

A CONSENSUS FOR ACTION: THE ECONOMIC INTEGRATION OF DISABLED PERSONS

Second Report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons

Bruce Halliday, M.P. Chairman

June, 1990

J 103 H7 34-2 H792 A122





J Canada. Parliament.

103 House of Commons.

H7 Standing Committee on

34-2 Human Rights and the

H792 Status of Disabled Persons.

A122 A consensus for or of the consensus of

103 H7 34-2 H792 A122

A CONSENSUS FOR ACTION: THE ECONOMIC INTEGRATION OF DISABLED PERSONS

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
CANADA

1990 0 7 0 4

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

Second Report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons

Bruce Halliday, M.P. Chairman

June, 1990

UBRARY OF PARLIAMENT CANADA
1990 0 7 0 4
BRIOTHEOLE DUPARLEMENT

This Report is available on audio-cassettes from:

The Clerk
Standing Committee on
Human Rights and the Status
of Disabled Persons
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Issue No. 30

Tuesday, June 5, 1990 Tuesday, June 12, 1990

Chairman: Bruce Halliday

CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES

Fascicule nº 30

Le mardi 5 juin 1990 Le mardi 12 juin 1990

Président: Bruce Halliday

Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Procès-verbaux et témoignages du Comité permanent des

Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons

Droits de la personne et de la condition des Personnes handicapées

RESPECTING:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(c), consideration of a draft Report on the economic integration of disabled persons

INCLUDING:

Second Report to the House

CONCERNANT:

Conformément à l'article 108(3)c) du Règlement, étude d'un projet de rapport sur l'intégration économique des personnes handicapées

Y COMPRIS:

Le deuxième Rapport à la Chambre

Second Session of the Thirty-fourth Parliament, 1989-90

Deuxième session de la trente-quatrième législature, 1989-1990

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS

Chairman: Bruce Halliday

Vice-Chairman: Maurice Tremblay

Members

Bill Attewell
Gilles Bernier
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Barbara Greene
David Kilgour
Peter McCreath
Walter McLean
Svend Robinson
Christine Stewart
Joseph Volpe
David Walker
Neil Young—(14)

(Quorum 8)

Marie Louise Paradis

Clerk of the Committee

Other members who participated

Jack Anawak David Bjornson Bill Casey Mary Clancy Stan Darling Darryl Gray Albina Guarnieri John Harvard Bob Hicks Al Horning Bill Kempling Allan Koury Beth Phinney André Plourde Robert Porter René Soetens Lyle Vanclief Jacques Viens

Brian White

Published under authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons by the Queen's Printer for Canada.

Available from the Canadian Government Publishing Center, Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9 COMITÉ PERMANENT DES DROITS DE LA PERSONNE ET DE LA CONDITION DES PERSONNES HANDICAPÉES

Président: Bruce Halliday

Vice-président: Maurice Tremblay

Membres

Bill Attewell
Gilles Bernier
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Barbara Greene
David Kilgour
Peter McCreath
Walter McLean
Svend Robinson
Christine Stewart
Joseph Volpe
David Walker
Neil Young—(14)

(Quorum 8)

Le greffier du Comité

Marie Louise Paradis

Autres membres qui ont participés

Jack Anawak David Bjornson Bill Casey Mary Clancy Stan Darling Darryl Gray Albina Guarnieri John Harvard Bob Hicks Al Horning Bill Kempling Allan Koury Beth Phinney André Plourde Robert Porter René Soetens Lyle Vanclief Jacques Viens Brian White

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes par l'Imprimeur de la Reine pour le Canada.

En vente: Centre d'édition du gouvernement du Canada, Approvisionnements et Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

REPORT TO THE HOUSE

The Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons has the honour to present its

SECOND REPORT

In accordance with its mandate under Standing Order 108(3)(c), your Committee has studied major issues relating to the economic integration of disabled persons. Your Committee has heard evidence from a range of expert witnesses and reports its findings and recommendations.

STANDARD COME SEVER ON BUILDING ACCUME

COMMETE TO SHAP HANDS TO LARSE CONCURSED IN PROSECUTION TO COMMETE STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF TH

Committee of the Commit

Antonia Control of the

President States and States

THE THE ATT ATT ATT ATT ATT

Managers

Particular to provide and the party of the p

The Standing Committee on High all My phrand the Status of Distibiled Persons by court to the present its

Same Marketing Committee of the Committe

THE COURT OF THE C

In accordance with its mandato under Standing Order 1982 (c), your Committee one studied major issues relating to the oconomic integration of distinguished persons. Your Committee him lies of our fixed him fixed him lies of our fixed him or annot of our fixed him fixed him lies of our fixed him fixed him

What the state of the additional of

An plantation on the supply set for the set of the state of the supply of the state of the state

The state of the s

na libres de la Canallai Commisse de Legas a como de la libres California de la processo de la come de la come April 1988 de Canalla California El Addition de la California de la come de

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee could not have completed its study on the economic integration of disabled persons, without the co-operation and support of numerous people. The Chairman and Members of the Committee extend their thanks to all the witnesses who shared with them their insights and their knowledge on this subject, as well as the organizations and individuals that submitted briefs.

Our thanks go, as well, to the staff of the committee. Dr. Jack Stilborn and Dr. William Young of the Library of Parliament established and coordinated our research program. Marie Louise Paradis, the Clerk of the Committee, organized our activities and managed the production of this report.

The Members of the Committee also wish to express their appreciation to the staff of the Committees Directorate, the Translation Bureau of the Secretary of State and the support services of the House of Commons, which provided logistical and administrative support in the development of this report.

Finally, the Chairman wishes to thank the Members of the Committee and other Members of Parliament who have participated for the numerous hours they dedicated to studying this question and preparing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pag	e
INT	roduc	TION	1
	A. B.	Economic Integration: A Theme For Change Our Work To Date	1 3
I.	ACCOL	NTABILITY: HISTORY OF AN IMPASSE	5
II.	WHERE	E NEXT?	3
	A.	The American Model	3
	В.	The Canadian Circumstance	
	C.	Action Not Advice	8
III.	OUR A	GENDA2	3
	A.	Potential Unfulfilled: Poverty and People With Disabilities	
	В.	Ability Wasted: Unemployment and People With Disabilities	6
	C.	Untangling the Web	8
		1. Disincentives to Work22. Education23. Support Services34. The Role of Government3	9
IV.	MAKIN	G IT HAPPEN: THE WILL FOR CHANGE	3
ADI	PENDIX	A	7

INTRODUCTION

The International Decade of Disabled Persons, enthusiastically promoted by Canada at its inception, will draw to a close in 1992. Its results in Canadian society at large can be readily capsulized. During the past decade we have seen new levels of awareness and sincere, if sometimes patronizing, goodwill. While there have been some noteworthy achievements, progress has on the whole been modest.

Within the community of disabled persons, the decade has seen many positive developments, particularly a new emphasis on independence and a new self confidence. Above all, however, it has seen the rise of new expectations and, given persisting realities, new levels of bitterness and frustration.

What is plainly needed now is action. Canadians, both individually and in the commitments of their governments, have already recognized the need for change. Persons with disabilities, in every available forum including this Committee and its predecessors, have told us with increasing precision what changes are needed, and why. What is left is the task of making it happen.

A. Economic Integration: A Theme For Change

This report, and the series of studies which it initiates, is our attempt to contribute to the process of making change happen. We have selected, as the theme for our present and future work, the economic integration of Canadians with disabilities. The idea of economic integration, as we have come to view it, suggests perspectives which we believe provide indispensable guidance for the task which now faces Canadians: the comprehensive inclusion, within our community, of the 3.3 million of us whom we have come to recognize as people with disabilities.

First of all, the theme of economic integration acknowledges that in a society which revolves around the activities of production and consumption, those who are denied participation in the marketplace are fundamentally marginalized. The two central economic activities — production and consumption — in turn identify the central areas which will be addressed in the future work of this Committee. Employment has the same importance to people with disabilities as it does for other Canadians. It is a fundamental form of social participation and source of personal satisfaction. It is also a prerequisite for access to the cornucopia of goods, services, opportunities and experiences that are available in an affluent society, to those who have the money. Like other Canadians, people with disabilities need an adequate standard of living in order to have an acceptable quality of life.

People with disabilities are painfully aware of these realities, and have consistently chosen economic priorities in their representations before this Committee. Their concerns

are amply supported by the evidence. Statistics Canada reports that, in 1985, about one quarter of all disabled men (including one third of those unable to work) and fully one half of all disabled women (including more than 60% of those unable to work) reported annual incomes of less than \$5,000. Official unemployment rates remain far higher among people with disabilities than among other groups. Rates of real unemployment and underemployment, reflecting the larger number of persons with disabilities who have given up even trying to find work or who remain trapped in low level jobs, have been estimated to approach 80%. These figures clearly suggest that the economic integration of people with disabilities is something which Canada has not achieved.

