DEFINING MORE INCLUSIVE SOCIAL POLICIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

COMMENT CRÉER DES POLITIQUES SOCIALES PLUS INCLUSIVES ? LE CAS DES PERSONNES HANDICAPÉES

Debora Vazquez

Social policies in Canada are presently nurtured by a neo-liberal view such that they address limitations of underprivileged groups by providing incentives or solutions at the individual level. These policies have failed to effect structural change that would recognize the need to promote the full inclusion of these groups, particularly people with disabilities. This neo-liberal view is based on a deficiency model that perpetuates a situation of prejudice and discrimination against this vulnerable group. Members of marginalized groups require policies and supports that promote equality and inclusion in their communities. A deep structural transformation must include the removal of prejudices, barriers, and segregation that limit the full potential of people with disabilities.

Key words: disabilities, deficiency, empowerment, structural change, performativity, productivity, neo-liberalism

Actuellement, les politiques sociales canadiennes sont nourries par une perspective néo-libérale qui aborde les limites des groupes marginalisés en fournissant des solutions et des incitations au niveau de l'être humain individuel. Jusqu'à présent, ces politiques sociales n'ont rien changé par rapport aux changements structurels, qui reconnaitraient le besoin d'inclure ces groupes à un maximum, plus spécifiquement les handicapés. Cette perspective néo-libérale se fonde sur le modèle de déficience qui perpétue les préjugés et la discrimination contre ce groupe vulnérable. Les membres des groupes marginalisés ont besoin des politiques et du soutien, ces deux promouvant l'égalité et l'inclusion des membres dans leurs communautés. Une transformation profonde structurelle doit obligatoirement inclure l'enlèvement des préjugés, des barrières, et de la ségrégation sociale afin que les personnes handicapées puissent être capable à un maximum.

Mots clés : Handicap, déficience, pouvoir, changement structurel, performativité, néo-libéralisme

People with physical disabilities have experienced a long history of exclusion and discrimination. In a neo-liberal society that rewards competition and achievement-praising ableism, a person with a disability is seen as someone who lacks rather than someone who displays different abilities to perform tasks in alternative and innovative ways. Neo-liberal solutions for persons with physical disabilities are based on a deficiency model where the alternative is to increase their productivity and their access to a free and competitive market. However, social policies do not address structural inequalities and the need for a structural transformation aimed to remove attitudinal barriers, prejudices, and stereotypes of inability or deficiency that emerge against these individuals, leading to unemployment and poverty. Moreover, current neo-liberal social programs that seek to compensate for disability and provide income aids to this minority group fail to promote universalistic and inclusive social policies that embrace people with disabilities as equals in the community. As a result, people with disabilities are further segregated and their social rights and full citizenship are compromised. Social inclusion policies need to deconstruct the effects of ableism, and a deep structural transformation is required to remove the boundaries that exist between full citizens and partial citizens.

Ableism and Inclusion

In a society that values ableism, people with disabilities face visible and invisible systemic barriers that prevent their inclusion. Mullaly (2002) states that oppression exists when an individual is blocked from opportunities for self-development, and is therefore excluded from full participation in the society. Goroff (1978) warns about the consequences of the inequality created by this exclusion, "an evaluation of oneself based on the rewards one receives must frequently result in a sense of self-deprecation and personal inadequacy" (p. 6). Neo-liberal social policies recognize and promote the individual responsibility for productivity and success in the market. Under this line of thinking, people with disabilities are at a disadvantage since job prospects and other opportunities for full inclusion are designed for able-bodied individuals. Social policies should be defined to promote equality and inclusion. These policies will fall short if market driven programs and structurally embedded ableism prevent the recognition of the differences of abilities that this population offers. Moreover, social policies should go further than just providing social assistance and incentives to citizens with disabilities, also ensuring that the government increases its role by promoting inclusiveness and equality in society.

