

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

1999

Restaging the welfare diva: Case studies of single motherhood and social policy

Iara Lessa
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lessa, Iara, "Restaging the welfare diva: Case studies of single motherhood and social policy" (1999). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 221. <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/221>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI[®]

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-40327-0

**RESTAGING THE WELFARE DIVA:
CASE STUDIES OF SINGLE MOTHERHOOD AND SOCIAL POLICY**

BY

Iara Lessa

Engenheira-Arquiteta, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, 1976

Master of Philosophy in Urban Studies, University of Kent, 1980

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of Social Work

In partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the Doctor of Social Work degree

Wilfrid Laurier University

1999

© Iara Lessa 1999

Abstract

The single mother has been an enduring and representative character in the development of social welfare. Casted as the embodiment of the various crises of the family which Western democratic nations have experienced throughout the twentieth century, she is the representative of what is outside the foundation of a desirable life: an economically dependent family unit without a male head. Nevertheless, the single mother is also an actual woman raising children alone struggling for survival under very adverse circumstances. In its materiality, it is this body, not the allegorical character, who is the subject of studies and interventions concerned with the future and stability of society.

Using a conceptual framework based both on recent developments of Foucault's work and on contemporary feminist investigations of subjectivity, this thesis proposes the *single mother* as a complex of rationalities which, in interaction with welfare practices, produces a way to govern women raising children alone and a specific mode of life. These two formulations - form of government and way of life - constitute the objects of two case studies which illustrate empirically their meaning. The case studies address the implementation of two welfare programs through the use of *texts of rule*: textually recorded logs of practice which produce an account of how rationalities and intentions were translated into practices.

The first case study examines the implementation of the mothers' allowances program in Ontario from its inception in 1920 until its transformation into Family Benefits in 1967. The second considers the development of the Ontario experiment of public housing as a program addressing the shelter needs of women who raise children alone in indirect and pivotal ways.

Through these case studies, the thesis shows how the individual and real woman raising children alone has both her subjectivity and material existence constituted by governmental relations between the single mother complex and the apparatus of welfare. Finally, the thesis relates how the processes of constitution do not totally determine these women and that agency lies in the very processes that subject them. This understanding leads towards a conceptualization that processes of government can create openings for change and transformation.

Acknowledgements

This work was generously supported by the now extinct National Welfare Fellowship and the Novia Carter Fellowship. While in existence, these award programs, administered by Human Resources Development Canada, were instrumental in fostering a dynamic and productive social policy environment in Canada. In particular, I would like to thank M. Evariste Thériault for his helpful administration and leadership of the programs. I am especially grateful to my advisor, Anne Westhues, for her guidance, encouragement and support. I have been lucky be able to count on the expertise of a stimulating and competent committee: Cynthia Comacchio, Peter Dunn and Ken Morrison. I thank a number of colleagues and friends who have offered me excellent criticism and have helped me to pursue this project. Although their number is too large to mention I would like to single out Ian Skelton, Helen Ball, and Norma Jean Proffitt. In addition to all this help and attention, I also drew on countless conversations and discussions with many faculty, both at Laurier and at other universities. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the Archives of Ontario for the use of their valuable records pertaining to the Ontario Housing Corporation .

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	ii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	iv
Chapter 1:	
DEVisING PROBLEMS, JUDGEMENTS AND INTERVENTIONS: 'WE'RE MAKING SURE THAT THOSE DOLLARS DON'T GO TO BEER' ...	1
Chapter 2:	
A PRE-EXISTING PROBLEMATIC SUBJECT: SINGLE MOTHERS AS OBJECTS OF INTERVENTION	9
Introduction: Setting Parameters	9
The Mainstream Theories of Social Welfare	15
Anti-collectivism: self-sufficiency and independence.	15
Welfare collectivism: the social and moral threat.	20
Social administration: the state as a redistributive agent.	27
Mainstream: children in unstable families and insecure economic situations ...	33
Critiques: Class, Feminism, Diversities and Post-structuralism	37
The political economy of the welfare state.	37
The gender critique: the value of women's labour.	46
Diversity and the challenge of differences: The example of the race critique. ...	56
Post-structuralism and social welfare.	65
Welfare and Single Motherhood	74
Chapter 3:	
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS AND METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES: THE SINGLE MOTHER COMPLEX	82
Introduction: What is <i>Single Mother</i> ?	82
The Direction that Refuses to Point the Way: Governmentality	87
Challenges from Feminism: Agency and Change	98
The Single Mother Complex: Thinking a Framework Through	107
Methodological Perspectives	113
Pursuing a Meaning for Policy Analysis Today	119
Chapter 4:	
THE GOVERNMENTALIZATION OF THE SINGLE MOTHER COMPLEX: BROAD PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES	123
Introduction	123

A Payment for Mother-Work: Motherhood and Normal Family Life	130
Why This Form of Government: An Administrable Subject	135
Administrative Structure.	136
Transformations	140
Legacies	145
Who is Governed: Eligible Subjects	147
Widows	148
Wives of incapacitated men	149
Deserted women.	152
Foster mothers.	155
Mothers with only one child.	156
Divorcees and officially separated mothers	158
Wives of criminals in prison	158
Unmarried mothers	159
Residency and citizenship	161
Financial circumstances	163
Morally unfit	165
Exclusion/inclusion	166
What is Governed: Programmatic Justifications	169
Administration, Eligibility and Justifications	174