More generally, the theme of integration can remind us of some important principles. The category of "disabled persons" is ultimately an arbitrary classification, which can lead us to ignore the universal truth that we are all unique in terms of our capabilities while being equal in terms of our fundamental status as human beings. The theme of integration reminds us that, as one of our witnesses put it, this is not a problem of "us" versus "them", but a problem of recognizing our common human condition, in practices which reflect the existence of a community, equal in citizenship and equal in rights. This recognition was persuasively expressed by one of our witnesses, Ms. Marcia Rioux of the G. Allan Roeher Institute, who said:

The needs of persons with disabilities should...not be thought of as special needs, any more than the needs of those without disabilities might have been seen as special had those with disabilities designed the world initially. If the needs of one group are seen as special, then they become pitted against the needs and rights of the rest of the population.... But if the assumption is instead that these needs and rights are not in fact special, then the discussion is about the best and most expedient way to change the systems so that they take disability, a rather unexceptional human occurrence, into account. (Issue 24, p. 23)

In addition to responding to the priority concerns of persons with disabilities, and reminding us of basic truths about disability issues, the theme of economic integration helps us to see the big picture. In the course of our hearings and other activities during recent months, we have been repeatedly struck by the interconnectedness of disability issues. Employment levels, for example, are directly affected by the structure of income support, taxation and social assistance programs which, in some cases, create powerful disincentives to employment. They are also affected by the accessibility of education and training which, like employment levels, are affected in turn by the accessibility of transportation and the availability of adequate sources of income, particularly when the costs of assistive devices are borne by the user.

The theme of economic integration, we believe, will enable us to take the comprehensive approach to these issues which is needed, if inconsistent and incompatible policies are to be brought to light. As well, it directs attention away from individual program costs and towards net costs, which is where attention should be focussed if scarce

resources are to be used efficiently. Costs of employment programs or accommodation initiatives, for example, need to be set against the substantial savings of public money achieved when the dependence of people with disabilities on social assistance is reduced.

We do not believe that economic integration is an unrealistic objective because of costs, especially when cost-benefit considerations are viewed in the context of labour market trends and anticipated labour shortages. Nor do we believe that disabled persons will demand specific changes whose net costs, on examination, prove to be extreme. We are convinced, however, that the collective failure of Canadians to give critical attention to myths about the costs of change, to recognize the rising economic and human costs of the failure to change, and to reflect these considerations in legislation, policy and practice, has become inexcusable.

B. Our Work To Date

Our work thus far has involved a series of hearings which began with briefings by advocacy and service organizations in June of 1989, and proceeded with formal hearings on the theme of economic integration commencing in February of this year. While most of the hearings have been held in Ottawa, the initial briefings were held in Toronto. Meetings were held, as well, in Washington, where we travelled to investigate comprehensive disability rights legislation which has since been passed by the Congress of the United States. A major purpose of this trip was to find out how disability issues have come to be recognized as a priority in that country.

Our hearings have apprised us of the major issues which must be addressed in a comprehensive study of economic integration. They are, by and large, the same issues that have been identified in reports dating back to the landmark overview, *Obstacles*, that the Special Committee on the Disabled and Handicapped released almost a decade ago, and that representatives of people with disabilities have repeatedly raised since that time. Sadly, the range of issues remains substantially undiminished.

In many cases where initiatives have been undertaken, we are concerned not only about their effectiveness but about inequitable levels of attention to the major types of disability: physical, developmental, psychiatric, visual, hearing, learning and invisible. Canada must seek to integrate all people with disabilities, not merely those with the highest media profile or those whose disabilities can be most conveniently accommodated.

This report provides our overview of the major issues and areas of concern, and points out relationships which need to guide the development of future proposals. It also sets out the basic findings which we have obtained thus far. Above all, it shows Canadians that we are still a long way from living up to our commitments to those among us who have disabilities. We must now ask ourselves, with renewed urgency, why this is so and what can be done about it.

I. ACCOUNTABILITY: HISTORY OF AN IMPASSE

At the present time, our hearings on the economic integration of disabled persons have convinced us that the situation is reaching an impasse. We have heard government officials, along with their corporate counterparts, point with pride to a record of achievement in meeting the needs of disabled persons. Above all, they present plans, plans and more plans. But we have also heard the voices of persons with disabilities seethe with the frustration of having to repeat well–known and well–worn arguments for actions that they feel had been promised ten years ago. What has created these two different and opposite realities?

If we look at the interactions between public expectations, parliamentary committees and government activities during the past decade, we feel that a large part of the explanation lies in the sequence of events since *Obstacles* was tabled in Parliament. The Special Committee on the Disabled and Handicapped which prepared that report in 1981 undertook the only comprehensive *tour d'horizon* on issues which related to disability which has ever been prepared in this country. The study received considerable fanfare as Canada's contribution to the International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981 and as a gateway to the Decade of Disabled Persons which runs from 1983 to 1992.

Expectations of the anticipated achievements of the Decade were enormous. The Committee's investigation met with an overwhelming response. Canadians submitted over 600 briefs, the majority of them unsolicited, and the Committee heard over 500 witnesses in centres across the country. Representatives and individuals from every aspect of Canadian society voiced their views: ministers and officials from federal, provincial and municipal governments; social service organizations of all types and organizations of persons with disabilities.

In critical ways, achievements of the 1980s lived up to anticipation. Pre-eminent among the advances for persons with disabilities was constitutional recognition. The inclusion of disabled persons in Sections 15 (1) and (2) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, remains an outstanding achievement of Canadian governments — both federal and provincial. Among all the nations of the world, Canada stands alone in including in our Constitution a clause according "equal protection and equal benefit of the law...without discrimination based on...mental or physical disability." Not only are these equality rights protected in the Constitution but since 1985, disabled persons have been provided with funds from a federally-funded Court Challenges Program to clarify these rights.

Another achievement, National Access Awareness Week, promotes at the grassroots level the partnership of the public, corporate and voluntary sectors along with national associations of and for people with disabilities. During this week, countless Canadians volunteer their time, energy and effort to provide all their fellow citizens with the opportunity to examine their communities and to become involved in developing strategies

to effect permanent change. Municipalities, corporations, organizations, unions and societies come together to meet the challenge of making concrete improvements in the accessibility of services. It has created a momentum which will continue to grow.

As an institution, Parliament too, shared in the accomplishments of the Decade. Disabled persons' concerns are now represented at the centre of Canadian democracy by our Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons. We have been granted a unique mandate by the House of Commons to "propose, promote, monitor and assess initiatives aimed at the integration and equality of disabled persons in all sectors of Canadian society." Our Committee is fortunate to possess a distinguished lineage which stretches back to the Special Committee which prepared the *Obstacles* report.

Obstacles, we still recognize, was not just a call to action but it also set out a shopping list. The final report which was tabled in the House of Commons on February 1981 made 130 recommendations. These covered the areas of human rights, employment, income, access to information, housing, independent living, access to facilities, transportation, recreation, education, technical aids, consumerism, institutional living, attitudes, prevention, research needs, and international perspectives. The Special Committee blamed the slow progress to that time on a "lack of direction and coordination on the part of government, institutional and community leaders who have the power to make changes." Obstacles also argued that by reassessing priorities and without increasing public spending, Canadians could meet the needs of citizens with disabilities.

We feel that these last observations are as relevant today as they were in 1981.

The investigation that resulted in *Obstacles* combined with the government's positive reception of the report to promote the popular belief that issues related to disability had found an important place on the social and political agenda. Because of its depth and comprehensiveness, *Obstacles* became the public benchmark against which expectations of progress have been measured. This approach is as true for those of us who sat on the Special Committee as it is for those organizations which submitted proposals for change in 1980.

What happened after *Obstacles*? Two years after the report was released, a gap showed up between the expectations of those committed to the findings in the report and the will of those responsible for the implementation of the recommendations. Initially, in December 1981, the government responded enthusiastically and made commitments to act on over eighty recommendations in the *Obstacles* report. In *Surmounting Obstacles*, which was released in 1983, the government indicated action or active consideration of all recommendations in the original report except those that were withdrawn or were outside federal jurisdiction. But where no direct implementation of the recommendations was undertaken, *Surmounting Obstacles* repeatedly stated that "reviews" were being undertaken or that "data" was being gathered or that "discussions" were underway. This

was a polite way of saying that many of the recommendations in *Obstacles* were quietly being shelved. Outside the government, however, knowledge and understanding of much of the *Obstacles* report was just filtering down to the grass roots where the expectations of government action had continued to grow.

Over the years, this gap between expectations and actions has widened. The proclamation of Section 15 of the *Charter* led disabled persons to anticipate greater progress. Organizations of disabled persons still saw the implementation of the *Obstacles* recommendations as their objective, but government departments prepared to dispute the wording and intent of specific recommendations. They argued that they had fulfilled their obligations or were proceeding "as practicable." In part, the departments' actions can be explained by the diminished level of concern for disability–related issues at the ministerial level and by the absence of an effective enforcement mechanism within the government. Without prodding from above, public servants found the task of addressing the complex issues related to disability easier to put off than to confront.

This treatment of the recommendations from *Obstacles* highlighted the fact that a true measure of accountability was absent. Was there any system to oversee the treatment of the remaining recommendations? It appears not. In the case of *Obstacles*, as with other situations, parliamentary committees appear to be the only ongoing bodies to try to establish an element of accountability in order to ensure fundamental and consistent progress for disabled persons.

