and job-training programs for poor and unskilled youth. In brief, the country may wish to focus its attention and its treasury on a range of other problems and plans in the 1980s, while the volunteer armed forces and the small-scale programs of non-military service by youth are preserved much as they are through fine tuning.

Each of the above options for National Youth Service presents the President and Congress, young people, and the institutions of the country with vastly different implications as to risk and gain, fiscal cost, and potential outcomes. There are certain advantages and disadvantages in each of the options, many of which are not entirely clear at the present time, and it is appropriate that a sustained, public debate precede the point when the country will or must decide in which direction it wishes to move with National Service, if it wishes to move in any new direction. The Tsongas and Cranston plan for a Presidential Commission seems to me the wisest next step to take, as long as groups and organizations throughout the society shoulder an equal responsibility in studying the choices and their implications.

A Look At Some Needs And Implications

There is little doubt that volunteerism has enormous value in American society, both for its contributions in getting needed work done that is not monetized and for what it contributes to the tone of alturism and sharing in society. Toqueville called the pattern of voluntary association in defining and solving problems the genius of American society that sets it apart from

Old World cultures as distinctively as our formal political institutions. There is also little doubt that a range of developments in contemporary society have undermined this pattern and the values that flow from it. Certainly some young people still grow up participating in volunteerism, but it is not a broad base. The military services are one example of this, with the monetary incentives being constantly increased to draw in even those young people who have few other opportunities. We are moving rapidly toward a mercenary army. Young people preparing for the professions -- supposedly based upon an ethic of service -- increasingly come out with mercenary attitudes. And certainly the vast numbers of young people who face periods of unemployment early in adulthood, or who become dependant upon government entitlements, cannot be expected to carry through life a sense of the values of volunteerism and service. In effect, only an elite of young people are imbued with the values of volunteerism and service, and the issue to be faced by the country is whether in one or two generations the spirit of volunteerism and service, which has been a central tradition of American democracy, will have atrophied and largely disappeared. Many people believe we are in the midst of such a cultural crisis today.

This raises the question of whether some structure of youth service must be introduced on a large scale as a central experience of growing up in America, both through a range of new programs and through reformalizing the significance of service in old programs and institutions. The concept of National Service, in all its ambiguity, is one way of thinking this through.

Another way of thinking about the concept is in terms of the realities of the transition to adulthood in contemporary society. For all achievements of universal, compulsory education and wide participation in subsequent higher education, schools have been rightly characterized as "holding stations" and "incubators" that segregate the young from the rest of society too completely and for too long. Feelings of isolation from social responsibility and of unproductivity in the world external to schools have led young people down paths that cause much harm. A broad range of programs to involve young people before age 16 in volunteerism and in well-defined service projects on a part-time basis -- as part of the curriculum -- could perhaps replace the sense of purposelessness suffered by many young people with far more positive experiences. We have manifold, small-scale examples to use in defining national policy. And Israel gives us a national model for this.

Then a period of full-time service for a year or two before college or professional school, or before taking up a career in blue-collar fields, could give young people of many backgrounds a richer orientation for adulthood. A year or two in VISTA or the California Conservation Corps would certainly be a more useful experience than the drifting and disillusionment of unemployment that a great many young Americans face. But the high achievers, too -- that quarter of youth who will come to grip the reins of power in American society, and who too often climb a narrow ladder without experiencing the pluralism and inequities in the larger social matrix -- have much to learn from giving service. This is especially true if a new system of service deliberately brings the classes and races and sexes together in a common experience,

and if the system has defined the needs of American society with a clarity that brings young people to realize that only through sustained, cooperative efforts can solutions to major problems indeed be found.

It is not inevitable that large numbers of young people and their elders view the transition to adulthood in modern America as a potential disaster area. The energy, desire for productive involvement, and critical awareness of young people could be mobilized as a national resource through a system of volunteerism and service.

A discussion of National Youth Service ought not go very far without attempting to be precise about social needs. The quality of experience of young people and the values of service are only two aspects of the national interest. I recently returned from West Germany where I was examining the system of compulsory National Service with a close look at civilian service. I visited a quite remarkable center for elderly citizens (Arbeiterwohlfahrt) in the city of Gelsenkirchen. Twenty one young men are serving for 15 months in this particular center, and over 10,000 are serving nationwide in such centers. The Center has three levels of services: a core nursing home for the feeble, services for elderly people in nearby apartments who need immediate access to the center, and "mobile services" to independent elderly folk who keep their own homes around the city. These 21 young men match their weekly schedules to requests from the elderly for all manner of services -- cleaning and helping to maintain private homes, assistance with shopping and other trips around the city, health and other personal care, and simple companionship for those who otherwise might be too isolated. The physical services are critically important in helping the elderly survive and particularly important in helping them stay independent, but I was told that the old people of Gelsenkirchen love the contact with feisty, energetic and sensitive young people. The center has asked for an increase to 40 young men next year.

In Langenfeld, I saw similar young people working at a psychiatric hospital on wards for acute treatment, for drug addicts, for the mentally and physically handicapped, and for the severely insane. Elsewhere I saw young men teaching the children of foreign workers, many of whom are low-achievers in school, and working in emergency relief units. Others serve in overseas development services.

There are over 30,000 young men in civilian service in West Germany, some 10% of an age cohort. A much larger number (230,000) are drafted into the military services each year. In fact, West Germany has backed into its civilian service. The country requires 15 months of military service, but there is a constitutional provision for conscientious objection to military service. During the 1970s the number of young men unwilling to give military service but willing to give civilian service increased dramatically, which forced the Federal Government to develop a system of equivalent domestic and non-military service. This was done through federal leadership but with the

collaboration of 10,000 organizations throughout West Germany. The demand exceeds the supply by 4 to 3, and the government is exploring ways to permit young people, and especially young women, to fill the remaining demand through voluntary service.

West Germany provides a model of the non-military needs that can be met through the services of young people, and the young people there with whom I spoke expressed the benefits they gain: Work experience, responsibility, and first-hand exposure to social problems they had not encountered before.

America also has its own traditions to draw upon. Millions of young people gained experience and made contributions through Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps. Young people have made contributions to the schools and to day-care centers through part-time volunteerism, and could meet a larger scope of needs in these institutions through full-time service. The Peace Corps, the Experiment in International Living, the American Friends Service and other programs are examples of assistance that can be given overseas from which young people have much to gain while they contribute.