Chapter 5:

THE GOVERNMENTALIZATION OF THE SINGLE MOTHER COMPLEX: TECHNOLOGIES, CONSOLIDATION AND EFFECTS	178
Introduction	178
How Government is Exercised: The Technologies of Government	180
Financial Support.	181
In-kind and tagged benefits.	189
Supervision.	191
Personal social services.	201
Emergence of the Dependent Mother: A National System of Welfare	208
The Dependent Mother: A Subject of Family Benefits	220

Chapter 6:

THE SPACE OF MARGINAL POPULATIONS: THE EXPERIMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING	226
Introduction	226
Conceptualizing the Housing Problem: A Better Way of Life for Canadian Families ..	234
Why This Form of Government: Defining Canadian Public Housing	250
How is Government Exercised: Housing as a Noun	260
Adequacy	261
Type of dwelling.	263
Affordability	267

What Governmental Practices Seek to Govern: Spaces of Marginality	275
Construction of units	275
Management of units	279
Allocation of units	280
Public Housing Apparatus of Implementation	285
 <i>Chapter 7:</i>	
THE SPACE OF MARGINAL POPULATIONS: THE EMERGENCE OF GHETTOS OF THE POOR	
Introduction	289
Opposition to Public Housing	292
Who is Governed: Populating Public Housing	298
Not a 'dumping ground'	299
The contested space of public housing	302
Tenant body	307
From dwelling units to tenants	310
Tenants' movements and the gendering of tenants	313
The ghetto: a deterrent to normal family life	321
From Tenants to Marginal Populations	329
 <i>Chapter 8:</i>	
WORKING FROM WITHIN: RESTAGING SINGLE MOTHERHOOD	
The Complex of Meanings of Single Mother	337
The Dependent Mother	342
The Marginal Population	349
Considering Agency and Resistance	356
Challenging Oppressive Practices	360
 REFERENCES	 363
 APPENDIX	 395

Chapter 1

DEVISING PROBLEMS, JUDGEMENTS AND INTERVENTIONS: 'WE'RE MAKING SURE THAT THOSE DOLLARS DON'T GO TO BEER'¹

In Brazil there are no single mothers. There we find many, may be millions of women with their children and no fathers. We hear endless stories about how fathers faded away in search of work in the city, in another city, anywhere. We also find widows, divorced and separated women and unwed mothers. The variety of descriptions is very vast since nobody ever thought of grouping them together under any general denomination or category such as mothers of one sort or another. What purpose would that accomplish? All have to fend for themselves, and if you need to ask for help from family, friends or relatives what counts is the whole story not a label. There is no doubt that there is a stigma against the *unwed mother*, the only one of these denominations which can be said to refer to something close to a category and, as well, to be definitely associated with motherhood. But nobody would ever imagine that all women raising children alone could be the same one thing. "Ha! you mean in the sense that they all have children and no father present in the house? But it is so different! Is it the same over there where you are living?"

Perhaps it is. At least nobody in Canada asks you what a single mother is. How did some women get to be a group defined by one aspect of their lives? Moreover, how did this one aspect

¹ Ontario Premier, Mike Harris. Reported by the *Globe & Mail*, 17 April, 1998.

come to refer to much more than the absence of a father? In this country, as in other parts of the rich and stable Western world, the single mother invokes a complex set of ideas, values and judgements. These are both echoed and fuelled by professional and scientific discourses which give to this group of women the aura of a social problem. The problem they represent is as diverse as the many individual portraits of single mothers themselves, but it is nevertheless a problem, sometimes of an extreme and increasing magnitude (see discussions in Ermisch, 1991; Harding, 1993a, 1993b). A frequent argument invokes the prevalence of poverty and other financial stresses among single mothers (Hetherington, Cox & Cox, 1982; Marsden, 1969; McQuillan, 1992; Statistics Canada, 1993), and the burden that they pose for social spending (see Durham, 1991; Harding, 1993a, 1993b). Single mothers' poverty is also seen as significantly affecting their children's academic, behavioural and emotional situation (e.g. Hetherington, Camara, & Featherman, 1983; Ross & Sawhill, 1975) as well as being a risk to adolescents' health and adaptation (Hamburg, 1993; Russel & Ellis, 1991).

The problem of single motherhood is also seen by some as characteristic of particular groups - such as Blacks in the US, who, for example, experienced customary family separations under slavery (see discussion in Amott, 1990) - or of underclass habits (see review in Leung, 1998, chap.1). Teenage unwed mothers and young divorcees are pathologized (see Horowitz, 1995; Kamerman & Kahn, 1988); they are portrayed in the media as deviant and as symbols of the decline of social and moral order (e.g., Hewlet, 1986; Schamess, 1990). They are also a reminder of the exponential growth of these problems with their inter-generational consequences:

Poverty and economic insecurity are serious problems in their own right. Some analysts, however, go even further to argue that the families headed by single women are creating an "underclass" in American society. According to this view, offspring from such families are more likely to drop out of school, be unemployed, and themselves form mother only families than are children who grow up with

two parents. (...) Evidence also indicates that income accounts for a substantial part - but not all - of the intergenerational transmission of poverty. Not surprisingly the greatest effect of income is on educational attainment and occupational status. Even after income is taken into account, however, children who grow up in mother only families are still far more likely to become single parents themselves than are offsprings who grow up in two parent households (Garfinkel & McLanahan, 1986, p.11-12).