Another episode began in October 1985, when Equality for All, the report of the Sub-Committee on Equality Rights, made another attempt to promote changes. The Sub-Committee noted the bureaucratic delays in implementing the Obstacles' recommendations, as well as the absence of effective co-operation among disabled persons, private organizations and governments. Further, Equality for All argued that the cost of meeting the objectives set out in Obstacles had been overemphasized and used as an excuse for inaction. In addition to recommending that the government take all necessary measures without delay to implement the Obstacles' recommendations that concerned access to facilities and services, Equality for All, proposed measures that would increase the accountability of those responsible for policies. Specifically, the report recommended that a federal coordinating agency should be responsible for supervising programs and for promoting the rights of disabled persons and that this agency should report annually to Parliament. Equality for All also recommended that a House of Commons sub-committee on the disabled and handicapped be given a permanent order of reference to study the annual report of the Minister. The Equality Rights Committee recognized that progress in the area related to disability would be difficult to achieve and urged the federal government to develop its priorities and timetables in collaboration with the provincial governments.

Towards Equality, the government's response, contains measures to address the issue of accountability for policies and programs for disabled persons. The response cited the designation of the Secretary of State as Minister Responsible for the Status of Disabled Persons and promised an annual report to Parliament. It also pointed to the establishment of a Secretariat for the Status of Disabled Persons in late 1985. The Secretariat had a mandate to develop, monitor and coordinate federal policies affecting persons with disabilities; to analyze intergovernmental initiatives; to promote integration through education, information and legislation.

In spite of these actions, there was no significant alteration in the direction of policy-making in the area of disability. The action plan which was coordinated by the Secretariat appears designed more to give the illusion of progress than to force the pace. The Secretariat could do little more. As established and maintained since late 1985, it is a small section which falls under the jurisdiction of the Assistant Under-Secretary of State (Citizenship). In spite of its broad mandate, the Secretariat has never been given statutory authority and its small staff and budget limit its activities and its clout. The annual report to Parliament consists of a short section in the annual report of the Department of the Secretary of State. Neither this Standing Committee nor its predecessors had, or have, an order of reference from the House of Commons to report on the estimates or to study the annual report of the Minister Responsible for the Status of Disabled Persons. Public servants who are responsible for disabled persons issues throughout other government departments are marginalized and have little access to the upper levels of the bureaucratic structure. In terms of assuring coordination between the federal and provincial governments, there has not been any high level federal-provincial conference to work out the mechanisms needed to ensure that co-operation leads to action.

The Sub-Committee on the Disabled and Handicapped of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, established in 1985, tried another means of increasing the accountability of those who were charged with responsibility programs and policies for persons with disabilities. The Sub-Committee attempted to build on the spirit and recommendations of earlier parliamentary reports in dealing with the concerns of persons with disabilities as producers and consumers.

Reasonably, the Sub-Committee presumed that the federal government should first get its own house in order. Certain major government departments and agencies concerned with disabilities were asked to provide information about their policies, services, special programs, and future plans. These could then be measured to assess the 'fit' between government activities and the needs of persons with disabilities. The first recommendation of the Sub-Committee in its report, *Challenge*, was that all departments and agencies prepare action plans, with realistic target dates to address accessibility, employment

policies, public communications and management commitment inasmuch as these concerned disabled persons.

Again, a call for action by a parliamentary committee provoked promises from the government. In the response, *Accepting the Challenge*, the government agreed to hire an additional 2700 persons with disabilities by 1991 and as incentives for departments to hire persons with disabilities to make provision for 400 person–years and \$15 million as well as \$3.7 million for technical aids. During their appearance before our Committee, the members of the Treasury Board Advisory Committee on Employment of Disabled Persons told us that the implementation of some of these measures has been spotty.

The government's response to *Challenge* provided realistic and measurable goals for progress for the employment of disabled persons within the public service, but with the passage of time, this Committee sees that the report did not bridge the gap between the expectations of persons with disabilities and the activities of federal departments and agencies. *Challenge* narrowed its focus to attempt to make government departments and agencies more readily accountable for their employment practices with regard to disabled persons. But the report proposed measures which, when implemented, would affect only a very small percentage of Canadians with disabilities. Beyond its efforts to spur action by making departments accountable for meeting specific target dates, the report did not address the broader issues of systemic discrimination in employment nor the means of promoting greater economic integration and independence of disabled persons for which the advocacy groups had been calling.

Some government and parliamentary bodies have taken not only the letter but also the spirit of *Challenge* to heart and have undertaken considerable efforts to eradicate systemic discrimination within their jurisdictions. In this regard, we single out the efforts of the Speaker of the House of Commons who has established a Task Force on Disabled Persons which has updated the original Action Plan for the House of Commons and has made its own recommendations to promote the accountability of managers for making progress happen. We also commend the Speaker for the personal interest he has shown by sponsoring activities for National Access Awareness week on Parliament Hill.

By 1990, we find, as well, that government departments and agencies have been called upon several times over the years to prepare responses to committee reports as well as to formulate action plans with regard to their activities, including employment, that concerned persons with disabilities. Modifications in certain programs and practices were made to satisfy the recommendations of Parliamentary Committees, and Royal Commissions such as the Abella Commission on Equality in Employment as well as the requirements of Treasury Board. Although they have not tackled the problems of systemic discrimination, many public servants, and some ministers, felt that they had achieved considerable progress in meeting the demands of persons with disabilities. In addition, the

Employment Equity Act which came into force in 1986 required all federally-regulated businesses with over 100 employees to file annual reports beginning in June 1988 regarding their employment of disabled persons, as one of four target groups. The Act focussed attention on the employment practices of the corporations affected by this legislation and they too modified their workplaces and hiring practices. Naturally enough, many corporations covered by the Act feel that they have made considerable efforts to accommodate the concerns of persons with disabilities.

During our recent hearings, it has become plain to us that disabled persons on their side and governments and business for their part, sincerely believe that each has not given sufficient weight to the legitimate claims or achievements of the other. Mr. Adrian Battcock of the Treasury Board Advisory Committee on Employment eloquently stated one side of the case when he said:

...this world is far from a perfect place and we have a long way to go in terms of removing systemic discrimination. Despite the best efforts, the best opportunities of government departments, of government programs, of government policies and particularly, in the area of government–regulated industries, our biggest fundamental flaw is to try to convince people...to understand the whole concept of systemic discrimination. [Due to] the artificial barriers that because of previous policies, previous programs, bureaucratic obstacles built into every type of process... the disabled person...has one difficult time getting past the front door. (Issue 29, p. 10)

Mr. Gérard Veilleux, the President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, put the other side of the question when he told us:

...we are confident that, in large measure, we are taking the right road. We intend to continue making the necessary adjustment and intensification of our efforts to achieve our goal, your goals. (Issue 25, p. 7)

The battle will be well and truly joined in the near future and the battleground will be the review of the *Employment Equity Act*. The call to arms will be legislated "Quotas" and "No quotas" in the employment of disadvantaged groups. The issues of enforceability and accountability will likely pit federal department against department, business against business and disadvantaged group against disadvantaged group.

Parliamentary committees, such as this one, feel caught in the middle. Our own great frustration is not that anybody says the wrong thing but nobody does the right thing. This is particularly true of government departments, agencies and private corporations which have appeared before us. As Members of this Committee, we try to carry out some monitoring of the actions of government and non–government operations as well as to understand the evolving priorities of persons with disabilities. There are limits on our capacity to enforce the accountability of governments. The bounds are set not only in terms of the time, energy and resources which we can devote to calling to task those with lagging feet, but also there are limits to our powers. We cannot force the government to accept our recommendations,

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

disabled persons from that intended by the government in proceeding to amend the Act. A mechanism specifically accountable for the government's progress on disability issues might have prodded quicker results.

Finally, since the Speech from the Throne in 1986, successive Ministers of Justice have affirmed the government's intention to amend the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, as recommended by *Equality for All*. Since March 1988 the commitment has incorporated the inclusion of reasonable accommodation. For persons with disabilities, this would remove the employer's capacity to refuse to adjust a job to suit the skills and experience of a qualified potential employee who has a disability. Appearing before this Committee on 13 June 1989, the then Minister of Justice, Hon. Doug Lewis, indicated an intention to introduce the amendments early in 1990. When the Hon. Kim Campbell, the Minister of Justice, appeared on 3 May 1990, she reiterated the commitment but postponed the date for action. Again, this shows another area in which a more effective mechanism at the centre of government might have prompted quicker action.

This Standing Committee shares the frustration of those who have been calling for comprehensive action. If one looks at the reports of parliamentary committees for the past decade, it is evident that their calls for change in areas such as those discussed above have not significantly altered the system which has, with no malice aforethought, forgotten about persons with disabilities. From *Obstacles*, through *Equality for All*, *Challenge*, and *No News is Bad News*, our colleagues through the years have listened, recommended and re–recommended. The reports, responses, studies, briefing books, that have resulted have consumed as much time and energy as it would have taken to act.

II. WHERE NEXT?

When we advocate change and accountability, we do not want to re-live the past but to put in place mechanisms that will shape the future. We recognize that the paradigm that was in place ten years ago has changed and we seek to find contemporary solutions to current problems. *Obstacles* recommendations sought to meet the needs of the 1980s. What is needed now is action to respond to the needs of the 1990s — and beyond.

Definite goals and public support are critical but we still have to ask the questions — how can things get moving? What alternatives for action will best assure both progress and accountability?

