

nor can we always even receive a response from the government. Both predecessor Standing Committees to this Committee tabled reports which did not receive formal responses from the government by reason of the dissolution of Parliament in 1988.

Clearly, the only way to ensure consistent and sustained progress is through a mechanism to ensure that the concerns of disabled persons are integrated into the overall policy development and programs of all government departments. And so we continue to issue reports with recommendations because we know that our limited powers are one of the few ways of calling to account those who have not integrated disabled persons' concerns.

For want of an enforcement mechanism within government, disabled persons are going to court. We feel that too many issues are being settled case-by-case and one-by-one in Charter challenges and human rights complaints because the political and bureaucratic system is unwilling to integrate disabled persons concerns in its activities. Too many individuals have been forced to fight long and lonely battles because the burden of eliminating discrimination is left with the victims.

There are several recent outstanding examples of acts of omission and commission that illustrate what happens when overall accountability is absent.

When the Department of Employment and Immigration tabled its document *Success in the Works* that outlined the new labour force development strategy it did not significantly take into account the needs of disabled persons, particularly in the \$800 million that was intended to be redirected from unemployment insurance into upgrading the skills of the labour force. By tying job training and re-training to unemployment insurance, the document effectively excluded the disabled persons who were not in the labour force. Again, persons with disabilities had to fight to have their concerns *added on* to an existing policy which had initially not considered their needs. A mechanism accountable for meeting disability concerns across the government could have prevented this situation.

The *National Transportation Act* was amended in 1988. The rationale for proceeding was to send a clear signal to all parties that greater accessibility to the transportation system is an integral part of the overall policies of federally-regulated transportation rather than a concession, favour or add-on for persons with disabilities. The amendments gave the National Transportation Agency the authority to issue regulations to improve not only the terms and conditions of carriage for persons with disabilities but also the physical accessibility of transportation facilities (both terminals and equipment). Among other things, these regulations could settle the question of the two-for-one fare question and allow free travel by an attendant accompanying a traveller with a disability. This has long been an item that falls high on the agenda of the disability community. Two years later, the regulations have not yet appeared. This delay has, in fact, given the opposite signal to