Current neo-liberal policies re-assert and reward the concept of "ableness" as the condition of full and virtuous citizenship. An individual with a disability is viewed as a citizen with limited opportunities to perform according to market demands and is continuously vilified for her need of additional incentives and supports. Grassroots groups representing people with disabilities face the challenge of neo-liberal governments engaged in a disability discourse that reinforces disability as deficiency in the market economy. This discourse advocates that a disability can be overcome by only providing accommodations and specific services or tax incentives. According to the neo-liberal model, once these accommodations have been provided, it is the individual responsibility of a person with a disability to seek integration into the society and to

make herself productive in the market economy. Without a profound construction of a different reality, these policies only partially mitigate the problem by targeting the consequence, but not the root cause of the exclusion and devaluation. Consequently, these policies continue to perpetuate the sense of segregation and personal inadequacy of people with disabilities.

When a person with a disability is constructed as "the Other", without a purposeful and systematic integration into the mainstream of society, isolation occurs and different levels or categories of citizens are created. Neo-liberal social welfare policies reward independence and successful paid employment; consequently, someone who cannot fully meet these expectations will be neglected by such policies. According to Mosher (2007), "social assistance policies and practices are increasingly premised upon, and actively promote, a demarcation of full and partial citizens and corresponding insider/outsider or us/them identities" (p. 120). Social policies with good intentions can be essentially exclusionary if not transformed by structural change in the way people with disabilities are perceived. People with disabilities will continue to seen as "partial" citizens and as a liability to a market-based society.

Toward a Policy of Full Citizenship

Prince (2009) states that "for Canadian disability policy and politics, five elements of citizenship are particularly significant. These are the discourse of citizenship, legal and equality rights, democratic and political rights, fiscal and social entitlements and economic integration" (p. 17). These elements of citizenship refer to the meaning of achieving a "full" citizen status, not only from a legal perspective, but, as previously discussed, from a holistic and humanistic view. It is also important to stress that the discourse of citizenship should include a revision of terms used by government, schools, media and the society at large around disability. In other words, it becomes critical to find ways to introduce a less exclusionary vocabulary that discourages ableism and stigma. The challenge to overcome within a neo-liberal ideology is to transition from a concept of a model citizen that fulfills market expectations, to a model of full empowered citizen, not driven only by their ability to produce profits but mostly by the opportunity to be included and contribute in the mainstream society.

Prince (2009) coins the term "absent citizens" for people with disabilities. He states:

> Citizenship is much more than a political concept and legal status…Citizenship entails cultural, economic, and social dimensions. In one or more of these dimensions, many Canadians with disabilities are effectively absent, lacking full enjoyment of the person, or freedom of expression and communication (p. 4).

According to Dossa (2005) "disability identity connotes negative images of dependency and passivity. In addition, disability identity brings into relief a trap that is difficult to escape: it is only when one subjects oneself to the essential label of disability that one is entitled to social assistance" (p. 2530). This view of dependency stigmatizes people with disabilities who are victims of an ongoing segregation from an otherwise "vibrant,

productive and profitable" community. Neo-liberal values, which regard the extension of accessibility to people with disabilities as sufficient to allow their immersion into the free market, continuously fail to address the need for structural transformation. This minimalist strategy misses the underlying ableist beliefs and attitudes in society, and the opportunity to inform policy and programming. The fundamental structural inequalities experienced by this minority group compromise their inclusion, and racialized and gendered prejudices are perpetuated through the lack of a universal social policy.

From an anthropological point of view, Dossa (2005) refers to a dehumanizing view of people with disabilities and states the existence of a school of thought that "advances the argument that there is no room for Other bodies in a market-based economy that conflates productivity with able-bodies (read young white males)" (p. 2528). Furthermore, Dossa (2005) claims that "the racialized/gendered/ disabled body is considered an anomaly" (p. 2529). Current neo-liberal social policies maintain social inequalities related to disability, class, race, and gender and strengthen the advantages of being a model citizen: white, male, able-bodied, middle class, and heterosexual. Mo Yee Lee (2003) confirms this perspective, "members of a cultural minority group in society tend to be devalued by those in the majority, and this negative devaluation can be stigmatizing to minority group members" (p. 386). Under the neo-liberal model, people with disabilities are the antitheses of a model or market citizen who is "autonomous, self-made, competitive, possessive, self-interested, and atomistic" (Mosher, 2007, p. 117).