In my own view, the question before the country in the debate over National Service is not whether young people can contribute and gain through service -- I believe that is established beyond reasonable dispute -- but whether the American people are prepared to organize these opportunities for young people on a large scale. I do not think that compulsion is necessary, though if there is a military draft I do not believe that non-military service should be elevated to an equal status with service in the armed forces. I would strongly prefer that the values of service be asserted through creation of a voluntary system, in part because this could go far in enhancing the spirit of volunteerism in this society for decades to come.

Many years ago, in 1906, William James first proposed the concept of National Youth Service. He did not have the needs of the military in mind. Indeed, he expressed his horror at the destructiveness of the military ethic in Western history, from Alexander the Great right up to Teddy Roosevelt. He was equally disenthralled with Pacifists. James thought that the utopias they propose are a "sheep's paradise" and given to a flabbiness which invites military conquest. No successful peacetime economy can be based on flabbiness, James suggested, but requires the discipline and hardihood that only a "moral equivalent to war" can provide. He proposed National Youth Service as a substitute for the discipline of war service, and predicted that numerous goods would flow to the commonwealth and to youth.

The central obstacle today in taking this step is the disarray resulting from political fragmentation, special interest groups, a sense that we are overwhelmed by insoluble problems, and an excess of materialism. The only way large-scale youth service will come about in some form other than a military draft lottery is through an assertion of leadership -- and I include the leadership of young people in this -- by those who believe in the profound values of volunteerism and service as a distinguishing characteristic of American democracy.

A COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM: PRO AND CON

Stephen McCurley
VOLUNTEER:
The National Center for Citizen Involvement

The following is a brief discussion of the major arguments which have been advanced for and against a Commission on Volunteerism. Most of the points outlined below have been developed as a result of discussions among national voluntary organizations as a result of the introduction by Sen. David Durenberger of a specific proposal for a Commission on Volunteerism in the summer of 1979.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to consider the idea of a Commission totally in the abstract. Few would disagree that continual examination of the field of volunteering is a desirable end, both to provide information about processes and results, and to provide direction for future activities. The specifics of that examination, however, are quite a different matter. Contending groups wish to ensure that an equitable and competent examination is conducted in proper fashion by the right parties.

The discussion which follows attempts to deal with this dilemma of specificity by listing the major arguments which surfaced in discussion of Sen. Durenberger's first version of a Commission on Volunteerism. Many of the points raised are of general concern to any mechanism which might be created to examine the voluntary sector and volunteering. The discussion is divided into four major topical areas: General Need, Public/Private Control, Timing, and Structure and Mandate.

THE GENERAL NEED FOR EXAMINATION

Proponents of a Commission on Volunteerism argue that volunteering is one of our most common and least examined characteristics. They contend that no major study of volunteering has ever been conducted in this country, with the exeception of the purely demographic work done in the ACTION/Census Bureau study in 1974. Those studies which have been conducted in examination of the voluntary sector have concentrated on the organizational aspects rather than

the personal activity of volunteering. Opponents argue that the studies of the past, such as the Filer Commission, have provided a wealth of data and recommendations that have yet to be actively utilized, and which have significant implications both for the voluntary organization and the individual volunteer. Proponents point to the many areas in which gaps exist in our knowledge, particularly to such topics as the lack of information about use of volunteers by government agencies at the state and national level. Proponents also argue that now is the proper time to carefully examine the implications of governmental policies which affect volunteering, including government funding of volunteer efforts, tax incentives for volunteer involvement, and other areas.

Some opponents of a Commission have accepted the need for continued research in volunteering, but contend that a Commission is not a proper method of conduct research or to reach recommendations for change. They point to past study groups as examples of failures to provide any meaningful changes. They argue that the field has already produced enough recommendations, but has yet to produce any implementation of suggested changes. The Commission on Volunteerism, they contend, would simply be another governmental report that no one paid any attention to.

Other opponents argue the lack of need for a Commission by suggesting the ability of the present system to conduct such an examination without the creation of a new body. National voluntary organizations could conduct the policy discussions incident to the Commission on Volunteerism through convenings of its own umbrella organizations, such as the Independent Sector or the National Assembly. Proponents argue the unlikeliness of such a venture, the possible bias of such bodies, and the need for providing input from governmental bodies if we are to examine the government/voluntary relationship.

Finally, proponents argue the need for a Commission as a public relations and recognition device. Even if the Commission can accomplish very little, they contend that its creation would serve as a signal of the importance of volunteering, and provide a means of serving notice of the need for maintaining support for volunteer activities.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE CONTROL

The issue of public versus private control concerns the questions of whether the voluntary sector and volunteering should be primarily examined by the voluntary sector itself or by some outside entity. Opponents of a Commission argue strongly that voluntarism is a private matter and that efforts at government intervention should be resisted. Any examination conducted by a government-sponsored body would simply be the the beginning of an effort toward government control of voluntary organizations and volunteering. Religious organizations have expressed particular disapproval of this type of governmental examination. If an examination is to be conducted, it ought to be conducted under the aegis of private organizations, with limited governmental intervention.

Proponents argue the inability of private organizations to conduct any such examination. They argue that lack of monetary resources and the difficulties of finding a neutral convening body prevent any such self-examination. In addition, proponents point the need for structured public participation in such a study. Given the extensive use of volunteers by governmental agencies and the sweeping impact of governmental policies upon volunteers, it is crucial to include governmental decision makers in any such examination.

Finally, proponents argue that the entire question of voluntary independence from government is a moot point. The relationship between the government and private voluntary organizations is already so intertwined through funding and regulations that to talk of the independence of the voluntary sector from government is to talk of a non-existent system. What is actually needed, proponents contend, is an attempt to rationally plan for mutual activity and support between two sectors that are inextricably bound together. If the present system continues, proponents argue, the government will eventually overrun private voluntary activity because no one took the time to examine the implications of this growing interdependence.

TIMING

Three areas of controversy have arisen over the timing of a Commission on Volunteerism. The first concerns the lack of consultation and planning which went into the first version of a Commission proposed by Sen. Durenberger.

Opponents argue that insufficient consultation with voluntary groups was conducted and that the views of the voluntary sector were not adequately taken into account. Proponents have argued that this might constitute justification for delaying the Commission, but is not justification for totally opposing it, and that sufficient consultation and discussion has since taken place. Proponents also contend that the Commission itself can provide the forum for examination of opposing viewpoints.