Further, single mothers, in certain arguments, pose a problem to the family as an institution, threatening with breakdown and disorganization this basic unit of society (Berger & Berger, 1983; Murray, 1984). See for example this commentary by Green (1993):

The family is the foundation stone of a free society. In it children learn the voluntary restraint, respect for others and sense of personal responsibility without which freedom is impossible. Yet family life has received surprisingly little attention from the supporters of liberty. The probable reason is that, until very recently, solid family life could be taken for granted. But today family life is breaking down. One parent families now make up about 20 per cent of all families; 31 per cent of all births now take place outside marriage; and each year about 150,000 children become the victims of divorce. On any reckoning these are dramatic developments which have caused many commentators, whether they incline to socialism or liberty, to re-think their philosophy (p.vi).

These understandings of single motherhood as a problem have generated an urgency for change and a heated social policy discussion throughout the affluent West. Ellwood (1988) has argued that welfare benefits tend to increase single parenthood. More conservative commentators charged that the support of single parents is a disincentive to marriage and family life (Gilder, 1982; Murray, 1984). As well, single motherhood has been used as one of the reasons to attack sex education, divorce laws, abortion, obscenity, homosexuality and contraceptives (see discussion in Durham, 1991; and Somerville, 1992). The 'blanket (*sic*) cheque' of social welfare allowances, which enables mothers budgeting decisions, is currently seen in Ontario as an invitation to vice and extravagance, as the citation in the title of this section illustrates, rather than an expenditure on the health of children (see Ontario Premier announcements, *Globe & Mail*, 17 April, 1998, p.1).

The search for a solution to the single mother problem in Western societies has profoundly

linked women raising children alone and the system of welfare. This system is itself a hallmark of the West and has strong associations with the family and motherhood. As of the fourteenth century, according to Raymond Williams' *"Keywords, vocabulary of culture and society"* (1988), the word welfare was commonly used to indicate happiness or prosperity: 'The extended sense of *welfare*, as an object of organized care or provision, came in the early twentieth century; most of the older words in this sense (see especially Charity) had acquired unacceptable associations' (p.332, emphasis in the original). From individual happiness and prosperity, the word, at the end of the nineteenth century, became associated with an emergent understanding of society as a collective form where private life and public wellbeing interconnected. A concern with the welfare of certain groups became, in a variety of forms, a shared trait of western European democratic nations and their colonies.

From its early manifestations as voluntary reformist activity and the gradual building of welfare programs to the rapid explosion of a welfare state in the post World War II period (in Canada, see Guest, 1985, chap. 1, for comparative studies see summary in O'Brien & Penna, 1998, p.8) preoccupations with the family have been central to the formation of a system of welfare. The ideal of the male breadwinner, dependent wife and children as the basic unit of society has inspired a system that reproduces and reinforces this form of family through a complex of ideas and practices. Elizabeth Wilson, one of the first social welfare feminists to expose the association between this system and the ideal of the family, has coined the now famous phrase: 'Social welfare policies amount to no less than the state organization of domestic life' (1977, p.9). Welfarism, as envisioned in Britain by the Beveridge Report in 1942, meant that 'The prevention of want and the diminution and relief of disease - the special aim of the social services - are in fact

a common interest to all citizens' (cited in Godin & Dryzek, 1987, p.64). This common interest included a very specifically class defined, gender delimited and sexual preference stamped basic family unit. The welfare state became the very symbol of a postwar consensus around objectives of growth, production and the male headed family unit.

Welfare, in its long and continuously unfolding trajectory, has touched many individuals and groups in particular ways. The diverse group of women brought together under the label *single mothers* is of special significance for social welfare. The widow with young children, the deserted mother, the divorced mother, the separated or married mother with absent husband, the displaced homemaker, the battered wife, the adolescent mother and many other characterizations of some women's lives have been, throughout the transformations of welfare, a central focus of its practices and strategies. Authors such as Snell (1991) and Ursel (1992, p.67) document the apprehension felt, around the turn of the century, by the Social Reform Movement in Canada with the increasing rate of illegitimate births, marriage breakdown and widowhood seen as a consequence of the impact of industrialization on the family and the Canadian way of life. By World War I the arguments about conditions of the industrial worker, growth of slums, infant mortality, crime and disease were associated with threats of family instability, juvenile delinquency and the importance of maternity, among others, to national survival (see Comacchio, 1997 for a discussion of changes in the ideas and roles of the family in early twentieth century). Reform ideas, around the interwar years, resulted in one of the first Canadian experiments with formal income support programs (Little, 1998; Strong-Boag, 1979). Mothers' allowance inaugurated a role of the state as guarantor of wellbeing through a direct intervention in certain families . It provided governmental support for deserving widows and, in one of its many metamorphosed

forms, it is maintained until today.

The origins of income security in Ontario begin with motherhood. With the creation of mothers' allowances in 1920, women became the first clients of provincial social assistance (Struthers, 1994, p.19).