A. THE AMERICAN MODEL

On May 24, 1990 the House of Representatives of the United States Congress passed the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by a vote of 403 to 20 and joined the Senate which eight months earlier had approved the Act by a similar overwhelming margin (79 to 6). While the legislation was under consideration in the House, we visited Washington from 18 to 20 March, to study the proposed Act and its consequences. Our interest was sparked by the similarity in the history both of the disability movement and, to a certain extent, of past legislative activities in Canada and the United States.

We found that in the context of the United States, this Act is the result of a comprehensive re-thinking of the place of persons with disabilities. It is a successful effort to come to grips with the need for action and accountability in government and in the private sector to speed up social change. The ADA represents the conclusion by American legislators that educational measures, and advisory bodies, have had only a limited effect in creating a more positive attitude, and substantial progress for disabled persons. Compulsion in the form of legislation, therefore, will henceforth supplement educational efforts. In short, within matters in its jurisdiction, the United States government is making an effort to face up to its responsibility for integrating disabled persons more completely into the economic and social life of the American people as a whole.

The relevance of the ADA for Canadians is not restricted to the specific clauses of the legislation itself but encompasses the factors that brought it about and the methods of implementation. What political, social and economic forces promoted the re–thinking of the place of disabled persons on a national scale? Would the emphasis on equality of opportunity placed in the ADA be more effective than the Canadian prohibition of discrimination found in Section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Human Rights Act? How did the legislation arrive at the strict time limits on the introduction and promulgation of regulations and how will these be enforced?

The answers in the ADA are plain. The attractiveness of the legislation lies in its linking of the discrimination experienced by disabled people to the social costs of such

discrimination for all citizens of the United States. Proponents of the Act argue that it will make significant cuts in the \$60 billion that the United States spends to support disabled persons who receive various types of social assistance. It was calculated that eight million Americans with disabilities want to work but cannot gain employment as a result of social and economic barriers. Supporters of the legislation can point to estimates that the cost of modifications will be small compared to the economic benefits that will accrue from increased tax revenues and savings in social assistance costs. A study by the American Department of Labour, published in 1982, found minimal costs would accommodate most disabled persons who want to enter the labour force. The cost of one-third of the accommodations would be between \$100 and \$500.

The second element of the ADA's appeal comes from its place in the mainstream of the American political tradition. Consistent with the historic political philosophy of the United States, the legislation reflects the central place of equality of opportunity for the individual, as an American social and economic objective. Accordingly, as far as employment is concerned, the aim of the Act is to provide equality of opportunity to an individual. In short, the ADA adopts the viewpoint of disabled persons themselves. The Act treats them as autonomous citizens with the right to live independently and to make their own unique contribution.

The concepts of accountability and enforcement are built into the Act. Not only are there deadlines to develop standards in employment, transportation and public accommodations but there will be significant penalties for non-compliance. In Canada, the general phraseology of regulations has too often led to court interpretations that erode their effectiveness. Although individual Americans can still proceed through complaints and litigation, departments and agencies of the U.S. government will be obligated to enforce clearly-written regulations, with specific standards and both of these come into effect on a date that is known in advance. By publishing the regulations in advance of their effective date, employers or businesses who must make modifications have the time to prepare.

Canadians can learn from the range of measures included in the ADA. Accommodation, for example, is required unless undue hardship would result in order to enable disabled persons to perform the "essential duties" of the job. As part of an employer's obligation to accommodate, the Act refers to restructuring work, part time work, re–assignment of duties, assistive devices and services, as well as training. The concept of "undue hardship" will be based on cost and will be subject to standards developed by a federal agency (The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission).

It is important to note the role that disabled persons have played in developing and in lobbying for the legislation. Disability rights organizations have used federal funds for human rights education to go to the grass roots, to identify local leaders and to forge a

strong network. This ultimately became a coalition that successfully came to be involved in the American political process — a non-partisan approach with a strong base within the two political parties formed to defend services for disabled persons from the federal budget-trimming of the early 1980s.

Because of the activism of disabled persons, issues related to disability attracted strong political interest. During the 1986 Congressional campaign, a disabled person tracked every candidate. American legislators came to realize that disabled persons formed a separate political constitutency that was 35 million strong. By the 1988 presidential campaign, both candidates had disability committees. The endorsement of a civil rights bill for disabled persons swung a major proportion of the disabled persons vote to the Republican candidate. The support of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights brought political status and media exposure to the legislative proposals. Following the election, the Bush Administration gave its blessing to the idea of an *Americans with Disabilities Act* and worked to prepare a version of the bill for presentation in the Senate.

By entering the political process, the disabled persons organizations in the United States had to confront certain realities and form certain partnerships. They had to re-evaluate their own objectives, and their own priorities in the light of decisions that they made themselves about what specific measures could be realistically achieved. Our Committee was greatly impressed by the balance that they struck and the victories that they won. In order to get the ADA through Congress, the representatives of the organizations of disabled persons negotiated modifications to their original "wish-list" directly with elected officials and bureaucrats as well as the business community. They sat face-to-face with their opponents and presented arguments based on research and on hard facts. It was not by complaining and appealing to a generalized sense of moral outrage that the passage of the *Americans with Disabilities Act* was brought about.

We applaud all those who fought for this magnificent advance in the integration of disabled persons into the life of the United States.

B. THE CANADIAN CIRCUMSTANCE

We must keep in mind that we live in a different country with a different system of political values and institutions. Although similarities abound between Canadian and American societies, we must determine what works for us. Much of what is included in the *Americans with Disabilities Act*, for example, falls outside the powers of a Canadian federal government.

At the same time, progress should be as easily achieved here as in the United States. Not only do we have a unique constitutional commitment to the rights of disabled persons which is embodied in *The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, but we have a greater

tradition of working toward social justice through government action. In addition to this, Canadians have traditionally expected their federal government to lead and their provincial governments to follow suit.

Some of the most important elements are already in place to move issues forward into the new decade. Organizations of disabled persons have defined their goals and articulated their needs. From the initial stages of self-help organizations grew the consumer movement of groups of persons with disabilities that has committed service providers, intellectually at least, to the idea that disabled persons have the right and the capacity to identify their own needs and goals. Consumerism has shifted onward to advocacy which is claiming for persons with disabilities the right of full participation in society. During our hearings, we received testimony outlining specific aspects required to ensure participation from a broad spectrum of individuals and organizations.

The Canadian public has demonstrated overwhelming support for achieving these goals. A survey conducted by Environics Research during October 1987 found that a representative national sample of 2013 Canadians supported changes to benefit persons with disabilities. Respondents were asked to indicate the level of their support for legal measures to provide equal access or affirmative action in both the government and the private sector for people who are physically or mentally disabled as well as aboriginal people, visible minorities and women. Support for equal access legislation was greatest for those with physical disabilities and over 90% of Canadians support measures applicable to both the public and private sectors. For women, support lies at 84% followed by native people (79%), people with mental disabilities (79%) and visible minorities (72%). Not only are Canadians willing to support legislated affirmative action but they are prepared to spend money. For example, 70% of Canadians agreed to support a \$50 tax increase if that is what it takes to integrate public transportation.

There are, however, a few areas where the pieces of the puzzle need to be filled in. If decision—makers at all levels of government and in the private sector are to be persuaded to act, the most convincing argument will be that the benefits of moving towards greater economic integration outweigh the economic costs of maintaining the present system. Proposals such as disability tax credits, disability insurance and extending social allowance benefits for expenses related to disability will be costly to implement. It is important, as Robert McInnes of the Canadian Council of Rehabilitation and Work (CCRW) told us, that governments realize that they "may benefit financially in the long–term through an initial investment at the start."

In this period, when the government is trying to control its expenditures, we are surprised that Canadian government departments and agencies, as well as organizations of disabled persons, have not approached disability issues from the perspective of costs and benefits. Without an appreciation of these facts of life, we wonder about the relevance and

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

shared program are incalculable in terms of making limited financial resources stretch further. The groups could establish a single campaign both to draw in less active groups and for research, communication, education and lobbying.

Partnerships outside the disability movement to promote significant changes are essential. We saw the positive effect of the formation of partnerships when the Canadian Council on Rehabilitation and Work appeared before us. Recognizing that a gap existed in communications between employers, people with disabilities and the various service organizations, as Robert McInnes, Executive Director of CCRW, told us:

We took it upon ourselves, with our very limited resources to start a communication process with employers, with national corporations and national organizations... (Issue 20, p. 5)

This is just one small area which could be greatly extended to others. For example, many of the disincentives to work, the problems with social assistance and unemployment insurance benefits that apply to people who traditionally are considered to be disabled also apply to people with AIDS or children living in poverty. Currently, devising an AIDS strategy is receiving considerable attention at all levels in the federal government and child poverty has appeared on the political agenda. A coalition composed of AIDS groups, those concerned with child poverty and disabled persons, all with common objectives, could more effectively advocate changes throughout the political and governmental system.

C. ACTION NOT ADVICE

The aim of this report is to provoke action, not to provide advice. Throughout our hearings on the issue of economic integration, disabled persons provided us with many suggestions as to the best way to proceed. These ideas can be broken down into three general areas: a federal legislative program, a mechanism to ensure accountability at the centre of government and greater federal–provincial co–operation. We believe that progress must occur on all of these fronts if the current needs of persons with disabilities are to be met.