The second timing issue involves the possibility that a Commission will infere with current legislative efforts being conducted by the voluntary sector. Opponents argue that the Commission will be used as an excuse for shelving such legislative proposals as the Fisher-Conable tax measure and the Mikulski mileage deduction legislation. They fear that the tendency will be to delay these legislative initiatives until after the Commission has reached its conclusions. Proponents have answered this argument by suggesting that the mandate of the Commission be written restrictively, and exclude any consideration of these current legislative efforts. This, they argue, would prevent any delay. They also contend that the Commission will eventually assist the bills by drawing attention to the importance of volunteering and by creating a mechanism around which support for the current efforts could be generated and focused.

The final timing issue is political in nature. Opponents argue that any Commission created during 1980 would inevitably be subjected to political pressures generated during an election year. They contend that the Commission would simply be composed of choices selected for political reasons rather than individuals will real interest and knowledge of the field. Proponents contend that this situation can be controlled by carefully structuring the requirements for memberships written into the legislation creating the Commission.

STRUCTURE AND MANDATE

A number of specific issues have arisen concerning the structure of any Commission on Volunteerism. They include the following general concerns:

1. Structure

Some arguments have arisen over the nature of the body which is to conduct the examination. Some have contended that alternative mechanisms would be more appropriate than a Commission. One suggested alternative

is that of a Presidentially or Congressionally appointed Task Force. Another might be some sort of Advisory Committee to provide on-going input into governmental policies affecting the voluntary sector.

2. Duration/Permanence

A second area of concern regarding the structure of a Commission is that of its longevity. One group contends that current proposals do not provide enough time for the Commission to conduct its activities. They argue that the Commission should be a longer-lived or even a permanent body which will conduct a complete examination of volunteering and provide continual input to policy-making bodies. Opponents of this view contend that this would simply create any bureacratic body which would be of little real help.

3. Selection of Members

Much discussion has taken place of the methods by which members of any Commission would be selected. Many fear that Commission members would be selected for political purposes and would not have any real knowledge of or interest in volunteering. Others have attempted to fashion means by which types or categories of individuals could be selected for the Committee or to suggest mechanisms by which private sector input could be gained for the selection process.

4. Mandate

Extensive discussion has taken place over the mandate of any proposed Commission. Arguments have been over whether to make the mandate broad enough to include a thorough discussion and review of the needs and potentials of volunteering, or whether to limit the mandate to areas that would not provide a threat to the independence of voluntary organizations. Some see a broad mandate as an invitation to federal interference into traditionally private concerns. Others see such a mandate as essential if an effective job is to be done. Some have suggested limiting the mandate of the Commission to an examination of the governmental role in volunteering activity. Others have suggested the elimination of tax issues from the mandate, so as to preclude interfence with the Fisher-Conable effort. Obviously, the specifics of the mandate question are endlessly broad. It is apparent, however, that in discussions of the first Durenberger proposal no clear consensus on the mandate of the Commission was reached by contending parties.

5. Funding Levels

A final concern about the structure of the Commission is that of its funding level. Many have expressed concern that the funding levels in current proposals have been inadequate to conduct the needed examination or to even conduct the specific activities outlined in suggested mandates. Others have argued that high funding levels are difficult to justify in a time when direct service programs are being cut back drastically. They contend that the money can be better spent elsewhere.

CONCLUSION

This has been an overview of the principal issues raised in discussions of a Commission on Volunteerism. It has talked about those issues in general terms to allow reference to the broad concept of a Commission rather than to argue about past or present specific versions of a Commission. Unfortunately, however, it is the specific versions around which debate must ultimately focus, and for whom specific language must be developed. In an attempt to provide some assistance about the specifics of a Commission, an appendix is added to this paper. The appendix consists of a letter written by Kenn Allen, Executive Vice-President of VOLUNTEER to Brian O'Connell of CONVO, outlining options for the language of a Commission on Volunteerism. The options and discussions contained in the letter focus on the general areas which have been discussed in this paper and were developed during meetings of some national voluntary organizations who were interested in proposals for a Commission. It is hoped that the specifics contained in the letter will provide an opportunity to focus the areas of broad concern which have here been discussed.

VOLUNTEER

The National Center for Citizen Involvement

January 14, 1980

Mr. Brian O'Connell
CONVO
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Brian:

As we agreed at our recent meeting, this paper summarizes issues concerning the proposed Commission on Volunteerism and suggests alternatives we may consider to resolve these concerns. I understand that this paper will be the focal point of our discussion on January 22. I very much appreciate your willingness to convene the CONVO membership once again around this matter and am pleased to have the opportunity to attempt to draw together the threads of our several meetings.

There appear to be at least four basic issues which have consistently arisen:

1. There is a danger that creation of the Commission will result in the unwarranted and unneeded intrusion of the federal government into the voluntary sector.

2. The independence of the voluntary sector from the government must be recognized and reinforced in the charge, structure and functioning of any Commission.

3. If the Commission is created, the full involvement of the voluntary sector in its appointment, planning, deliberation and decision-making must be insured.

4. It is inappropriate to mix a discussion of the federal role vis-a-vis volunteering with consideration of national service.

In an attempt to deal with each of these concerns, I have outlined below a series of options that might be considered in the charge, structure and functioning of the Commission.

Charge

Much of the discussion has resolved around whether or not a Commission, once created, would systematically expand its scope of inquiry until it

1214 Sixteenth Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 467-5560
Boulder Office P.O. Box 4179 Boulder, Colorado 80306 (303) 447-0492

had moved into those areas, primarily tax policy, that are seen as inappropriate for it or as an invasion of the independence of the voluntary sector. Inherent in this discussion has been the concern that that independence is not widely recognized or respected by the federal government. It is appropriate to address this concern in two ways: through inclusion of a preamble clearly outlining the private-public relationship on volunteering and by clearly delineating and limiting the scope of the Commission's work.

A preamble statement might say something like this:

> Individual citizens, acting voluntarily, have played a unique, irreplaceable role in the growth and development of the United States -- by identifying and defining community needs, creating and maintaining structures to deliver human services, advocating both for causes and for those unable to speak for themselves, governing and directing both private and public organizations and agencies. This tradition of involvement has resulted in the growth of the voluntary sector as a full partner in charting the future course of the nation. Both government and the business sector must seek, whenever possible, to preserve, protect and sustain that partnership; and, the government, in particular, must act in such a way as to encourage and facilitate the effective involvement of individual citizens and the maintenance of voluntary organizations.

The philosophy expressed in such a statement also should be expanded upon in the legislative history.