One clear limitation of the discourse around disabilities that contributes to the conception of negation starts with the definition of a disability. From a sociological conception and according to Titchkosky, as cited in McColl and Jongbloed (2006), "people with disabilities are first and foremost defined as 'problem' people…the policy text uniformly defines disability as a problem" (p. 61). This notion of disability is restated in the Ontario *Human Rights Code* (1990) that defines a disability as:

> (a) any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, a brain injury, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or other animal or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device, (b) a condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability, (c) a learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language, (d) a mental disorder, or (e) an injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997 (2005).

This definition of disability, as many others do, focuses on "the problem" and on what an individual is "lacking" or "missing" based on the perception of what "normalcy" is. Under an ableist approach, the social construct is clear: a person with a disability is someone who has an impediment to do something that other people are *able* to do. This

reductionism is the main source of stereotypes and prejudices of people with disabilities, which lead to unemployment and poverty.

On the other hand, a universal approach toward social policies aims to be more inclusive. Joiner, as cited in McColl and Jongbloed (2006), explains universalism in the following way:

> an alternative model based on the universal nature of disability as it impacts all people. Instead of seeking to demarcate disabled and able-bodied people as two separate and distinct categories, a universalism model of disability views functioning and the relative ease with which one interacts with the environment along a continuum (p. 92).

While we cannot neglect the need for accommodations and accessible spaces, services and employment opportunities for people with disabilities, the definition of social policies that do not segregate "the abled" from "the disabled" should aim for a structural transformation of society.

Performativity in a Market Driven Society

In a neo-liberal state where performativity is the driver of success, disabled groups are at disadvantage. Brodie (2002), a political scientist, argues that "a performative philosophy of governance engages with those who do not fit neatly into a market model in one of two ways: either they are treated as inadequate or dysfunctional market players or they are completely erased from the public agenda" (p. 98). Several policies, such as the *Accessibility for Ontarians Disability Act* (AODA), enacted in 2005 (with its first regulation enacted in 2007 and coming into force in 2010, and its second enacted in 2007 and coming into force in 2011) (Ministry of Community and Social Services, 2010) have been defined to promote accessibility for people with disabilities, among other initiatives. However, inadvertently or not, those policies further promote segregation rather than structural transformation and, therefore, do not address the deep social prejudices that privilege ableism in our society.

Hiranandani (2005) points out that "most legislation, policies and practices have regarded people with disabilities as unfit for society, as sick, as functionality limited, and as unable to work" (p. 1). Titchkosky (2005) observes on how media has contributed to a depiction of disability as a life without possibilities. She states, "the task becomes explicating what in the world makes possible this unified singular depiction of disability as a kind of limit seemingly disconnected from all possibilities" (p. 660). Under this conception, irrespective of the good intentions of social policies, disabled individuals continue to face significant challenges to their inclusion in mainstream society. Our culture continues to overwhelmingly privilege non-impairment. Titchkosky (2005) adds "disability serves as the exemplar of weakness against which a community will or will not demonstrate its strength…this world is one which encourages people to perceive disability as thoroughly encapsulated by negation" (p. 662). This statement is supported by the following compelling statistic published by Statistics Canada (2006): "In 2006, 63.6% of Canadians aged 15 to 64 with an activity limitation who were not in the labour force (nearly 420,000 people) reported that they were completely prevented from

working" (p. 17). People with disabilities want to be working, but lack of accessibility and structural barriers prevent them from doing so. Neo-liberal accommodation practices are not addressing underlying structural ableist values and consequently, social policies are ineffective in integrating people with disabilities into the market economy.

If people with disabilities do not fit into the market model, then their marginalization from society is a foreseeable consequence. The social construction of disability involves the creation of barriers, physical and attitudinal, that people with disabilities experience. This situation lends to a sense of powerlessness and oppression for people with disabilities, who are marginalized not only from employment but also from a number of non-inclusive mainstream events in society. From an employment perspective, many employers are still reluctant to hire someone who may require additional accommodations or who, in a biased perception, may not meet the productivity requirements of the job. Hiranandani (2005) observes that "disability is a disadvantage due to social, cultural, attitudinal, and environmental barriers…in a society which idealizes physical and mental capacities, people with disabilities are marginalized" (p. 13). Economist and political scientist Rae in *The Harper Record* (2008) states:

> While Canadians with disabilities need leadership from all levels of government to remove existing barriers and to prevent the introduction of new ones, the Harper government has made it clear that it believes in a government that focuses only on core federal responsibilities. Since Stephen Harper was elected Prime Minister, Canadians with disabilities have been adversely affected by the Harper government's belief in a more limited role for the Government of Canada, and by a number of his government's decisions (p. 366).