Many of our witnesses submitted proposals which they would like to see included in legislation and regulations. Most of these measures are not new ideas but are a restatement of issues currently under consideration by the government. Pre-eminent among these are amendments to the *Canadian Human Rights Act* to include the concept of accommodation and to address the issue of *bona fide* occupational requirements. Among other suggestions are a variety of issues that could be dealt with by legislative or regulatory reform: employment, election law, the *Canada Evidence Act*, tax and Canadian Pension Plan barriers to employment. Transportation is an obvious area where action has been promised and has been "in the works" for many years. The mechanism in the *National Transportation Act* to establish binding regulations in a host of areas has not been utilized. The *Immigration*

Act presently requires immigration officials to refuse entry to those with disabilities who apply for landed immigrant status. People who are deaf or hearing-impaired have long advocated a requirement for increased captioning. This might be supplemented by another requirement that all televisions contain a micro-chip which permits decoding of closed captions at a small expense. Changes to the federal building code could serve as a model for the other levels of government and housing could be made more accessible by introducing a compliance mechanism in Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's contracts.

What we would like to see is a comprehensive assessment of the legislative and regulatory options and a comprehensive commitment to carry out reforms which includes a timetable for implementation. Where required, this timetable should include delays, that are known in advance, to allow those who must make modifications to undertake these changes.

Given that disabled persons can point to a growing list of unfulfilled undertakings, we feel that a mechanism to assure progress in the federal government must be established. This would, among other things, provide a reassurance that the legitimate concerns of disabled persons would be heard and dealt with expeditiously. Again, we have formulated a list of alternatives.

Both the Canadian Paraplegic Association (CPA) and the Treasury Board Advisory Committee on Employment (ACE Committee) urged the establishment of a Prime Minister's Council on Disabled Persons. Although CPA and the ACE Committee called this an "advisory" council, when we analyze their proposals, we realize that they want a body with a stronger mandate than that associated with existing advisory bodies within the government. Under normal circumstances, an advisory council might be useful but we share the view of the majority of our witnesses that today's circumstances warrant a mechanism with stronger enforcement powers than those associated with providing "advice" and making recommendations. The history of the recommendations of parliamentary committees concerned with disability have shown us that what is needed now is more muscle at the centre of government. An advisory council with part-time members and a mandate to inquire - but not to enforce - would likely only increase the frustration of disabled persons across the country. Brian Bertelson is the senior member of the ACE Committee which directly advises the President of the Treasury Board and is the most centrally-located advisory committee of disabled persons in the federal government. Yet, he told us that his greatest disappointment lay in the hedging of the departments in providing information to the ACE Committee.

We like the idea of an independent agency, perhaps modeled on the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, that audits policy implementation and reports on progress to Parliament through this Standing Committee. In part, this is because we find it attractive to split the policy-making side of disabled persons issues from the grant-giving

aspects. Perhaps such an agency could even work directly with us under an expanded budget and mandate for this Committee. There is much to be said for the beneficial results of having two complementary and separate bodies sharing responsibility for a policy area. Competition can lead to progress.

But we confess to doubts about the capacity of an independent agency to effect immediate changes. In the long-term, such an agency might have a significant impact, but in the short-term, the members of such a body would be occupied with the necessary steps to become truly operational. Delays would result from the need to find offices, hire staff, decide on appropriate areas in which to exercise its mandate and establish working relationships throughout the government structure. Realistically, it would take a minimum of three years before any such agency could become effective.

Because this Committee shares with disabled persons an impatient wish for immediate action, we are looking for a mechanism that can easily be incorporated into the existing structure of government. This can and should be supplemented by other actions, perhaps a task–force established by the Prime Minister that compares to the environmental roundtable, or a Prime Minister's special representative. These could be superseded in time by an agency reporting to this Committee. A voice at the centre is imperative because, as we noted above, disabled persons units, directorates and secretariats appear to function on the margin of their respective departments. In short, they are not effectively integrated into the central decision—making process of government.

What we seek is the best means to achieve this integration. In our system, the final decisions regarding the government's priorities and programs are made by the cabinet and by its committees. The responsibility for policing the preparation of memoranda to cabinet, preparing the agenda, briefing the Prime Minister and the chairs of committees and of dealing with crisis, lies in the Privy Council Office (PCO). The PCO, in turn, is divided into secretariats designated to deal with groups of issues. We wonder if disabled persons are well served by the Privy Council Office. Unlike women, visible minorities, or aboriginal people, there has never been an officer in the Privy Council Office whose sole responsibility has been to coordinate cabinet business inasmuch as it relates to disabled persons. We feel that disabled persons deserve more than this.

We therefore urge the immediate appointment of a ranking official of the PCO to assume responsibility for disabled persons and to perform the relevant ongoing functions related to cabinet activities. This official could serve as the link to cabinet of a high–level committee that is composed of representatives, perhaps deputy ministers, of other central agencies and significant departments. This could ensure that all government agencies take action, as required.

In the final area to be addressed, that of federal-provincial cooperation, we have received several suggestions and, in one sense, warnings. In light of the testimony which we have heard that depending on the province or territory of residence, there are twelve different standards of living for disabled persons who receive social assistance, we feel that federal-provincial issues must be addressed. We also heard of serious anomalies in the administration of federal-provincial cost-sharing programs such as the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) and the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Program (VRDP).

Submissions made by different organizations suggested different solutions. The representatives of the Canadian Disability Rights Council told us that they have concluded from their legal research that Section 15 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* requires the federal government to administer its funds under cost–sharing agreements in such a way that the equality of persons with disabilities is advanced. As a measure of its frustration, the ACE Committee urged that the federal government should tie its spending power to the implementation by the provinces of national standards for disability–related programs.

We also heard other less drastic and divisive coordinating proposals that might be tried. These included the appointment of a Prime Minister's personal representative to negotiate alterations in agreements with the provinces in critical areas where programs are cost–shared. In a more positive vein, the CPA advocates the creation of a federal–provincial advisory committee and tabled a proposal that issues related to the disabled persons should be considered at the First Ministers Conference this autumn. This latter suggestion has considerable merit both for raising the national profile of issues related to disability, and providing the flexibility for the federal government and the provinces to decide on a mutually acceptable course for future action.

III. OUR AGENDA

The hearings we have held during recent months have persuaded us that long standing systemic impediments continue to reduce the effectiveness of individual initiatives and programs. This problem should, however, be viewed as an opportunity. Its resolution promises increased results from many of our existing programs, as well as a greater likelihood that future initiatives will not be, in effect, sabotaged by the context in which they are implemented. We have been convinced, by insightful presentations from several consumers' groups as well as our own independent findings, that a comprehensive approach to economic integration, which pays special attention to the linkages between disability issues and programs, is now an indispensable precondition for significant progress. As one of our witnesses argued with respect to poverty:

The Canadian Disability Rights Council submits that the structural poverty of persons with disabilities will not be changed without a comprehensive approach to income security programs, education and training, and employment. These issues cannot be looked at in isolation from each other, nor can existing programs be merely tinkered with if a real change to the lives of persons with disabilities is to be made. In addition to developing a strategy to deal with these key issues which affect the incomes of persons with disabilities, measures must be taken which will correct the many contributing problems in areas such as access, information, rights, immigration, taxation, transportation, institutionalization, and others. Without a comprehensive approach to the problem, persons with disabilities in Canada will stay poor. (Issues 27, Appendix "HUDI–14" pp 2–3)

During the remaining life of this Parliament, we intend to contribute to a comprehensive approach to economic integration by building on the foundation established in this report. We hope that our future work can help strengthen political will, increase the accountability of government departments, and spur action that gets results.

We will be continuing the work begun this Spring with a series of hearings and reports, starting in the Fall. The initial phase of this work will be an investigation of the two problems, mentioned at the outset of this report, which we have come to see as central to the economic integration of people with disabilities. Poverty and employment issues are consequences of a range of shortcomings at all levels of our system, and progress in their resolution will only be achieved when the system, as a whole, is managed to produce it. An exploration of these problems, and of practical solutions, is thus the logical starting point for a comprehensive approach to economic integration.

A. Potential Unfulfilled: Poverty and People With Disabilities

Although we confronted many paradoxes during our hearings on economic integration, none has proven as intractable as breaking the lockstep that exists between poverty and disability. Mr. Adrian Battcock stated the problem bluntly when he pointed out that:

The reality is that 80% or 85% of all disabled people in Canada come from social, economic and cultural backgrounds where they lack the primary tools to assimilate into the greater society. (Issue 29, p. 11)

The facts speak for themselves. Nineteen eighty-six statistics show that 14.3% or 2,794,000 disabled persons in the Canadian population are over the age of 15 years. If poverty is defined as those with an income of \$10,000 or less, these people tend to be poorer than their fellow citizens. According to 1985 figures, 15.5% of all Canadians could be defined as poor, but for people with disabilities the figure rises to 50% even in wealthy Ontario. Figures show that women have an even higher poverty rate than disabled men.

The poverty of Canadians with disabilities shows up graphically in terms of actual income including earnings, investment income, private pensions and government benefits. Sixty-three per cent of the persons with disabilities received an income of less than \$10,000. In Ontario, disabled persons between the ages of 15 and 64 had gross incomes which were 46% lower than those of non-disabled Ontarians of the same age. Incomes would have been still lower, except that so many disabled persons receive some type of pension. In fact, almost half the working age disabled population received no earnings at all. Over eighty percent of women with disabilities earned \$10,000 or less and almost 60% claimed to have earned nothing.