The specific language creating the Commission should carefully delineate its mission. Based on our discussions, this might say:

> The Commission is responsible for undertaking a balanced, and comprehensive study of volunteering and citizen service, with particular attention to--
>
> (1) ways in which the federal government can most appropriately and effectively involve part-time, unstipended volunteers in federally-operated or federally-funded programs; including, but not limited to, an examination of current and potential volunteer roles, needs for support structures to expand volunteer involvement and potentials for mandated volunteer involvement in service delivery;
>
> (2) ways in which the federal government may most appropriately and effectively strengthen part-time, unstipended volunteering in non-government programs; including, but not limited to, providing technical assistance to volunteer-involving organizations, establishing and maintaining an information clearinghouse on volunteer activities, offering research and development grants, disseminating information about volunteer opportunities and strengthening the capability of private, voluntary organizations at the local, state and national level;

The concern about the intrusion of the Commission into tax policy can be dealt with in two ways. The first -- ideal from our point of view but probably not acceptable in Congress -- would be a clear statement, such as:

> The Commission does not have, and shall not be given, responsibility for studying the charitable contribution of money or tangible goods.

The second approach would be to clearly state in the legislative history the intention to exclude tax policy from the scope of the Commission's consideration.

Structure

The membership and method of selection of the Commission is most critical to the success of its work. Three possible options are outlined below:

Option 1 specifies the categories from which members of the Commission shall be drawn:

(a) The Commission shall be composed of 21 members, appointed by the President not more than 60 days after passage of this legislation, of whom --

(1) four shall represent private volunteer-involving organizations;

(2) four shall represent private volunteer-supporting organizations;

(3) two shall represent minority or ethnic organizations;

(4) two shall be local volunteers nominated by national volunteer-involving organizations;

(5) one shall represent a for-profit corporation with an ongoing program for employee volunteer service;

(6) one shall represent organized labor;

(7) two shall represent the Congress;

(8) two shall represent agencies or programs of the federal government;

(9) two shall represent agencies or programs of state and local government.

(b) The chairman shall be appointed by the President.

Option 2 retains the original proposal that appointments be made by both the President and Congress but attempts to improve that process by giving the President the responsibility to appoint the chairman and by specifying that a majority of the membership must come from the private sector:

(a) The Commission shall be composed of 21 members of whom --

(1) 7 shall be appointed by the President, including the Chairman;

(2) 7 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(3) 7 shall be appointed by the President Pro tempore of the Senate.

Appointments shall be made not later than 60 days following passage of this legislation.

(b) The Commission shall include individuals who represent private volunteer-involving organizations, private volunteer-supporting organizations, minority or ethnic organizations, business, organized labor, the federal government, state and local government. Not less than a majority of the appointees shall represent private voluntary organizations.

Option 3 suggests an appointment process that might come closest to guaranteeing our involvement:

(a) The Commission shall be composed of 21 members, appointed by the President in the following manner:

(1) not more than sixty days following passage of this legislation, the President shall appoint the chairman of the Commission;

(2) within ninety days following his or her appointment, the Chairperson shall submit to the President a list of not more than forty nominees from which the remaining 20 members of the Commission will be appointed; the nominees list is to be developed in consultation with voluntary organizations and agencies.

All appointments to the Commission shall be made not later than 180 days following passage of this legislation.

(b) The Commission shall include individuals who represent private volunteer-involving organizations, private volunteer-supporting organizations, minority or ethnic organizations, business, organized labor, the federal government, state and local government. Not less than a majority of the appointees shall represent private, voluntary organizations.

Functioning

Certain aspects of the functioning of the Commission could be mandated in the legislation to insure full and effective participation of voluntary organizations in its work. For example, the paid staff of the Commission might be limited to a director and a secretary with all other work to be contracted to voluntary organizations or provision could be made for voluntary organizations to donate staff to work with the Commission. Certainly at least the latter should be not only permissible but encouraged.

Other such provisions might include:

> The Commission shall appoint such advisory committees as it sees fit, to assist it in its work. Any such committees shall be appointed by the Chairman with the advise and consent of the Commission. Each such committee appointed shall be chaired by a member of the Commission.
>
> The Commission shall institute such procedures as it may deem appropriate, including but not limited to national, regional and local hearings, which will insure maximum participation in the work of the Commission by volunteers and voluntary organizations.
>
> The first meeting of the Commission shall be held not more than sixty days following the appointment of the members. The Commission shall meet regularly and must meet at least quarterly in public session.
>
> The Commission is authorized and encouraged to seek or receive such additional funds from private or public sources as it deems necessary to supplement funds appropriated for its work.
>
> The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress, not later than 18 months after the first meeting of the Commission, a final report of its study and investigations, together with such recommendations, including recommendations for legislation, as the Commission may deem advisable. The Commission shall cause the final report of its work, including recommendations, to be widely distributed to local, state and national voluntary organizations. The Commission may submit to the President, the Congress and the voluntary sector such interim reports as it deems advisable.

National Service

The issue of whether or not a commission on volunteerism should or could be related to one on national service may be the most difficult problem to solve simply because it may be beyond our ability to affect. Short of simply taking the bottom-line position that such a relationship is unacceptable, the only alternative may be to guarantee the integrity of the volunteerism aspect of the commission's work in the legialation. For example:

(a) The Commission shall have two primary working committees: The Committee on Volunteering and the Committee on Citizen Service.

(b) The Committee on Volunteering shall be responsible for studying ways in which the federal government may most appropriately and effectively strengthen part-time, unstipended volunteering and ways in which the federal government can most appropriately and effectively involve part-time, unstipended volunteers in federally-operated or federally-funded programs of human and social service.

(c) The Committee on Citizen Service shall be responsible for studying the feasibility and desirability of creating programs of national service for youth and elders.

(d) Each committee shall consist of ten members, appointed by the Chairman from the total membership of the Commission. The Chairman shall appoint chairpersons for each committee. The Chairman of the Commission shall serve as an ex officio member of each committee.

(e) The committees shall have equal staff and budgets.

Again, Brian, we very much appreciate the role you and CONVO are playing in this discussion. You have offered an appropriate and helpful neutral ground upon which discussion on the commission can take place. I hope that at this upcoming meeting we can begin to reach some closure on the critical elements outlined above so that we will be preapred to speak together effectively with Senators Durenberger and Cranston and with the Congress as a whole.