This reflection is in line with neo-liberal ideology which limits or even removes the role of governments in structural change and in the definition of inclusive social policies. There are several instances where the conservative government has de-funded critical programs, such as the Court Challenges Program aimed to financially support legal challenges to discrimination of people with disabilities. According to Rae (2008), on December 13, 2006, the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* was adopted, and Canada, while being one of the initial signatories, had not ratified it as of 2008 (it was not ratified until March 2010). The purpose of this Convention is to promote, protect, and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights by people with disabilities. It covers a number of key areas such as accessibility, personal mobility, health, education, employment, habilitation, and rehabilitation, participation in political life, and equality and non-discrimination. This holistic approach toward inclusiveness should nurture the creation of a National or Federal Disability Act that would mirror the one created in the Unites States, i.e., the *Americans with Disabilities Act*.

However, Rae (2008) argues that "such an Act will not deal with the lack of disability supports and chronic poverty that is the plight of far too many Canadians who live with a disability in our affluent country" (p. 370). The stigma of disability versus ability needs to be addressed by social policies at the risk of falling short in promoting full inclusiveness. The lack of a social policy that neglects the need to deeply modify the

structures (cultural, educational, economical, and systemic) will only contribute to the ongoing disadvantage of people with disabilities.

Deficiency Model

Canadian provincial governments have designed a series of policies, programs, services, and benefits to people with disabilities. Most of them are targeted to individuals with mobility impairments. These programs range across transportation, housing, education and training, employment, recreation and culture, health, tax, and income assistance. However, Rioux and Valentine, as cited in Prince (2009), argue:

> a basic contradiction exists between the vision of inclusion as held by governments and the vision understood by disability groups…governments emphasize selective services, discretionary programs, and, through social insurance contributions, earned benefits…[but] disability groups look to governments to play a strong leadership in tackling exclusions (p. 9).

The government response is based on a deficiency model where it pretends to equalize the role of citizens with disabilities by compensating their disability and adding supports to increase their productivity. While selective programs offered by the government are targeted to alleviate the disadvantages experienced by people with disabilities, these same programs also contribute to segregate them, impacting the ultimate goal of full inclusion.

There is an additional collateral effect of these selective policies. Reinforcing Dossa's (2005) assertion, individuals with hidden disabilities will be inhibited from disclosing their disabilities as they will be stigmatized with the negative connotation that considers them as the Other. However, failure to disclose a disability will prevent the individual from accessing the programs, social services, and accommodations that they would require. Furthermore, even people with permanent physical disabilities are required to periodically provide proof of disability for renewing certain services or accommodations, which is demeaning and oppressive.

Current neo-liberal social policies targeting people with disabilities do not change the structural disadvantage that prevents them from participating in the mainstream society. These policies involve income transfers that do not solve the inherent dependency and segregation experienced by people with disabilities. Social policy professor August (2009) states:

> current Canadian disability policy is based, explicitly or implicitly, on a compensation strategy to provide financial and other resources to adults who are presumed to suffer competitive disadvantages that prevent them from using the market economy to their advantage. While this is true enough that many adults with disabilities are disadvantaged with it comes to economic activity, current disability policy does not aim to change that reality; it merely tries to moderate its impact in the short term (p. 8).

Changing the reality requires a government willing to expand its role in the definition and implementation of social policies, limiting the free flow of market driven policies.

The neo-liberal welfare state aims to remediate a shortage of income capacity through workfare policies, but without regard to human dignity. Consequently, economic inclusion for people with disabilities will be characterized by insurmountable challenges that will limit their full citizenship status, with the subsequent waste of human potential. Rather than focusing on alternative abilities, the society at large focuses on the disability. August (2009) states:

> passive disability policies assumes that adults with disabilities, both as individuals and as a group, lack productive capacity or potential, and therefore deserve compensation from their fellow citizens…building programs around an assumption of dysfunction rather than a goal of functionality is an unfortunately common, and generally very harmful, error in social policy (p. 5).

