

and . . . there is no federal-provincial body charged with looking at the development of people, our most valuable resource, in a comprehensive manner.²

Finally the E.C.C. propose that "The Federal Government should establish an office to provide information and co-ordinate research on poverty"³

The experience of the Committee confirms the need for such an office. We propose, however, that it should not be restricted only to matters of poverty but should be broadened to encompass all aspects of human resources and social-welfare problems.

At present there is no one agency at the federal level in Canada which has the responsibility of conducting research and maintaining a continuous "watch" on human and social problems throughout the country. Human problems are divided according to departmental jurisdictions and academic disciplines on the basis of whether they relate to health, welfare, employment, citizenship, ethnic and/or racial, language and culture, native or immigrant, education or training problems. There is not a single agency which is responsible for the study of and provision of advice on the "whole man" or the individual as a member of a specific sub-group of the Canadian population. As a result, there is no comprehensive body of knowledge available as a baseline for the study of such human problems as poverty, unemployment, education, cultural and social conflict, discrimination, deviance, delinquency, social adjustment to technological change, and so on, at a national level. Consequently, each social problem must be studied from scratch when it reaches a crisis state.

The Committee found that the available research was fragmented rather than co-ordinated, the result of individual studies and not of systematic investigation of the entire problem. Frequently analyses of poverty problems had been made by a single discipline with little consideration of the influence of factors outside that discipline. Governmental agencies, with their special bias, rarely had the kind of data which would establish whether their programs were actually helping the poor. "Evaluation" for most such agencies consisted essentially of collecting and presenting data justifying the continuation and expansion of existing programs and expenditures, rather than objective information on the benefits which such programs provided to their respective clients. Performance is measured in terms of inputs (the amount of money spent or the number of clients served) and not in terms of output (cost/benefit ratios or the effect of services on the lives of clients).

The Human Resource Development Authority of the Province of Alberta noted another aspect of the problem in its brief:

A persistent problem such as poverty always raises the question about the adequacy of our knowledge. It is often assumed that the development of further information will lead to more effective action. Concerning poverty at this particular time, it is safe to say that there is no deficiency of general knowledge. During the past five years, social scientists and other specialists in Europe, U.S.A., and Canada have published literally thousands of research studies and reports dealing with poverty and human-resource development.