In addition, many other social welfare interventions have, throughout the development of Canadian social welfare, addressed this group of women in indirect and ambiguous ways. One example is public housing which became, in the 1960s, a much heralded radical new approach to preventing urban poverty in Canada. Single mothers were never intended as a specific target group of public housing but, nevertheless, they became not only a visible tenant of this segregated space but its utmost icon. As enduring and controversial as the welfare system itself, the single mother constitutes one of its most popular images.

Single motherhood is therefore, as this brief overview has shown, a widely studied and highly polemicized topic in Western societies. I propose to contribute to this body of knowledges and convictions by examining, not the single mother herself, but her formation, sustenance and effects as manifested in a specific location - Ontario. This is, above all, a proposal to undertake an inquiry into the nature of single motherhood and its relationship with social welfare focusing on the assumptions and functioning of the ways society problematizes groups of the population and makes them the object of collective provision. At a general level this exploration speaks to an investigation of the effects of systems of social welfare in the operation of a particular case, that of the single mothers. However, this dissertation is also an attempt to make sense of social interventions in the form of social welfare programs and their relationships with people and change. This is, therefore, also an exploration of agency and transformation within this system.

In this dissertation, I will use a theoretical framework based on Foucault's work and

expanded by a variety of contemporary social scientists: governmentality. Governmentality places particular importance on practices of welfare rather than the common focus on rationalities. I will use, as well, a variety of contemporary feminist formulations and focuses which have explored agency and the subject in contemporary societies. Using this framework, my intent is, borrowing loosely from Judith Butler's discussion about her own work (see Prins 1998), to challenge the meanings and workings of a central social concept of welfare - that of single motherhood - by undoing its assumptions, denaturalizing its explanatory status and restaging its ontological essence.

This task seems particularly timely. On one hand, the figure of the single mother seems to have crystallized many current debates around the welfare traditions of postwar Western societies. Changes in the family form and the redefinition of the family have been at the core of the discussion regarding the nature of welfare. Either as a threat to the assumptions of the traditional family or as a promise of women's independence from male control or, even because of the challenges single motherhood poses to the universalization of the wage-worker, social interventions addressing single mothers, directly or indirectly, have been at the centre of a discussion regarding the public management of a future society and the socialization of its members. On the other hand, contemporary discussion around welfare is also a discussion about specific interventions, the meaning of public provision, the basis and rationale for collective support and their articulation with individual responsibility. Single mothers' nature and their entitlement have been a constant in these debates and newly articulated solutions concerning family responsibilities have yielded a variety of interventions. For example, measures already implemented in the US, Britain and Canada emphasize, rather than the state, the responsibilities of

a private individual, the absent father or the single mother herself, for child maintenance. In this sense the single mother is the welfare diva: the central figure who, on and off the stage, carries and sustains the show.

The dissertation follows a structured path. First I review the theoretical articulations, the political rationalities, through which dominant understandings of welfare systematize and consolidate single motherhood as a representation of problems and a central object of social interventions (Chapter 2). This will provide an overview of principal mainstream welfare theories, a summary of their central critiques, and my assessment of how this scholarship has contributed to an understanding of single mothers. Next, in Chapter 3, a conceptual framework for examining the relationship between single mothers and welfare will be proposed and the object of the thesis will be reformulated and expanded with the proposal of two case studies of government interventions. The following two chapters (Chapters 4 and 5) will discuss the first case study exploring the implementation of mothers' allowance in Ontario. The second case study - the public housing experiment in Ontario - will be discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. Concluding, Chapter 8 will summarize the empirical studies and discuss the implications of the dissertation for the study and development of social policies today.

Chapter 2:

A PRE-EXISTING PROBLEMATIC SUBJECT:

SINGLE MOTHERS AS OBJECTS OF INTERVENTION

Political rationality has grown and imposed itself all throughout the history of Western societies. It first took its stand on the idea of pastoral power, than on that of reason of state. Its inevitable effects are both individualisation and totalisation. Liberation can only come from attacking, not just one of these two effects, but political rationality's very roots (Foucault, 1981, p.254) .

Introduction: Setting Parameters

This chapter reviews how the relationship between single mothers and social welfare has been conceptualized by dominant theories of welfare. The review focuses on the way social welfare is understood and how a claim to address women raising children alone through the system of welfare is articulated, in Canada, within these dominant theories. It addresses the *political rationalities*, in the sense proposed by Foucault, that have animated the links between welfare and single mothers. Its aim is to make explicit these rationalities: how ideas and reasons have made sense of women raising children alone as a social problem which could and should be addressed by specific social welfare interventions. It is, therefore, a review of the main theories that formulate single mothers as subjects of welfare rather than a review of the history of single motherhood or of works addressing single mothers.

A review addressing the rationalities of *social welfare* contains, already at the outset, a reference to the geographic and historical location of these ideas. Social welfare, both as a

preoccupation and as a series of collective measures aimed at promoting the wellbeing of populations, is associated with liberal democratic Western states. This geographic reference is in fact a political one in the sense that, putting aside the interconnected socio-economic and cultural processes in the world, it refers to some countries which share certain characteristics. In a summary form, Williams (1988, p.333) has sketched these characteristics as constituting, first, a form of political rule different from communism; second, having Christianity as a predominant religion; and, third, exhibiting a relatively strong and dominant economy world wide. In this sense although the Brazilian or Indian economies are larger than the Australian and all three countries are in the southern hemisphere, only Australia is seen as sharing the traditions of Western democratic liberal states and having a social welfare system. The West is commonly understood as the rich, industrialized capitalist nations.