This assumption of dysfunction will extrapolate to a concept of "deviance", signaling an individual that is unfit for the model society and subject to social welfare aids. Mosher (2007) offers a further depiction of this concept of deviance: "welfare recipients are characterized as lacking moral virtues that are integral to the constitution of the 'model' citizens" (p. 120). Moreover, the negative neo-liberal connotation of welfare recipients, of which people with disabilities are a part, is also summarized by Murray, as cited in McGregor (1999): "these [welfare recipients] are likely to abuse the system and to lose the work ethic and a sense of responsibility for their own situation" (p. 103). This neo-liberal perception of the welfare recipient as a deviant perpetuates a continuous state of disadvantage and exclusion for people with disabilities.

Prince (2009) refers to the notion of applying an "ability lens" rather than a "disability lens" to social policies. This change of perception from negation to affirmation can promote a dignified role in society for citizens with disabilities, providing them with income, self-confidence, respect, and recognition in the community. However, one of the key challenges for people with disabilities continues to be finding suitable opportunities for a meaningful and stable job.

Employment Opportunities

The Conference Board of Canada and other agencies that support employment efforts of people with disabilities have stated that Canada is currently experiencing a shortage of skills. As baby boomers age and birth rates continue to be static or declining, people with disabilities offer a relatively untapped reservoir of talent. A document on employment and disabilities published jointly by the Conference Board of Canada and the Ministry of Citizenship Ontario (2001) states that "employers who recognize the potential of underutilized talent sources will be at an advantage in the race for talent" (p. 12). A full utilization of talent available from people with disabilities is not only dependent on having proper accommodations but on removing structural and attitudinal barriers that plague racialized groups.

The neo-liberal conception of the state poses significant challenges to people with disabilities who want to pursue a fruitful integration in the employment market as evidenced by government studies. Based on a 2006 Participation and Activity Limitation Survey conducted by Statistics Canada (2006), only 51% of people with disabilities between the ages of 15 and 64 were employed, while more than 75% of persons without disabilities were fully employed.

According to MacGregor (1999), a neo-liberal regime accepts unemployment in the name of freedom of choice, praising individualism and "hard work". However, the implications of unemployment of people with disabilities within this framework are significant. As recipients of welfare benefits, people with disabilities are already considered outcasts from the "model citizen" concept and incapable of meeting market demands. The notion of attributing poverty and individual deficiency to the individual performance dominates the neo-liberal philosophy pursued by the Canadian government.

Titchkosky points out "disability is first, foremost and seemingly forever, 'not.' It is not strength, not ability, it is not x, y or z" (p. 663). This negation is more damaging than the disability itself. In a competitive social or employment situation, an individual with a disability will be seen as plagued with deficits and shortages that are disempowering and oppressive. Dominant groups will consider individuals with disabilities as permanently unable to fully integrate into a productive environment. Moreover, in many cases people with disabilities will be offered sheltered jobs that will not allow them to unleash their full capabilities. Once a group is defined as inferior, the label tends to be reproduced. The dominant group judges members of marginalized groups to be incapable of performing roles or functions that the dominant group values (Mullaly, 2002). There is also a racially gendered consideration when discussing disabilities. According to Emmett and Alant (2006):

> women with disabilities are more discriminated against and disadvantaged than men with disabilities…there are more barriers to access and participation for women than for men, and mothers and caregivers in particular face enormous challenges when raising children with disabilities or chronic illnesses, especially within the context of women-headed households and early pregnancy (p. 450).

This reality is further discussed by social workers Fairchild and Quinn (2000) who state that "in many countries, women with disabilities are excluded from all important areas of life, social interactions…developmental activities in education and training; and economic opportunities in the areas of employment, earning money and maintaining control in their lives" (p. 23). Consequently, there is a double discrimination effect experienced by women due to their gender in addition of their disability status.

Under these types of challenges, racialized individuals will be expected to insert themselves into the productive mainstream society. Whether the disability is permanent or temporary, "the new welfare state is characterized by an 'employability' model emphasizing reentry into the workforce" (McKeen & Porter, 2003, p. 111). Workfare policies, derived from neo-liberal governments, reward individuals who are ready to

contribute to society but do not recognize the structural disadvantages and barriers that people with disabilities face in terms of inclusion.