Sincerely,

Kerry Kenn Allen
Executive Vice-President

KKA/gbr

THE PUBLIC - PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP: A PERSPECTIVE FOR THE 80s

A PAPER PREPARED FOR THE
NATIONAL FORUM ON A COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM

MARCH 26th to 28th, 1980

BY JACK MOSKOWITZ* AND ELLEN WITMAN**
UNITED WAY OF AMERICA

****

There was a time when government was not a very large part of our lives. Most people went about their daily activities unaffected by public policy decisions. When they needed help it was not to the government they turned, but to a local private charity. Groups of religious or civic volunteers took care of the hungry and the homeless, visited the sick and aided the victims of natural disasters. The fire companies, schools, libraries and museums were all operated by volunteers. Almost every citizen contributed to his or her community through volunteer activity of one sort or another.

Today government plays a far larger role in our lives than ever before. The individual citizen finds public policies increasingly influencing his everyday life. Each year billions of tax dollars flow into the kinds of health, cultural and social service programs that once were nearly the sole domain of the voluntary sector.

This trend toward increasing government involvement in traditionally private ventures has raised questions about whether or not the pluralism that has distinguished this nation for the past 200 years can be preserved. Are the taxpayers willing to support both public and private institutions? Should they do so?

A major struggle of the 1980s will be between the proponents of a strong voluntary sector and the advocates of government dominated services. The former argue that the private, nonprofit sector must continue to be a viable alternative to government. Competition, they believe, will force improvements in social services just as the competitive marketplace stimulates innovations in business. A strong voluntary sector can also provide a balance to the power of government and respond to local community needs as opposed to national priorities.

Yet, it is precisely the power of government and its national scope that appeals to those in support of greater government involvement in social welfare issues. Food stamps, welfare and housing programs, job training and employment projects, medicaid and other services to poverty populations need the power and resources of the federal government. The private sector simply cannot deliver services on so large a scale. In addition, it is argued that public funds are better accounted for and more easily controlled.

The argument is not new. Nor is America the only nation to question the value of supporting both public and private service systems. Many countries have already witnessed the demise of pluralism. In several Western European countries where they once flourished, philanthropy and volunteerism are today considered elitist and patronizing. Providing services for the citizens is deemed the duty of the state -- and only the state. That is an example we could follow. Some would argue that we are well on our way.

There is good reason to be fearful of allowing this country to go the way of Europe's socialist states. Throughout our history, the one factor that has separated our society from other nations is the value Americans place on the individual. We are more concerned with individual rights, individual freedoms, individual potential, and individual responsibility than almost any other people in history. Only a pluralistic society made up of many kinds of institutions fostering initiative and experimentation, many conflicting beliefs and means of expressing them, and many avenues for dissent and competition can perpetuate that value. The diversity that by definition must exist in a pluralistic society gaurantees that no single ideology, no single institution and no single sector of society will go unchecked or unchallenged.

Volunteerism is perhaps the finest example of our regard for individual citizens. Within our pluralistic society, and especially within the non-profit sector, anyone who wishes to pursue his or her interests, promote beliefs -- popular or unpopular -- or fulfill a desire to serve others can do so alone or by participating in an organized association, civic group or church. Whether driving a senior citizen to the doctor or marching in the streets for civil rights, the individual can contribute to, and in many instances lead, his community and his country. Virtually every far-reaching change in our history has come from innovations in the private sector. From child labor laws to ERA the impetus for government to act has come from a private sector push.

It is easy to understand, therefore, why the growing involvement of government in traditionally private efforts is creating concern and controversy in the voluntary sector. Public and private agencies are becoming inextricably interdependent. As social programming expanded, government came to rely, in large part, on private volunteer agencies to deliver publicly supported services like Meals-on-Wheels, Title XX, Juvenile Justice and Low Income Energy Assistance, thus avoiding duplications, greater expense and bureaucracy.

Many private organizations now rely heavily on government funds, raising questions of control and regulation and creating budgets precariously dependent on government grants and contracts. A recent survey of United Way member agencies indicated that on the average over 40 percent of agencies' budgets comes from government programs. Most of this funding represents federal programs administered through state and local governments. In addition, the intricate relationship between federal and state spending and voluntary agencies' budgets means that virtually all public policy decisions involving tax revenues and expenditures affect the private sector directly or indirectly.

The voluntary sector also benefits from these joint ventures. There is not doubt that in this time of high inflation hundreds of voluntary organizations would fail without the influx of public dollars, and those that survive would be able to provide far fewer services to far fewer people. The needed infusion of public funds enables the private sector to broaden the spectrum and enhance the quality of services offered.

The relationship between the public and private sectors developed with two great bursts of government activity -- in the 1930s during the Depression and again in the 1960s during President Johnson's Great Society years. This partnership, however, has not developed smoothly. The growth of this system was not well planned. No clear definition of the voluntary role has evolved. It has been a matter of flying by the seat of our pants -- responding by instinct without any structured means of evaluating the kind of response required or appropriate. Neither the voluntary sector nor the various levels of government gave sufficient thought to sorting out how this new relationship would affect voluntary organizations and volunteers or the delivery of services through government programs.

Some voluntary agencies, for example, expanded their services through government funding without adequately calculating the attendant costs and problems. The accountability requirements of government grants impose administrative burdens on small voluntary agencies that are unrealistic given their limited resources and staff. On the other side, governmental units sometimes establish duplicative, competitive agencies wasting dollars and nearly putting voluntary service providers out of business. Governments--federal, state and local-- frequently make policies on issues such as taxes, budget priorities and disclosure that have enormous impact on the private sector without sufficient study or consultation with voluntary representatives to mitigate negative consequences.

Problems like these in a rapidly changing society are inevitable, but there are ways to prepare, to anticipate and to alleviate difficulties. The voluntary sector is just beginning to master these skills. We plunged into public policy debates in an ad hoc fashion, concerned primarily with protecting ourselves from the intrusion of government and secondarily with benefiting from federal largess. Now we are being asked direct, hard questions, and we find we have only soft answers. There is no reliable statistical information, for instance, on the relative overhead and effectiveness of the voluntary dollar compared to the federal dollar. Sound methodology is only now being developed to determine where the voluntary dollar comes from and where it goes, who volunteers, for what reasons, in what capacity, and what the relationship is between those factors. In general, sources of information on the voluntary sector are meager and undeveloped.

Having enumerated our weaknesses, I hasten to add that the voluntary sector today is stronger, more organized, more unified and more knowledgeable about the basic issues and problems that confront it than ever before. Relationships are developing between segments of the nonprofit sector that did not recognize until now their common concerns. On March 5, 1980 an event took place that would have been unthinkable 20 years ago. One hundred and thirty-three voluntary organizations from the Audubon Society to Zero Population Growth came together as charter members to inaugurate Independent Sector, Inc., an organization created to encourage and enhance the traditions of private initiative, charitable giving, and volunteering. The organizing committee's report, entitled "To Preserve an Independent Sector," stated as a general conclusion:

> Despite how very real the obstacles are, they are balanced by a growing conviction that if the independent sector is to continue to serve society well, it must be mobilized for greater cooperation and impact. Despite all the differences, antipathies and antagonisms which may exist in this quarrelsome, competing and truly independent sector, there are even stronger forces pulling it together.