Why does this poverty exist? In large part, we feel that it results from the failure to undertake sustained and well-thought-out attempts to encourage disabled persons to participate in the labour force. This, we will leave to the next section of this report. But there are also a myriad of reasons that we will briefly explore here. Income security programs frequently exclude disabled persons precisely because they have not worked for pay. Disability benefits offered both by the Canada and Quebec pensions plans, for example, are similar to Unemployment Insurance in requiring a work history which disabled people do not have. In addition to this, the disability benefits systems include eligibility requirements that have little to do with the nature of the disability but rather, with how or why the disability occured. In terms of benefits provided under these programs, we note that many people told us of their meagreness. Irene Feika, the National Chair of the Coalition of Provincial Organizations of the Handicapped (COPOH) told us that "It is the kind of money where you exist, you do not live." Money available under the Canada Assistance Plan varies from province to province to a maximum of \$720 per month. And there are disincentives to work that come with these benefits. Some people have to class themselves as incapable of holding employment. This makes the individual ineligible for employment-related training.

Disabled persons are discouraged from living outside the welfare umbrella. Irene Feika described the inherent disincentives to work that keeps disabled persons below the poverty line:

... you heard me say this a hundred times, folks, my medicines cost \$500 a month. For me to be employed, I need to be in a situation where I am being well paid, where I have a good benefit package in order to make it worthwhile to work... If your technical aids, if your attendant care, is part of that disability pension, it is not worthwhile working in many instances because you will have less disposable income than if you stayed on a pension. (Issue 27, p. 17)

In addition, the low exemptions for earnings and assets in both pensions and social assistance programs keep disabled individuals from building up their own contingency fund. They cannot work without giving up their entitlement to welfare or to the benefits such as extended health coverage or technical aids that come with a disability pension.

Poverty levels are exacerbated by the nature of the federal-provincial relationship. We received evidence from COPOH that when the federal government raised disability benefits available under the Canada Pension Plan two years ago, the provinces treated the extra \$150 per month as income and deducted it dollar-for-dollar from income security cheques. Currently, COPOH told our Committee that it is afraid that provincial governments will treat the refundable tax credit from the proposed Goods and Services Tax in the same manner. Disabled people have to work hard merely to stay in the same place.

In proceeding with our study of economic integration, inasmuch as it relates to poverty, we wish to make one thing clear: we do not believe that it is necessary for governments to spend more money. The comment in *Obstacles* that we quoted earlier, bears repeating:

Without increasing public spending, Canadians have an opportunity to meet the needs of our disabled citizens, and thus join the ranks of those countries who can be proud of the way they recognize the human potential of everyone. (*Obstacles*, p. 6).

One of our witnesses, Marcia Rioux, put the problem in context when she said:

The problem we start with in looking broadly at disability is that most of the programs and policies that are in place were established as add-ons to programs that did not have the issues involved in disability in mind when they were conceived. Historically, they began with assumptions that people with disabilities would not be a part of the mainstream of society... In most cases, the result is a series of social and economic programs that have an add-on to deal with disability. (Issue 24, p. 22)

By treating disabled persons as individuals with "special" needs, rather than as citizens with the same rights as others, debate has centred around how money can be distributed to fill the needs of this "special" group. We notice that the argument which segregates out disabled persons is most often used to deny them resources or to "throw money" at them. We propose to take a different approach. By studying the ways of changing the systems that take disability into account, we hope to make useful recommendations that, we predict, will actually reduce the costs of disability-related programs.

B. Ability Wasted: Unemployment and People With Disabilities

The need to create employment opportunities for disabled persons rests at the center of the set of issues involved in economic integration. Our success in the area of employment, indeed, can serve as a litmus test of the effectiveness of the whole universe of governmental policies, including the tax system, income support programs and the elimination of disincentives to work, education and training, transportation and access to facilities. More directly, it is a test of the effectiveness of employment programs themselves.

1. Employment levels

The facts of the employment situation are beyond dispute. Statistics Canada provided us with a valuable overview of the employment situation of people with disabilities, based on the 1986 Health and Activity Limitations Survey (HALS). This survey provides much-needed, non-anecdotal information about disability and we hope it can be repeated in the future so that longitudinal data, indicating trends, can be developed. Until this is done, the overall impact of recent governmental initiatives (with the partial exception of those in the employment equity area, which supply their own data) cannot accurately be determined.

According to our expert witnesses, approximately 40% of the population of 1.8 million adults with disabilities was employed as of 1986, in contrast to 70% of the comparable population without disabilities. Of the 896,000 people with disabilities who were not in the labour force in that year, 69% indicated that they were completely unable to work and relied upon various forms of social assistance, pensions, workers' compensation, or insurance. The remaining 280,000 indicated they were able to work, although about half indicated some limitation in the kind or amount of work they could do. The population not in the labour force includes both people who have given up seeking work because of discouragement and people who feel that they cannot afford to declare themselves able to work, or seek work, because this could threaten the loss of disability benefits.

A further category of adults with disabilities consists of the unemployed — those without work but actively seeking it. In 1986, 128,000 people with disabilities (mostly between the ages of 25 and 44) belonged in this category. The unemployment rate of persons with disabilities was thus 15.2%, almost double that of persons without disabilities. HALS identified that by far the most common barrier was "lack of suitable employment", followed by "inadequate transportation." It is important to keep in mind that the unemployment rate of persons with disabilities, although much higher than that of other Canadians, significantly understates the severity of the overall employment problem because of high levels of discouragement and withdrawal from the labour force in this

group. Consumers' groups of disabled persons have estimated that the rate of underemployment and unemployment among people with disabilties approaches 80%.

2. Major Programs

At the federal level, Employment and Immigration Canada administers a range of employment and human resource development programs. A number of our witnesses from consumers' groups drew attention to the low participation rates of persons with disabilities within these programs, and argued that community—based programs run by and for persons with disabilities have achieved more favourable results.

Canada Employment Centres, for example, are normally the services of first resort for job seekers and, during 1988–89, placed approximately 7,700 disabled people in jobs (on the basis of figures provided in departmental Main Estimates, this represents approximately 0.9% of all placements). The Canadian Jobs Strategy (CJS) consists of six major programs providing developmental assistance to targetted clienteles such as the long-term unemployed, and young people or women facing difficulties entering the labour market. While departmental officials indicated that the CJS sets "fair target levels" for the participation of people with disabilities within each of its components and trained over 6,000 in this group during 1988–89, this figure represents a participation rate by persons with disabilities of only 1.7%. As well, persons with disabilities constituted less than 1% of the number of students who participated in the Department's summer student program, Challenge 88.

Employment and Immigration Canada also administers the collection of data that is required by the *Employment Equity Act*, which was proclaimed on 13 August 1986. The second report to Parliament under the Act, tabled in December of 1989, demonstrated that the representation of disabled persons in the federally regulated workforce remains unacceptable. Persons with disabilities represented 1.71% of the workforce in 1988, an increase from 1.59% in the previous year. There is reason to believe, furthermore, that a significant portion of this increase reflects a greater number of existing employees identifying themselves as persons with disabilities and not new positions filled by disabled persons.

Within the public service itself, Treasury Board administers an employment equity program involving the establishment of departmental action plans and the reporting of results. Since 1987, this program has required departments to establish numerical representation targets by major occupation, including the management category. Current targets require that 6,907 disabled persons be employed by 31 March 1991, an increase of 40% over 31 March 1988. While final conclusions on the success of this program would be premature, witnesses from the Treasury Board Advisory Committee on Employment of Disabled Persons indicated that results do not reflect true equity principles.

While the comments of witnesses about most current programs focussed on results, their concerns about employment programs funded under the *Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Persons Act* (VRDP) related to underlying assumptions. It was argued that the thrust of these programs is too often segregational rather than integrative. Sheltered workshops supported by VRDP funding, for example, were portrayed as keeping people with disabilities outside the conventional workforce, unprotected by labour standards and without access to work–related benefits such as workers'compensation, unemployment insurance, or the Canada/Quebec pension plan.

We were impressed by the level of sincere goodwill, and many of the plans for enhanced action, described for us by corporate and governmental witnesses. We share, however, the sense of frustration repeatedly expressed to us by people with disabilities. Given the length of time disabled persons have been waiting for commitments to be fulfilled, sincerity and goodwill are no longer enough. Nor are governmental initiatives, unless they produce results.

C. Untangling the Web

Poverty and employment issues lie at the centre of a web of interconnected causes and effects. While we can identify the central position of these two problems, we also know that we cannot develop effective solutions without taking account of the context in which poverty and unemployment persist. Our studies, therefore, will both explore these two problems and identify issues and areas of governmental activity with important linkages to them. Our recent work has already identified a number of such areas.

1. Disincentives to Work

Our witnesses have advised us that various employment, social benefit, and training programs contain disincentives for persons with disabilities to seek jobs, and are thus major contributors to both unemployment and poverty. Public and private insurance plans discourage persons who become disabled from returning to full or part–time employment by disqualifying them from future benefits. Disability pensions providing assistance for medical expenses, technical aids and attendant care may, in effect, "trap" people with disabilities in unemployment, given that available employment and benefits packages can result in a loss of disposable income to those becoming employed.