Some of the icons of Western democracies such as the emphasis on democratic rights and procedures - e.g., election, representation and mandate - the capitalist economy, and the nuclear family as the basic unit of society have, in the 1990s, become the new indicators of an overwhelmingly victory of Western political, cultural and social organization. Other such icons, however, remain part of the common baggage shared by the traditional northern European states and some former British colonies. Welfare is among the latter. A review of social welfare approaches, then, is necessarily restricted to approaches developed in the West rather than world-wide approaches to promoting the wellbeing of populations.

In undertaking a review of dominant social welfare theories as they affected the understandings of single mothers in Canada it is necessary to make clear the relation of this country with the West. The map of the ways social welfare understands, distinguishes, classifies

and addresses single motherhood in Canada, necessarily includes traditions, discourses and rationalities which, in general, were not thoroughly implemented in this country, such as, for example, the Elizabethan Poor Laws. Although these laws were only marginally implemented in Canada, certain practices such as workhouses or houses of industry and, primarily, the body of justifications, feelings and roles that were part of the Poor Laws and its reform in 1834, have profoundly marked the rationalities around social welfare in this country but not determined them. In this sense the development of welfare has some common features, structures and processes across the West but it assumed intrinsically different forms in the different nations of this continuum (see Tilly, 1984, ch.6).

The review of this shared theoretical body of social welfare rationalities invites also, in addition to geographical and historical, some methodological considerations. This task speaks to an attempt to understand general constructs and to group them into schools of thought with clear boundaries despite their multitude of points of view, their richness and their internal contradictions. This has often been accomplished by electing a particular criterion - say for example, the role assigned to the state - and using this criterion to align or separate formulations from different authors. I acknowledge the difficulties of using this method which produces a somewhat caricatural sketch of these multifaceted rationalities. On the other hand, as social welfare theories have been widely studied, there is, already ingrained in this literature, a certain consensus around the criteria and the groupings they generate within this literature. Therefore, in this chapter, I follow the traditional organization of the welfare literature around the relationship between the market and the state as it has been established by British, American and Canadian scholarship.

This organization, however, is not without some internal discrepancies, although most of them have been harmonized in the recent flurry of new editions of classical social welfare publications (e.g. George & Wilding, 1994 and Pascall, 1997 in Britain; Armitage, 1996 and McGilly, 1998 in Canada). Williams (1989, ch.1-2) discussing the classifications of the classic manuals of the discipline (George & Wilding, 1985; Mishra, 1981; Pinker, 1979; Room, 1979; Titmuss, 1974; Wedderburn, 1965), sketches the convergence of their several classifications around three broad categories: anti-collectivism; social reformism; and political economy followed by the feminist and the race critiques. Pascall's classic feminist rendering of the literature (1986, p.6) summarizes this knowledge into a *mainstream* approach, constituted by individualism, social reformists and political economy, and a feminist critique. A similar path is proposed by Abramovitz (1988), who understands mainstream as composed of liberals and Marxists. Dale & Foster (1986) propose a comparable classification but carefully comment that '[t]here are of course, other critiques of the Welfare State which, like feminism, unite theoretical analysis with a commitment to change society' (p.x). Canadian scholar Djao (1983), identifies four perspectives on social welfare: rugged individualism; modified individualism; social democracy; and Marxism. Armitage (1996) follows Williams closely but attributes a Canadian slant to the names of the mainstream classifications: Conservative, Liberal and Socialist Schools.

Overall these scholars, although not in the same way, use the axis of the interactions between the state and the market to examine mainstream thought and propose the critiques organized around the class, gender and race analyse. Following their footsteps, I trace the unfolding of the three established core mainstream approaches which provide a comprehensive theoretical view of social welfare. Added to them I also review the emergence of critiques based

on class, gender, race, ability and other differences as well as post-structuralist formulations which have developed understandings of aspects of social welfare or question some of the established formulations while adopting others.

A review of a body of literature as vast as that encompassed by the theories of welfare encounters a number of methodological difficulties which have been dealt with, in this chapter, in a variety of ways. One of these difficulties is the clear demarcation of boundaries and origins of each group of theories. This is a particularly sensitive problem since there is immense cross fertilization among perspectives, particularly among recent critiques which have not been thoroughly scrutinized and classified. Some authors within the feminist critique, for example, are also self-proclaimed Marxists. Or, in another example, the discussion of differences may be considered a part of the post-structuralist approach. Throughout this chapter these difficulties will be made explicit rather than solved. Although the different approaches will be definitely inserted within a specific classification, their ambivalent location within those boundaries will be highlighted and discussed. In particular, a variety of recent contributions characterized by the 'post' prefix - post-Fordism, post-modernism, post-structuralism, post-welfare state, post-enlightenment - have come to fore (see Borrows & Loader, 1994; O'Brien & Penna, 1998). These will be addressed, here, under the post-structuralism label emphasising primarily their relevance for illuminating the link between social welfare and women who raise children alone.