What force is so strong that it can unite social welfare, health, environment, education, community, minority, religious, and women's organizations? Self-preservation. All of these groups are aware that private giving is eroding, the giving base narrowing, and the value of the contributed dollar shrinking rapidly. Tax policies detrimental to philanthropy have been enacted. Laws regulating solicitations exist in 36 states and the District of Columbia. Energy costs and inflation are crippling voluntary agencies while at the same time, cutbacks in public services are increasing the need and the expectation for service from private organizations.

We have been hurt not only by public policies, but also by our own deficiencies. For too long private organizations viewed the government as an adversary to be resisted at all costs. Lack of early cooperation led to the enactment of numerous laws detrimental to voluntarism, laws we are now attempting to change. Government regulation of fund-raising practices grew out of scandals and poor accountability among private organizations. Although sound accounting standards are now utilized by most nonprofits, the public is demanding greater accountability for the contributed dollar. They are entitled to know where their money goes, how much is collected, what services it provides and who benefits from them. If voluntary organizations do not voluntarily provide this information, government regulation will be even worse in the future.

These are serious problems and the voluntary sector is in serious trouble, but we are far from extinct. Forty billion dollars was contributed by Americans to charitable organizations last year and millions of people donated their valuable time to provide services to others, protect the environment, bring symphony music or theater where it had never been before and myriad other volunteer activites. This vitality is the best guarantee that the voluntary sector will survive.

But survival is not enough. Voluntarism must be effective, strong and vital in this society or it will exist here only as it does in those Western European states where it is an avocation of the wealthy elite. Preserving and protecting voluntarism in the 1980s will require not only increased dollars and volunteer assistance, but also a renewed commitment to the philosophy and practice of voluntarism. We must define our role and make a convincing case for pluralism in this country. The philosophical undergirding of voluntarism needs to be shored up. Too many of those now assuming leadership positions in government, academia and business grew up in an era of big government with little or no association with organized philanthropy. They are not committed to the private sector or the concept of pluralism. They may be concerned about a balanced federal budget, but not about a balance of power and responsibility between the public and private domains.

Fortunately, there is opportunity in adversity. The present economic trends offer an appropriate climate for advocating a strong voluntary sector. It is time to bring into the public debate on economic policy the value of private,

voluntary activity and the contributions made by volunteers to improving the quality of life in America. It is time to focus attention on ways to stimulate new activity and support the continuing efforts of established charitable organizations. It is time to look at the history of this country and understand the indispensible role voluntarism played -- and continues to play -- in shaping the institutions, values and policies by which we live.

The purpose of this dialogue is twofold. First, it must reaquaint Americans with the crucial concept of pluralism and rekindle the belief in individual commitment and responsibility -- not just for oneself, but for one's neighbors and community. Secondly, it must lead to the development of a different kind of partnership between the public and private sectors. The nonprofit sector must actively participate in public policy decision-making from beginning to end. It is no longer enough that voluntary agencies receive federal funds to provide services. The distribution of grants is the last and weakest stage of public policy decision-making. Partnership -- equal partnership -- means having significant input in the formulation of policy and insuring that its implementation will strengthen and encourage the work of volunteers and voluntary organizations.

We are making progress. Volunteers and organizations in the independent sector are gaining confidence in themselves and the respect of those in the public sector as they become more experienced and politically sophisticated. Evidence is everywhere of the growing effectiveness of voluntary organizations. Many voluntary agencies are working with the Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, the White House Conference on the Family and other administration initiatives. The executive departments frequently consult with nonprofit organizations before issuing new regulations or implementing new programs. Our ability to influence legislation is also improving. At local, state and federal levels voluntary organizations are beginning to understand the legislative process and how to intervene in it.

Perhaps the most valuable lesson the voluntary sector has learned is that it has the right -- and indeed the obligation -- to initiate legislation, to act where appropriate to enhance and strengthen voluntarism, and to protect and preserve the independence of private organizations. One example of a legislative initiative is the unanimous voluntary sector effort to secure passage of the Fisher-Conable/Moynihan-Packwood legislation allowing all taxpayers a deduction for their charitable gifts whether they itemize or not. This proposal will provide additional revenues to voluntary organizations and a much needed tax cut to lower and middle income givers. Equally important is the fact that for each dollar contributed, charities receive an equivalent amount in volunteer time. People who give money to a cause, candidate or organization are far more likely to become involved in the activities associated with it than are those who do not give. Therefore, changing the tax code to provide an incentive for giving to lower and middle income people will also encourage the volunteering of time. To date there are 180 cosponsors in the House of Representatives and 40 in the Senate due to an effective lobbying campaign by the independent sector. When a tax cut is enacted, Fisher-Conable/Moynihan-Packwood proposal will be in the running for inclusion.

There are numerous ways the government can encourage and support volunteering and voluntary organizations. During the recent Title XX reauthorization hearings a coalition of voluntary organizations urged Congress to allow the use of training funds for volunteers as well as paid staff in voluntary organizations providing Title XX services. The proposal was not adopted, but the issue will undoubtedly be raised again. Governments at all levels should set an example to employers by giving job and education credit for significant volunteer experience. Another means of encouraging volunteering is to institute flex time so that employees can schedule convenient times to volunteer in community activities while still maintaining full time jobs. As the dialogue continues between the public and private sectors many innovative ideas will emerge for fostering commitment and involvement among employees and dedication and cooperation among public sector employers. The same ideas, of course, can be applied to private sector employers in both profit and nonprofit organizations.

More important than the specific suggestions, however, is the dialogue itself. Volunteer leaders must take every opportunity to make the case for supporting the private sector. Public officials must take a long hard look at what will happen if voluntary organizations fail. If solutions to many of the problems confronting the voluntary sector are not found in the 1980s, we may find America looking very much like Western Europe's socialist countries by the 1990s. Clearly the challenge of this decade is tremendous, but so is the opportunity. Should we succeed in meeting the challenge our pluralistic society will be far stronger than it has been for years and both voluntarism and government will be enriched.