It was argued, as well, that assistive devices required for employment are not items of discretionary spending, and that the current tax system discourages people with disabilities from entering the workforce by failing to provide for the full deductibility of employment–related expenses, and discourages the employment of persons with disabilities by failing to permit employers to deduct the full costs of accommodating their needs.

At the present time, in an era of great fiscal constraint, it would appear that taxpayers are simultaneously financing programs which discourage people with disabilities from working and programs intended to foster their employment. Nothing could more strongly demonstrate the need for a comprehensive — and consistent — approach to disability issues. Aside from enabling existing programs to work better, such an approach may be expected to achieve significant cost savings, particularly where it enables persons with disabilities to move from complete reliance on income support programs to employment, supplemented by assistance, to defray the costs of disability.

2. Education

A low educational level is a major barrier to adequate employment, for all people including those with disabilities, and thus a central contributor to poverty. Conversely, education and training can provide a vitally important means for a person with disabilities to gain adequately–remunerated employment in a job market that is likely narrowed to start with, by other barriers.

According to Statistics Canada's 1986 Health and Activity Limitation Survey, persons with disabilities tend to have a lower level of formal education than their non-disabled counterparts. In 1986, fully one third of the population of disabled persons had no higher than a primary school education (versus 11% of the non-disabled population) and 61% had not completed high school (versus 38% of the non-disabled population). At the other end of the spectrum, only 4% of disabled persons had a university degree, versus 11% of the non-disabled population.

The impact of education on employment levels is striking. While disabled persons with only a primary school education had an employment ratio of 17% (versus 55% for non-disabled persons), those with a university degree had an employment ratio of 50% (versus 87% for non-disabled persons). The fact that disabled persons with university degrees still had an employment ratio that was lower than that of non-disabled persons with only a primary school education clearly indicates that education, alone, will not resolve employment problems. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the employment level of disabled persons improved more rapidly, as educational levels increased, than did that of non-disabled persons.

According to witnesses representing the National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS), a national survey of post–secondary educational institutions revealed substantial variations in levels of physical accessibility as well as in levels of service required by specific disabilities, such as visual impairment or learning disabilities. The overall picture was summarized, in blunter terms, by Mr. David Leitch, of the Atlantic Centre of Support for Disabled Students, who said:

People in those universities who are open and aware know something about the "Obstacles" report. They know about the commitments of the federal government. They know about the *Charter of Rights*, but it is still "if it is convenient, we will do something"; and when they do something, they make so much of it, it is a form of benevolence. That does have to change. (Issue 26, p. 11)

Educational programs funded under the Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Persons Act, which provides for federal coverage of 50% of the costs of a range of provincial "vocational rehabilitation services" designed to help people with disabilities pursue employment, came in for specific criticism. We were advised that the vocational emphasis of program can channel students into areas of study which do not match their interests, thus increasing the likelihood of failure; that funding for graduate studies (a virtual prerequisite for employment in some areas) is not available; that assistance levels and regional variations in the provision of services remains a problem; and that people with some varieties of disability, such as those with learning disabilities or hearing-impaired are markedly less well– served than others.

A critically important point was made during our hearings by a witness representing the Canadian Association of the Deaf. Education is much more than a means of getting a job. Without it, individuals may not clearly understand their rights and entitlements under existing law, or the political and bureaucratic processes which define, implement and change this framework. Without an understanding of these areas, and the skills required to use these mechanisms, disabled persons are excluded from the primary processes through which integration can be achieved.

3. Support Services

The impacts of such ancillary services and facilities as transportation and housing on the employment of disabled persons has not, to our knowledge, been systematically studied. Our witnesses have indicated to us, however, that the availability of accessible transportation or suitably–located and affordable housing, can often make a critical difference to employment prospects and living standards.

The relationships, furthermore, run in both directions. One of our witnesses suggested to us that a central reason for the lethargic rate of change in the area of accessible transportation, for example, is the assumption on the part of planners that people with disabilities "have nowhere to go," i.e. do not need public transportation to get to jobs. Equally, as long as persons with disabilities remain for the most part poor, they will be unable to obtain suitably–located housing or to afford modifications which may be required to enable them to cope with the combined demands of home life and full–time participation in the workplace.

We have noted, in an earlier section, that 1988 amendments to the *National Transportation Act* mandated the National Transportation Agency to develop regulations to

ensure the accessibility of federally-regulated modes of transport to persons with disabilities, and that these regulations have yet to appear. While these regulations will affect interprovincial travel rather than the local trips most obviously associated with employment needs, we wish to note that interprovincial travel is required, at least occasionally, in many jobs. Transportation barriers to disabled persons thus affect more than integration within the marketplace for recreational travel and tourism, they also join a myriad of other barriers whose combined effect is to narrow the practical range of job opportunities.

Our witnesses have also drawn attention to a range of additional services that have an impact upon economic integration. Among these are child care, both as it relates to the parental care of children with disabilities and affects their disposable income and participation in employment, and as it relates to access by persons with disabilities to child care and their disposable income and employment. Financial barriers to access to attendant care and assistive devices also require attention, as does the removal of what our witnesses have advised us are discriminatory eligibility requirements which sometimes place those most in need at the greatest risk of not receiving these supports.

4. The Role of Government

Many of these areas reviewed above and elsewhere in this report either cross jurisdictional boundaries are lie within the jurisdiction of provincial governments. Our witnesses have shown ample awareness, however, that the world of federal provincial relations is a world of practical political arrangements as well as a world of constitutionally–defined jurisdictions. Our witnesses have made it repeatedly clear to us that they look to the federal government for comprehensive leadership across the range of issues related to disability, and regardless of jurisdictional niceties. One witness, indeed, went as far as to call for the federal government to invoke the general spending power set out in Section 91 of the *Constitution Act*, and simply go ahead and do what needs to be done.

Having called for comprehensive action, and having recognized that it is unlikely to occur unless responsibility for it is clearly vested, we recognize that the federal government must take the lead role in bringing about change. One dimension of our future work will be to explore forms of leverage which can be brought to bear on the federal–provincial scene.

As we have argued in a previous section, accountability and leverage are needed not only on the national scene, but within the federal government itself. At the present time, federal employment policy and programs fall under three different departments, and policies relating to economic integration are administered by virtually the whole universe of departments, Crown corporations, boards and agencies which operate within the federal jurisdiction. The coordination issue clearly requires attention.

Like previous parliamentary committees, we believe that the federal government must put a priority on getting its own house in order. Our hearings suggest that there is a considerable distance yet to be travelled in this regard, and that the degree of integration of persons with disabilities within the federal government currently ranks as an acute embarrassment, particularly in light of the commitments reviewed in Section 2 of this report. Witnesses from the Treasury Board Advisory Committee on Disabled Persons provided an especially well–informed, if depressing, overview of processes at work within the federal bureacracy, including the persistence of testing methods, used by the Public Service Commission, which exclude capable people whose disabilities prevent them from taking the tests. More generally, we were told that the federal government is not meeting even its own modest targets for the hiring of people with disabilities. None of our witnesses, including departmental officials, undertook to defend the government's internal record. It is indefensible. Its improvement is clearly an immediate priority.

IV. MAKING IT HAPPEN: THE WILL FOR CHANGE

In previous sections of this report, we have surveyed past actions, directions for the future, and the contribution this Committee plans to make. In this concluding section, we consider the immediate issue: how can change be made to happen?

The absence, within the federal government, of an effective and accountable mechanism for change is one important reason why Canada's commitments to people with disabilities remain only partly fulfilled. As well, it is hard to deny convincingly that another reason is provided by the nature and degree of real will underlying these commitments. In surveys of public opinion and through the commitments of successive governments, Canadians have professed concern about the situation of persons with disabilities, and intentions to act. The results achieved to date suggest, however, that it may be time for Canadians to consider their true motives.

Do we really care about people with disabilities? Or are we interested primarily in feeling good about ourselves, and achieving the easy gratification which comes from declarations of good intentions? We suspect that the full answer to this question is not without an element of discomfort. We have been impressed again and again, however, during the course of our hearings and as we interact with Canadians outside our committee rooms, by how many Canadians genuinely want to join forces with disabled people in coming to grips with inequalities. All of our witnesses — ministers, bureaucrats, corporate officials, consumers and their representatives, and independent experts — agree that the present situation of persons with disabilities is unacceptable. All, and we think it is important to stress the level of consensus here, are making efforts, subject to the constraints which govern their activities, to bring about changes.

We do not believe that the problem is primarily one of sincerity. Nor, we suspect, do most people with disabilities. It is precisely the coexistence, during the past decade, of apparently genuine sincerity and the absence of significant progress which, in our view, underlies their present sense of frustration. If a major social interest, political leader, or even the public in general were to declare opposition to equality for persons with disabilities, then they would at least have an adversary to confront and, perhaps, a tangible explanation for the absence of change. As it is, however, they have only our constant sincerity.