In addition to the demarcation of boundaries, a further methodological difficulty faced by a review of theories of social welfare is the reduction of the wealth of aspects embedded in a particular perspective by presenting, essentially, a generalization or an analysis of predominant tendencies. I addressed this difficulty by attempting to focus each different perspective around its

contributions for the understanding of single motherhood rather than its importance for the field of social welfare. As well, along with others (Pascall, 1986), I address the concern of describing only predominant tendencies within a perspective by identifying specific representative authors in each perspective and exploring their contributions to the particular school of thought and to understandings of single motherhood.

In terms of structure, the organization of this chapter will follow the dominant welfare perspectives and their relevant formulations to address women who raise children alone. The first section discusses the core mainstream theories of social welfare. These are divided into three perspectives: anti-collectivism, welfare collectivism and the social administration school. I conclude this section with a summary of how women raising children alone are understood within the mainstream. The next section discusses the main critiques to the mainstream. First, it addresses the political economy of the welfare state which applied Marxist theories to develop an understanding of welfare in contemporary states. Then, it describes the feminist welfare perspective, which brought women and their work, and with them the single mothers, to a position of centrality within welfare discourses. Following, the thoughts around difference and diversity are explored and particular attention is dedicated to the race perspective since it has proved central to discussions regarding single motherhood and welfare although not the sole or main representative of these thoughts. Finally, I introduce the post-structuralist perspectives which have problematised the previous approaches and interjected uncertainty, attention to constitutive aspects and a rejection of totalities to welfare perspectives. In the final section I summarize the theories and perspectives discussed earlier in the chapter, discuss the contributions of these critiques, and point out some dimensions of this body of theories I find wanting for an

understanding of single motherhood.

The Mainstream Theories of Social Welfare

As remarked previously, a number of welfare scholars use the designation mainstream to refer to the body of theoretical articulations that form the dominant meanings of welfare (e.g.: Abramovitz, 1988; Pascall, 1986; Williams, 1989). These meanings are rooted in the belief of individuals as substantial entities from whom other categories are derived, that is, in the individual as a starting point. In the nineteenth century, certain formulations of individualism emerged in a highly articulated form as a school of thought usually referred to as liberalism (O'Brien & Penna, 1998, pp.16-44). It proposed a doctrine of social wellbeing in which individual actions and initiatives are seen as the prime means to interact in society, with the market place constituting the main locale of these interactions. Liberalism had enormous consequences for the formulation of a variety of rationalities around social welfare (see C. Gordon, 1991, p.14-15). Among these, I have distinguished three main approaches which have been referred to by a various names but are addressed here as: anti-collectivism, welfare collectivism and social administration (loosely following Williams, 1989). This section will discuss these three approaches which, to this day, coexist and continue to produce new formulations and explanations in face of social, economic, political and cultural developments.

Anti-collectivism: self-sufficiency and independence.

Anti-collectivism has a variety of representations and spans the conceptual spectrum from nineteenth century *laissez faire*, neo-liberalism and the policies of today's new right (see Djao, 1983; O'Brien & Penna, 1998; Williams, 1989). Common to all is the fundamental belief in

individual action and initiative and the corollary free market as the prime motor of progress. In its laissez faire formulation, anti-collectivism is rooted in Social Darwinism as represented in the works of Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner. Spencer, for example, saw society as an organism constantly perfecting itself through elimination of the unfit and poor (Martindale, 1960). Sumner argued that individual self-assertion was an expression of the wisdom of nature (Hofstadter, 1955). These authors proposed the market as the best path to secure individuals' needs and desires. Both proposed the abolition of the Elizabethan Poor Laws and opposed public measures such as hygienic controls.

Within the tradition of the Elizabethan Poor Laws, those that could not look after their own wellbeing might receive a certain measure of help from private or public sources. After the reform of the poor laws, this help was regulated by the principles of *less eligibility* and *deservedness*. In order not to interfere with the market activity of the purchase of individual labour power, less eligibility implies that welfare measures cannot exceed the lower market wage and, as well, should not grant to the recipient the same privileges as those assigned to the individual workers. Recipients of collective support also have to prove that their condition is not due to their own fault, to their lack of self restraint, or improvidence, or some other moral weaknesses: i.e. prove that they are deserving subjects.

Collective provision has a specific interpretation within anti-collectivism: 'to allow individuals to provide for themselves, to reward those who have done so, and, to provide a back up for those who have not been able to do so because of circumstances beyond their control' (Sapiro, 1990, p.42). Within the laissez-faire tradition, individuals have specific functional roles. Men are, through selling their labour in the market, to support their wives and children. Women

are addressed through the family unit where they should perform the natural, biologically determined roles of bearing, rearing and caring. The fundamental importance of the family lies in its role of disciplining its members as individuals to foster success in the market place. Hence, it remains an appendage to the world of production (Pascall, 1986; Williams, 1989). This normalization of family life and its protagonists is based on an individual whose place of claiming individuality is the market place, is masculine and has a job (Sapiro, 1990). Women are neither protagonists nor beneficiaries but, as mothers, essential to the formation of the individual through the family.

