

effectiveness of future policies, programs and activities. It is shocking, for example, that the recent demographic review carried out by the Department of National Health and Welfare did not include specific studies on issues related to disabled persons — fully 13% of the Canadian population! Given the projections of future labour shortages, we are surprised at the unavailability even of ball park estimates of costs and benefits of economic integration as we have defined it in this report. In response to *Obstacles*, studies were undertaken on the proposed national disability pension and that should provide some indications in this regard but these have not been made public.

There are places where research into costs and benefits has begun. Statistics Canada provided us with some clues when Mrs. Adele Furrie, Manager of the Post Censal Surveys Program, reported on the results of the 1986 Health and Activity Limitation Survey. The data, she said, reinforces the perception that barriers exist to the economic integration of disabled persons. During its appearance before this Committee, the Canadian Paraplegic Association (CPA) cited \$5.5 billion as a net contribution to the Canadian economy of employing the 171,215 disabled persons who are available to work. CPA arrived at this amount by combining the \$2.1 billion spent on maintaining these people on social assistance with an estimated \$3.4 billion that they could earn. Admittedly, this is a rough calculation, but it provides an indication of the magnitude of the figures involved. There needs to be a follow-up to the G. Allan Roeher Institute publication, *Income Insecurity: The Disability Income System in Canada*, and the current work associated with the Institute on services and employment programs for persons with disabilities.

Intensive research to secure specific data and analysis must be carried out. In this regard we wish to issue some warnings. First of all, the traditional type of cost-benefit analysis will have to be modified to take into account the complexity of the issues. Any such analysis should look at the way the various systems operate and whether it is costing more to administer them in their existing form than by making changes. In this regard, we are thinking of the over-servicing of certain individuals and groups of disabled persons as well as the under-servicing of others. For example, studies should take into account the costs of institutionalization versus the costs of independent living. Secondly, in the current system of grants, it is easier to get money for “soft” research like meetings and conferences than for the type of “hard” analysis and program evaluation which is required.

Clearly-articulated goals are most easily achieved by alliances. Disabled persons and their organizations must band together, must assume the leadership to advocate for change. While groups that appeared before us have outlined certain generalized goals that are shared, we know of no public agreement to adhere to a specific programme of action. The success of the ADA hinged, in large part, on its including a combination of issues that benefitted a wide range of persons with disabilities. Because of this, no groups felt that their concerns were ignored and most joined together in common cause. The advantages of a