The problem of will, we have come to believe, is not a product of the absence of sincere intentions but rather, primarily, of the inconsistency of attention. As we have argued in our historical overview in Chapter 2, public and political attention has too often tended to focus on disability issues while commitments are made, and then to move elsewhere before actions fulfilling these commitments are carried out, or results can be assessed. This

problem is clearly apparent to people with disabilities themselves, and is part of the reason that their frustration is increasingly tinged with bitterness and scepticism about motives:

COPOH would like to remind the Government that disability is not a trendy issue that can be shelved after its UN year has finished. Disabled people will not allow our issues to be downgraded. (Issue 27, Appendix "HUDI-15" p. 26)

It is tempting, at least initially, to respond to the transience of public and political attention to disability issues with moral indignation and appeals to conscience. These indeed may be appropriate, but in our view will not result in significant progress. Feelings of guilt which sermonizing might bring about are likely, themselves, to be temporary. At most, we might anticipate another cycle of promises and plans.

More productively, we should ask ourselves why the political will to act on disability issues has traditionally been transitory, given the genuine concern which clearly prevails? The blunt answer, we suspect, is that the political will to act on disability issues has been weakened by the fact that, in the past, there has often been little political payback from action. As we have argued in preceding sections of this report, the results from initiatives taken thus far have tended to produce ascending levels of frustration and criticism in the community of persons with disabilities, rather than the positive responses which might encourage further action and effort. Even in the absence of negative responses from client groups, the results provide negative feedback on their own. We are concerned that political actors may be led to conclude that their efforts are largely futile, and that political time and energy would be better invested elsewhere.

At first sight this conclusion suggests a dilemma: action is needed if results are to be achieved yet results, or at least their realistic prospect, are necessary if the will required for action is to be created. We do not believe, however, that the dilemma is intractable. Indeed, it provides useful guidance. It tells us that the fostering of political will has to be recognized as part of the challenge facing those who seek action on disability issues. It suggests, as well, that exhortation and a reliance upon miracles of repentance and conversion may not, alone, meet this challenge.

A clear demonstration of the reasons why existing initiatives directed to persons with disabilities have failed to deliver anticipated results, accompanied by a recommended measures which are convincingly demonstrated to avoid the mistakes of the past, could in our view do much to reinvigorate political will. We plan, in the course of the future hearings and reports outlined in a previous section of this report, to contribute to the development of solutions which work. We hope that this will also contribute to the strengthening of political will.

Our evidence shows that not only Canadians with disablities, but Canadians in general, are waiting for the comprehensive action which is clearly needed if the economic

integration of persons with disabilities is to become a reality. The need is there, and the political support is there. Governments now just have to act. We therefore recommend:

- 1. That the Government of Canada, in partnership with people with disabilities, representatives of the private and voluntary sectors, organized labour, and this Committee, make the economic integration of people with disabilities a continuing national priority, and develop a national action strategy including the specific initiatives set out in recommendations 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to be presented during National Access Awareness Week in 1991.
- 2. That a more effective mechanism be established within the federal government to ensure ongoing and consistent monitoring, advocacy and coordination on behalf of disabled persons in relation to all policy, legislation and regulations.
- 3. That all federal departments, Crown corporations and agencies be required, under the supervision of the mechanism recommended above, to review and, where necessary, reform legislation and regulations to ensure the comprehensive inclusion of disabled persons in existing federal programs.
- 4. That an immediate audit of and report on the employment equity process internal to the federal government, as it relates to persons with disabilities, be undertaken on a department by department, directorate by directorate, agency by agency, and occupational level by occupational level basis, by Treasury Board using criteria agreed to by the Canadian Human Rights Commission.
- 5. That the Government of Canada undertake, in cooperation with provincial, territorial and municipal governments, to develop a federal-provincial-municipal plan of action for disabled persons that will ensure ongoing consultations, cooperation and coordinated action. This plan of action should be initiated at the forthcoming meeting of federal and provincial first ministers on the economy.
- 6. That the Government of Canada increase funding for research related to persons with disabilities, including cost-benefit analyses of integration and, in particular, commit itself to fund Statistics Canada in conducting a post-censal survey of people with disabilities in conjunction with the 1991 census so that the important data obtained in 1986 can be updated.

APPENDIX "A"

		WITNESSES
	Issue No.	Date
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE TREASURY BOARD OF EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED		
PERSONS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE (ACE)	29	May 30, 1990
Adrien Battcock, Chairman;		
Brian Bertelsen, Member;		
Bruce Gilmour, Member.		
ATLANTIC CENTRE OF SUPPORT FOR DISABLED STUDENTS	26	May 22, 1990
David Leitch.		
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION ON REHABILITATION AND WORK	27	May 24, 1990
Robert J. McInnes, Executive Director;		
Peter Krahn, Assistant Director;		
Rich Newman, Manager;		
Joanne de Laurentis,		
Vice-President, Canadian Bankers Association;		
Phil McLarren, Vice-President,		
ORC Canada.		
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNITY LIVING	27	May 24, 1990

Diane Richler, Executive Vice-President; Amber Faulkes, Board Member.

CANADIAN DISABILITY RIGHTS COUNCIL

27

May 24, 1990

Shelagh Day, Board Member;

Yvonne Peters, National Coordinator.

CANADIAN PARAPLEGIC ASSOCIATION

24

May 15, 1990

Bev. G. Hallam,
Managing Director;

Gregory Pye, Coordinator of Public Affairs.

COALITION OF PROVINCIAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE HANDICAPPED

27

May 24, 1990

Irene Feika,
National Chairperson;

Doreen Demas, COPOH Council member;

Laurie Beachell, National Coordinator.

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION

17

February 13, 1990

Michèle S. Jean, Executive Director;

Marnie Clarke, Director General, Employment Equity;

Yves Poisson, Director General, Policy and Program Development;

R.R. Van Tongerloo, Director General, Labour Market Services; Jean-Yves Boisvert,
Director General,
Operations and Services Branch;

Louise L. Holmes, Director General, Human Resources.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Wolfgang Voght, Secretary of State for Labour and Social Affairs;

Wolgang Behrends, Ambassador in Canada.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF DISABLED STUDENTS

Frank Smith;
Collinda Joseph.

NATIONAL INJURED WORKERS COMMITTEE

Wolfgang Zimmermann, National Organiser;

Doreen Demers, Council Member.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Nancy Lawand, Executive Director, Status of Disabled Persons Sec.;

Catherine Lane, Acting Assistant under Secretary of State;

Sue Potter, Director, Disabled Persons Participation Program;

R. Joubert, Director General, Personnel.

31

June 14, 1990

26 May 22, 1990

31

June 14, 1990

17

February 15, 1990

STATISTICS CANADA

19 March 27, 1990

John W. Coombs, Director General, Institutions and Social Statistics Branch:

Adèle Furrie, Program Manager, Post Censal Surveys Program;

Lee Reid, Director. Personnel Policies Division.

G. ALLAN ROCHER INSTITUTE

24 May 15, 1990

Marcia H. Rioux, Director:

Cameron Crawford, Assistant Director.

WESTERN CANADIAN CENTRE OF SPECIALIZATION IN DEAFNESS

Roger Carver.

26

May 22, 1990

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, your Committee requests that the Government table a comprehensive response to the Report within 150 days.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of the Disabled Persons (Issues No. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31 and 30 which includes this Report) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Halliday, M.P Chairman

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990 (47)

The Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons met in camera at 11:15 o'clock a.m. this day, in Room 371, West Block, Peter McCreath, presiding.

Members of the Committee present: David Kilgour, Peter McCreath, Christine Stewart, Joseph Volpe, David Walker, Neil Young.

Acting Member present: Darryl Gray for Barbara Greene.

In attendance: From the Research Branch of the Library of Parliament: Jack Stilborn, William Young, Research Officers.

In accordance with its mandate under Standing Order 108(3)(c), the Committee commenced consideration of a draft report on the economic integration of disabled persons.

At 12:00 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1990 (48)

The Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons met in camera at 4:00 o'clock p.m. this day, in Room 308, West Block, The Chairman, Bruce Halliday, presiding.

Members of the Committee present: Barbara Greene, Bruce Halliday, Peter McCreath, Christine Stewart, David Walker, Neil Young.

Acting Members present: Bob Porter for Gilles Bernier, Stan Darling for Bill Attewell, Bob Hicks for Walter McLean, Brian White for Peter McCreath.

In attendance: From the Research Branch of the Library of Parliament: Jack Stilborn, William Young, Research Officers.

In accordance with its mandate under Standing Order 108(3)(c), the Committee resumed consideration of a draft report on the economic integration of disabled persons.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, the Draft Report, as amended, be concurred in and adopted as the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, the Chairman be authorized to make such typographical and editorial changes as may be necessary without changing the substance of the Draft Report.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, the Committee print in a bilingual issue format, with Mayfair cover, up to 10,000 copies of its Second Report to the House and that, further to consultation, the Clerk determine the appropriate amount of copies to be printed.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, the Chairman be authorized to retain the services of a firm for the production of the Second Report on audio cassettes.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee request the Government to table a comprehensive response to the Report within 150 days.

The Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee on International Human Rights presented the Third Report of the Sub-Committee.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, the Third Report of the Sub-Committee on International Human Rights be concurred in and adopted as the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons.

By unanimous consent, it was agreed,—That, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons present the Third Report to the House of Commons before the summer recess.

At 5:20 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

Marie Louise Paradis, Clerk of the Committee