Overall, for the anti-collectivists, families that do not fit within the traditional model of a male wage earner and his dependent wife and children are not only exceptions but unfortunate accidents (see Gordon, 1994a, p.52). Single mothers are in this category. According to Brown (1988), after the 1834 reform of the Poor Laws in Britain, widows and their children continued to receive out-door relief but they were expected to retribute through piece work at home or through the care and boarding of orphans. Separated women were still the responsibility of their husbands and qualified for relief in the less eligible conditions of the workhouse. The unmarried mothers were since 1610 addressed through Bastardy Act, which condemned the 'lewdness' of the mother who failed to procure herself a husband and a father for her children. She and her child were treated harshly as a deterrent to those who indulge in activities which burden the community. The 1834 reform maintained that there could be no reason for giving to 'vice the privileges denied to misfortune' (cited in Dennis & Erdos, 1993, p.114). Collective provision for women raising children alone in this tradition is, hence, not only a form of support but also an instrument for teaching appropriate behaviours and for separating those deserving from the

undeserving.

In Canada, with few exceptions, the poor laws were never implemented (Splane, 1965). Provisions for welfare came preferably through the family, but could also come from private philanthropy or through local public sources. In all circumstances they should encourage self-sufficiency and the expected functioning of the family. Widows and their children, depending on their moral standing, could be the deserving subjects of public or charitable welfare. However, within the anti-collectivism perspectives, welfare has the very specific function to make this incomplete unit of society function, as closely as possible, as a complete unit. An illustration of this position in a Canadian situation is found in Charlotte Whitton's depiction of the allowance to widows with two or more children in the interwar years in British Columbia:

Mothers aid, properly administered, is much more than a mere means for supplying a state amount of material wants. It is a question not only of whether aid is given, or how much is given, but how it is given. Service must precede and accompany it, to the end that the family itself realizes that it, and each of its members, no less than provincial funds, must honestly and sincerely participate in the whole plan, which is the development of initiative, and self-reliance and independence at the earliest possible date, and to such degree and strength as to avoid future dependency (Cited in Guest, 1985, p.56).

As the West emerged from the World War II, anti-collectivism inspired, again, a clear perspective on welfare. Then it found its main expression in Milton Friedman and F.A. von Hayek, who acclaim freedom as the main value, and economic principles as the rule for social and political life. Friedman saw freedom to act in the market, guaranteed by equality of rights and of opportunity, as the main tool for protecting the individual's interests (1962, 14-15).

Hayek (1949) declared freedom from coercion the basis of economic freedom and claimed that welfare services represented state coercion and unequal treatment of different people. Hence for these authors social welfare is achieved through the ability to foster people to become independent. Help for those outside the labour market should come from private charity in order

to preserve the freedom of those who give and provide an incentive to work (Friedman, 1962). Hayek (1944/1976) recognizes the family as a legitimate unit as much as the individual but in its strict function of fitting children for the labour market. The heart of a free society is an energetic, private moral order built on strong families and vigorous voluntary associations serving one another, i.e., social welfare has what was latter called a residual role (Wilensky & Lebeaux, 1965). Referring to the British single mother, for example, Cheetham (1976) comments on the clear separation of those morally undeserving since 'a society's welfare system must not appear to undermine one of its basic units, namely the conjugal family' (p.149). Similarly, Melichercik (1978/1987) describes a trend in Canadian social policy which argues that the development of supports systems would 'encourage and facilitate further erosion of what they consider traditional family values and practices' (p.217).

In its current articulation, anti-collectivism assumes expression in the writings of the new right represented by Roger Scruton (1980) and Rhodes Boyson (1971) inspired primarily by Hayek (see Gray, 1993). Here the individual is considered free to choose, take risks and be held responsible for the consequences of her/his actions. For this group, the distribution of wealth that arises in a free market is fair if it is the product of individual acts of free exchange. The role of the state is to provide a framework of rules within which each individual act of free exchange is uncoerced. The new right developed a particular critique of the welfare state which they consider inefficient, wasteful, morally disruptive and an inhibitor of individual freedom through taxation, planning, legal controls and the monopoly of social service provision.

Specific social policy applications are the writings of Mount (1982) and Scruton (1980) where the family plays a central role and state intervention is necessary to strengthen that role.

Women, especially mothers, should be primarily domestic and supported by men. New right views in the US, Britain and Canada have particularly attacked state support for single mothers as devaluing the role of men as providers:

Nothing is so destructive to all these male values as the growing imperious recognition that when all is said and done his wife and children can do better without him (Gilder, 1982 quoted in Mayo & Weir, 1993, p.38).

In Britain, Green (1993) has called for the state to introduce measures to encourage traditional two-parent families through changes in the divorce laws, reform of benefits and tax incentives (in Britain see Mayo & Weir, 1993, p.37-38; Pascall, 1986, p.7; and Williams, 1989, p.119; in the US see Fraser (1993); Fraser & Gordon, 1992; Sapiro, 1990). In Canada, Eichler (1985) documents similar calls by the group REAL Women which identified the divorce legislation as a social evil threatening the stability of marriage and the family (p.20) and Richards (1997) argues that the state should encourage two-parent heterosexual families on the grounds that these are qualitatively better for children than other types of families (for other examples see McDaniel, 1994, p.123).