August (2009) observes that "many adults with disabilities want to work, and could do so, with supports and a welcoming labour market" (p. 6). However, as unemployment figures demonstrate, the reality is that social policies and economic incentives are not achieving a fundamental notion of inclusion and equity involving citizens with disabilities. The Council of Canadian with Disabilities (2010) states that disability "is an evolving concept that results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers that hinders their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others" (para. 17). This social construction of disability requires far reaching social policies that recognize the structural inequality and address the impacts of a society privileging ableism.

Conclusion

The advancement of inclusion should be largely a government responsibility. However, there are still several attitudinal barriers and prejudices that need to be removed. These structural and attitudinal barriers hinder opportunities for training and skills development for people with disabilities. Furthermore, a majority of paid jobs or even volunteer opportunities are designed for able-bodied persons, mostly because they lack the appropriate accessibility or accommodation.

The overall stigmatization encouraged by ableism is fueled by neo-liberal social policies that reward performativity. From a social policy view and drawing a parallelism with the British conservative ideology, government may be committed to

social inclusion [but] it appears to have abandoned the goal of promoting greater equality. The question has to be whether, in the context of entrenched structural inequalities, genuine social inclusion, including the eradication of poverty, is possible without greater equality (Lister, 1998, p. 220).

A neo-liberal state that does not focus on addressing structural inequalities will have limited success in achieving a full inclusion of all members of the society.

According to Prince (2009), disability policies are still a second priority when compared to larger social issues related to health and child care. Moreover, the government and non-profit institutions need to better coordinate programs and disparate actions around disabilities. On the other hand, many community and grassroots groups struggle due to limited funds and their access to policy defining bodies. An increased focus should be placed in the development of policies and strategies that normalize accessibility and accommodations, rather than an exceptional and abnormal response to selected disadvantaged groups of society.

Hunter (2006) states that "to be without employment, apparently unless one is wealthy, idle, and living in a gated neighborhood, is to be outside of the community" (p. 193). The boundaries of citizenship are defined by the successful economic contribution of its citizens through well paid jobs. Furthermore, the social exclusion created by this neo-liberal approach is disempowering, and affects marginalized groups primarily

women and people with disabilities. Consequently, it creates a concept of an "underclass" that must be avoided in a society that values human rights, dignity, and social justice.

Members of marginalized groups require policies and supports that promote equality and inclusion in their communities. Moreover, governmental initiatives should include the use of media and other institutions to remove stigma and discrimination in the family environment, in the workplace, in the communities, and in the society at large. Community-led programs must engage people with disabilities in order to uncover their full potential and showcase their different abilities. Employment is a key element of social inclusion for those with disabilities, and policies and programs at a national level should involve multiple partners who recognize the value of the capabilities of an individual with a disability and benefit from their contribution.

There have been several federal initiatives with respect to people with disabilities over the last few decades, yet a clear system that measures accountability and success needs to be created, one that is continuously shared with the community.

Different types of disability supports should be perceived as enablers and not as charity that compensate for a deficiency. Social policies should recognize that support programs targeted to people with disabilities need to promote inclusiveness and structural equality. In addition, these programs need to have both a universal and individualized approach in order to ensure effectiveness.

These policies should promote a structural reform where people with disabilities can thrive in the mainstream of society and be able to empower themselves from their historic position of disadvantage, encapsulation, and discrimination. Ableism needs to be de-constructed in order to eradicate the deficiency model proposed by neo-liberal values. A deep structural transformation must include the removal of prejudices, barriers, and segregation that limit the potential of people with disabilities. A new language should be inserted when referring to people with disabilities as persons who have different abilities, able to contribute creatively and productively to society. This change in vision would help them achieve a status of full citizens with all the rights, responsibilities, and entitlements that today are exclusive of those who meet the neo-liberal ideal of a model citizen. No social policy will be effective unless *all* individuals find inclusive means and equal opportunities to achieve their highest potential as human beings.