* Jack Moskowitz is Senior Vice President for Government Relations, United Way of America. Prior to joining United Way of America in March 1977 he was principle lobbyist for energy and tax matters at Common Cause. He also has served as executive director, National Committee on Tax Justice.

** Ellen Witman is a Legislative Assistant for Government Relations, United Way of America. Prior to joining United Way of America in July 1977 she was a senior staff associate for the National Community Development Assoc.

AMENDMENT NO. 1678

Purpose: To establish a National Commission on Volunteerism.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES—96th Cong., 2d Sess.

S. 1843

To provide for Federal support and stimulation of State, local, and community activities to prevent domestic violence and provide immediate shelter and other assistance for victims of domestic violence, for coordination of Federal programs and activities pertaining to domestic violence, and for other purposes.

February 28 (legislative day, January 3), 1980

Referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources and ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT intended to be proposed by Mr. DURENBERGER

Viz: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE III—THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 301. The Congress finds and declares that:

(1) Individual citizens, acting voluntarily, have played a unique, irreplaceable role in the growth and development of the United States, by identifying and defining human services, advocating on behalf of causes and in behalf of those unable to speak for themselves, and by governing and directing both private and public organizations and agencies.

(2) This tradition of involvement has resulted in the participation of the voluntary sector as a partner with the Government and with other social and economic sectors of our Nation in charting the future course of the country. However, the tradition is being challenged by changing employment preferences, the persistence of inflation, and other socioeconomic factors. Conversely, other socioeconomic trends, such as the preference for earlier retirement, offer opportunities to continue the tradition of volunteering. The implications of these trends on the ability and willingness of individuals to volunteer has not been examined.

(3) Volunteer organizations and the Government share many common goals, and often work together to achieve these goals. However, there are numerous examples of Government policies and programs that work at cross-purposes to the goals of volunteer organizations, present obstacles to individual volunteering, or do not recognize the potential of including volunteers. The Government should seek, whenever possible, to preserve and expand the cooperation and partnership with volunteer organizations. The Government should, with assistance from volunteer organizations, formulate a policy regarding its partnership with volunteer organizations and the involvement of individual volunteers in achieving common goals and program objectives. This policy

should recognize the independence but mutual concerns of volunteer organizations and the Government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 302. (a) There is authorized to be established a National Commission on Volunteerism.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-five members who shall be appointed by the President. The members shall be representative of private volunteer-involving organizations, private volunteer-supporting organizations, minority, women, and ethnic organizations, employee and employer organizations, the Federal Government, and State and local government. A majority of the appointees shall represent private voluntary organizations. No more than four members of the Commission shall be members of the United States Congress.

(c) The President shall appoint one member of the Commission to be the Chairman.

(d) Any vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner provided in this section for the original appointment.

(e) The President shall appoint the members of the Commission within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this title.

(f) Thirteen members shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings as may be authorized by the total membership of the Commission.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 303. (a) The Commission shall identify the significant socioeconomic factors expected to affect volunteers over the next ten years, and shall make a comprehensive study of the relationship of these factors to volunteering. The socioeconomic factors to be studied shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) The age distribution of the United States population and longer life expectancy.

(2) Changes in the composition of the labor force, including the increase in the number of women in the full-time work force.

(3) Changes in attitudes toward careers, the preference for most flexible career patterns, the preference for early retirement, and the need for income security.

(4) The higher educational attainments of the labor force and the subsequent demand for challenging jobs, and the decline in the number of fulfilling jobs being created.

(5) The persistence of inflation and its influence on the ability and willingness of individuals to volunteer.

(6) The scarcity and increased cost of energy.

(b) The Commission shall identify the significant public policies of mutual interest to volunteer organizations and Government, and the programs carried out pursuant to these policies, except that the Commission shall not examine policies and programs set forth in or developed pursuant to title 20 of the United States Code. Such policies and programs shall include but shall not be limited to—

(1) those pertaining to the utilization of volunteers or volunteer organizations in the delivery of public services through grants or contracts, as stipend or unstipended volunteers, and through other means;

(2) those providing for offering public technical assistance or support services to volunteers and volunteer organizations.

(c) The Commission shall examine the affect of these policies and programs on the willingness and ability of individual volunteers and volunteer organizations to participate in the delivery of public services. The Commission shall propose changes in these policies and programs that are designed to increase the opportunities for volunteer participation, strengthen the partnership between Government and volunteer organizations, and provide flexibility and diversity in the delivery of public services.

(d) Within eighteen months of its effective date, the Commission shall issue an initial report of its findings. The initial report shall contain proposed recommendations for Federal and State government action to encourage individual volunteering and to reinforce the work of organizations of volunteers.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

SEC. 304. (a) The Commission shall conduct at least five regional public hearings in diverse geographical sections of the country to disseminate the initial report and the proposed recommendations. Notice of the hearings shall be published in the Federal Register, and the notice shall be distributed widely to volunteer organizations, interested businesses, interested labor organizations, and appropriate State and local government officials. The Commission shall take the public comments into account when preparing the final report and recommendations.

(b) At appropriate intervals, but at least one each six months during the first eighteen months, the Commission shall hold a public hearing to report on the progress of its work and to solicit public comments. Notice of the hearing shall be published in the Federal Register, and the notice shall be distributed widely to volunteer organizations, minority and ethnic organizations, interested businesses, interested labor organizations, and appropriate State and local govern-

ment officials. The Commission shall take the public comments into account when proceeding with its research, in preparing the initial report and the proposed recommendations.

(c) No later than twenty-four months after its effective date, the Commission shall report to Congress and the President its research findings, its recommendations, and summaries of the comments received during the public hearings.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 305. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out the provisions of this title, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, request the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents and have such printing and binding done, as the Commission deems advisable.

(b) The Commissioner may acquire directly from the head of any department, agency, instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government available information which the Commission determines useful in the discharge of its functions. Each department, agency, instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government shall cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish all information requested by the Commission.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director, and such additional staff personnel as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title;

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the comparable daily rate for a GS–18 under section 5332 of such title;

(3) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, without condition or restriction other than that it will be used for the purposes of the Commission, and to use, sell, and otherwise dispose of

such property for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Commission under this title;

(5) enter into agreements with the General Services Administration for procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from the funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services; and

(6) enter into contracts with Federal, State, and local public agencies, private business concerns, institutions, and other volunteer organizations for the conduct of research, surveys, the preparation of reports, and any other activity which the Commission determines to be necessary.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 306. (a) Members of the Commission who are otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission not otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall receive $100 per day when they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reim-

bursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 307. The Commission shall terminate one hundred and twenty days after the submission of the final report under this title.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 308. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $200,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

AMENDMENT NO. 1678

Purpose: To establish a National Commission on Volunteerism.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES—96th Cong., 2d Sess.