References

Accessibility for Ontarians Disabilities Act (2005). Retrieved November 2, 2008 from http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_05a11_e.htm.

August, R. (2009). Paved with good intentions: the failure of passive disability policy in Canada. Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Retrieved October 23, 2010 from http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1475&context=gl adnetcollect.

Brodie, J. (2002). The Great Undoing: State Formation, Gender Politics, and Social Policy in Canada. In C. Pelissier Kingfisher (Ed.), *Western Welfare in Decline: Globalization and Women's Poverty* (pp. 90-110). Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Conference Board of Canada & Ontario Ministry of Citizenship (2001). Tapping the Talents of People with Disabilities. Report by Ruth Wright. Retrieved from October 11, 2010 from http://www.conferenceboard.ca/temp/9b0f6d13-6438-4ebd-a366-9cbebe6eb312/TAPtalents.pdf.

Council of Canadians with Disabilities (2010). A Federal Disability Act: opportunities and challenges. Retrieved October 14, 2010 from http://www.ccdonline.ca/en/socialpolicy/fda/1006#background.

Dossa, P. (2005). Racialized Bodies, Disabling Worlds: "They [service providers] always saw me as a client, not a worker." *Social Science and Medicine, 60*(11), 2527-2536.

Emmett, T., & Alant, E. (2006). Women and disability: exploring the interface of multiple disadvantage. *Development Southern Africa, 23*(4), 445-460.

Fairchild, S., & Quinn P. (2000). Socio-Empowerment issues for women with disabilities. Joint Conference of the International Federation of Social Workers and the International Association of Schools of Social Work, Montreal, Canada. Retrieved October 18, 2010 from http://www.mun.ca/cassw-ar/papers2/Fairchild.pdf.

Goroff, N.N. (1978). Conflict theories and social work education. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 5*(4), 498-507.

Hirandani, V. (2005). Towards a Critical Theory of Disability in Social Work. *Critical Social Work, 6*(1).

Hunter, G. (2006). Child Poverty and the Canadian Welfare State. In A. Westhues (Ed.), *Canadian Social Policy: Issues and Perspectives, 4th Ed.* (pp. 179-201). Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Lee, M.Y. (2003). A solution-focused approach to cross-cultural clinical social work practice: Utilizing cultural strengths. *Families in Society, 84*, 385-395.

Lister, R. (1998). From equality to social inclusion: new labour and welfare state. *Critical Social Policy, 18*(2), 215-225.

McColl, M.A., & Jongbloed, L. (2006). *Disability and Social Policy in Canada*. Toronto: Captus Press, Inc.

McGregor, S. (1999). Welfare, neo-liberalism and new paternalism: three ways for social policy in Late Capitalist Societies. *Capital & Class, 67,* 91-119.

McKeen, W., & Porter, A. (2003). Politics and Transformation: Welfare State Restructuring in Canada. In W. Clement, & L Vosko (Eds.), *Changing Canada – Political Economy as Transformation* (pp. 109-134). Ottawa: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Ministry of Community and Social Services, Ontario (2010). Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities. Retrieved October 26, 2010 from http://www.mcss.gov.on.ca/en/mcss/programs/accessibility/index.aspx.

Mosher, J.E. (2007). Welfare Reform and the re-making of the model citizen. In M. Young, S.B. Boyd, & G. Brodsky (Eds.), *Poverty: Rights, Social Citizenship, and Legal Activism* (pp. 119-138). UBC Press.

Mullaly, B. (2002). *Challenging Oppression: A Critical Social Work Approach*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Prince, M. (2009). *Absent Citizens: Disability Politics and Policy Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Inc.

Rae, J. (2008). Two steps forward and two steps back: The legacy of disability rights in Canada. In T. Healy (Ed.), *The Haper Record.* Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Retrieved October 20, 2010 from http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National_Office_Pubs/2008/HarperRecord/The_Legacy_of_Disability_Rights_in_Canada.pdf

Statistics Canada. Participation and Activity Limitation Survey 2006: Labour Force Experience of People with Disabilities in Canada. Retrieved October 12, 2010 from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-628-x/89-628-x2008007-eng.htm.

Titchkosky, T. (2005). Disability in the news: A reconsideration of reading. *Disability & Society, 20*(6): 655-668.