-- S. 1843

To provide for Federal support and stimulation of State, local, and community activities to prevent domestic violence and provide immediate shelter and other assistance for victims of domestic violence, for coordination of Federal programs and activities pertaining to domestic violence, and for other purposes.

February 28 (legislative day, January 3), 1980

Referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources and ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT intended to be proposed by Mr. DURENBERGER

Viz: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE III—THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 301. The Congress finds and declares that:

(1) Individual citizens, acting voluntarily, have played a unique, irreplaceable role in the growth and development of the United States, by identifying and defining human services, advocating on behalf of causes and in behalf of those unable to speak for themselves, and by governing and directing both private and public organizations and agencies.

(2) This tradition of involvement has resulted in the participation of the voluntary sector as a partner with the Government and with other social and economic sectors of our Nation in charting the future course of the country. However, the tradition is being challenged by changing employment preferences, the persistence of inflation, and other socioeconomic factors. Conversely, other socioeconomic trends, such as the preference for earlier retirement, offer opportunities to continue the tradition of volunteering. The implications of these trends on the ability and willingness of individuals to volunteer has not been examined.

(3) Volunteer organizations and the Government share many common goals, and often work together to achieve these goals. However, there are numerous examples of Government policies and programs that work at cross-purposes to the goals of volunteer organizations, present obstacles to individual volunteering, or do not recognize the potential of including volunteers. The Government should seek, whenever possible, to preserve and expand the cooperation and partnership with volunteer organizations. The Government should, with assistance from volunteer organizations, formulate a policy regarding its partnership with volunteer organizations and the involvement of individual volunteers in achieving common goals and program objectives. This policy

should recognize the independence but mutual concerns of volunteer organizations and the Government.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 302. (a) There is authorized to be established a National Commission on Volunteerism.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-five members who shall be appointed by the President. The members shall be representative of private volunteer-involving organizations, private volunteer-supporting organizations, minority, women, and ethnic organizations, employee and employer organizations, the Federal Government, and State and local government. A majority of the appointees shall represent private voluntary organizations. No more than four members of the Commission shall be members of the United States Congress.

(c) The President shall appoint one member of the Commission to be the Chairman.

(d) Any vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner provided in this section for the original appointment.

(e) The President shall appoint the members of the Commission within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this title.

(f) Thirteen members shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings as may be authorized by the total membership of the Commission.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 303. (a) The Commission shall identify the significant socioeconomic factors expected to affect volunteers over the next ten years, and shall make a comprehensive study of the relationship of these factors to volunteering. The socioeconomic factors to be studied shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) The age distribution of the United States population and longer life expectancy.

(2) Changes in the composition of the labor force, including the increase in the number of women in the full-time work force.

(3) Changes in attitudes toward careers, the preference for most flexible career patterns, the preference for early retirement, and the need for income security.

(4) The higher educational attainments of the labor force and the subsequent demand for challenging jobs, and the decline in the number of fulfilling jobs being created.

(5) The persistence of inflation and its influence on the ability and willingness of individuals to volunteer.

(6) The scarcity and increased cost of energy.

(b) The Commission shall identify the significant public policies of mutual interest to volunteer organizations and Government, and the programs carried out pursuant to these policies, except that the Commission shall not examine policies and programs set forth in or developed pursuant to title 20 of the United States Code. Such policies and programs shall include but shall not be limited to—

(1) those pertaining to the utilization of volunteers or volunteer organizations in the delivery of public services through grants or contracts, as stipend or unstipended volunteers, and through other means;

(2) those providing for offering public technical assistance or support services to volunteers and volunteer organizations.

(c) The Commission shall examine the affect of these policies and programs on the willingness and ability of individual volunteers and volunteer organizations to participate in the delivery of public services. The Commission shall propose changes in these policies and programs that are designed to increase the opportunities for volunteer participation, strengthen the partnership between Government and volunteer organizations, and provide flexibility and diversity in the delivery of public services.

(d) Within eighteen months of its effective date, the Commission shall issue an initial report of its findings. The initial report shall contain proposed recommendations for Federal and State government action to encourage individual volunteering and to reinforce the work of organizations of volunteers.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

SEC. 304. (a) The Commission shall conduct at least five regional public hearings in diverse geographical sections of the country to disseminate the initial report and the proposed recommendations. Notice of the hearings shall be published in the Federal Register, and the notice shall be distributed widely to volunteer organizations, interested businesses, interested labor organizations, and appropriate State and local government officials. The Commission shall take the public comments into account when preparing the final report and recommendations.

(b) At appropriate intervals, but at least one each six months during the first eighteen months, the Commission shall hold a public hearing to report on the progress of its work and to solicit public comments. Notice of the hearing shall be published in the Federal Register, and the notice shall be distributed widely to volunteer organizations, minority and ethnic organizations, interested businesses, interested labor organizations, and appropriate State and local govern-

ment officials. The Commission shall take the public comments into account when proceeding with its research, in preparing the initial report and the proposed recommendations.

(c) No later than twenty-four months after its effective date, the Commission shall report to Congress and the President its research findings, its recommendations, and summaries of the comments received during the public hearings.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 305. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out the provisions of this title, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, request the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents and have such printing and binding done, as the Commission deems advisable.

(b) The Commissioner may acquire directly from the head of any department, agency, instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government available information which the Commission determines useful in the discharge of its functions. Each department, agency, instrumentality, or other authority of the executive branch of the Government shall cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish all information requested by the Commission.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director, and such additional staff personnel as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title;

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the comparable daily rate for a GS–18 under section 5332 of such title;

(3) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, without condition or restriction other than that it will be used for the purposes of the Commission, and to use, sell, and otherwise dispose of

such property for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Commission under this title;

(5) enter into agreements with the General Services Administration for procurement of necessary financial and administrative services, for which payment shall be made by reimbursement from the funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services; and

(6) enter into contracts with Federal, State, and local public agencies, private business concerns, institutions, and other volunteer organizations for the conduct of research, surveys, the preparation of reports, and any other activity which the Commission determines to be necessary.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 306. (a) Members of the Commission who are otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission not otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall receive $100 per day when they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reim-

bursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 307. The Commission shall terminate one hundred and twenty days after the submission of the final report under this title.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 308. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $200,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.