Welfare collectivism: the social and moral threat.

Welfare collectivism encompasses a variety of views and ideas including the liberal reformers of the turn of the century, to Keynes and Beveridge in the 1930s and 1940s, through to the more recent perspectives of the mixed economy of welfare represented by Plant (1988) and Pinker (1990). Although with variations, welfare collectivists share with the anti-collectivists a common belief in the superiority of capitalism, along with individual liberty, the importance of character and self development (George & Wilding, 1985). However they believe in alleviating the negative effects of capitalism and the private market with state intervention or a combination

of philanthropy and state efforts. The aim of welfare collectivism is to promote equality and political stability to allow for harmonious economic development (Williams, 1989).

For the early Fabians in Britain, unemployment and poverty are seen as rooted in the very organization of industry and threaten the possibility of a household to be self-sufficient. The solution proposed lies in the state management of the spheres of the family, social policy and industry: industrial labour should be organized with wage earning concentrated on the able-bodied man - what Walters (1994, p.271) calls the masculinization of industrial labour - and complemented by women's maternal and domestic work in the family. The innovation these early welfare collectivists introduced, however, rests in the articulation of a rationality of collective responsibility for the wellbeing of the population and in doing so defined a role for their own class. Through campaigns, lobbying and advocacy these white, middle-class, urban reformists proposed that to help the unfortunate to stand on their own feet was in the interest of all, and, more than that, was a duty if society was to progress. For example, during the interwar years, fatherless families judged deserving, i.e. widows, were the aim of intense campaigns on both sides of the Atlantic. In the women's movement, welfare collectivists demonstrated how financial support for deserving widows was in the interest of children and ultimately of society. This support would eliminate the threat of poverty and its consequences: delinquency and social unrest (see Gordon, 1994a in the US; Strong-Boag, 1979 in Canada; Wilson, 1977 in England). A quote from the annual report of 1920-21 of The Ontario Mothers' Allowance Commission demonstrates how the link between the duties of motherhood and society was formulated:

The mother is regarded as an applicant for employment as a guardian of the future citizens of the State, and if she does not measure up to the State's standards for such guardians, other arrangements must be sought in the best interests of the children and to prevent increase in the numbers of dependents of this nature (cited in Strong-Boag, 1979, p.27).

In North America, although mothers' allowance was passed, the dominant approach to single motherhood in the first half of the twentieth century seemed to be 'a very modest financial aid for worthy widows, who also had to work; condemnation and little help for "unworthy" single mothers; and maternity homes for hiding and a place for childbirth by the "fallen" whose children would soon be adopted' (Kamerman & Kahn, 1988, p.50; see also Kunzel, 1993 in the US; and in Canada see Levesque, 1994, Little, 1998).

Welfare collectivist thought is also expressed in the works of both Keynes and Beveridge who had a remarkably enduring influence in the formulation of welfare practices. From their experience in the depressed thirties, both believed that unregulated capitalism was wasteful and inefficient (Djao, 1983). The Beveridge Report - the 1942 "Report on the Social Insurance and Allied Services" in Britain - became one of the most important documents, within the welfare state, regarding the definition of who is entitled to what under what circumstances. The report named the 'five giants in the path of reconstruction and progress' (cited in Guest, 1985, p.109) - want, disease, ignorance, squalor, and idleness - to which the solution was discerning state intervention, through the coordination of contributory insurance schemes (see Colwill, 1994). Want, the lack of income to allow a subsistence level, according to Beveridge's surveys was caused by interruption or loss of earning power. His recommendations rested then on a series of provisions to adjust the relationship between industry and population: social insurance against loss of earning power due to unemployment; sickness; disability; and old age in addition to children's allowance to adjust wages to family size. Employment, the link to social security, was a male issue since marriage, as specified in the report, should be women's sole occupation. Men offered women security through marriage and they constituted a single administrative unit: the family.

Beveridge considered housewives and mothers as essential for the continuance of British race and ideals in the world; and the consolidation of the family as the basis of social stability (Colwill, 1994; Pascall, 1986, p.8; and Williams, 1989, p.123). Households not conforming to this model were seen as deviant, transitional or potentially problematic. Wilson (1977, p.148) argues that this path to social security has enforced two traits in the nature of the postwar family: that most married women should not do waged work remaining dependent on their husband's incomes and benefits; and secondly that the numbers of single mothers, then primarily perceived as widows, would remain minimal and required no special provision.

Brandt (1982) documents that women's labour constituted a problematic issue for the planners of postwar reconstruction in Canada. It was clear to them that although there would be less employment available to women, war widows and single women would still be forced to look for permanent employment due to the shortage of potential husbands (p.242). However, Leonard Marsh's 1943 "*Report on Social Security for Canada*", modelled on the Beveridge Report, envisaged women's social security in their capacity as housewives. In a chapter on women's needs the Report maintained that under normal circumstances, women would not be seeking gainful employment. Widows, in most provinces, were eligible for mothers' allowance. The Marsh Report judged these programs to be inadequate and in need of standardization, but nevertheless, it gave them its approval. The plight of unmarried mothers combined the diametrically opposed role of mother and worker and their social security took a back seat to that of the dependent wife/mother (Pierson, 1990, p.82; see Riley, 1983, ch.6 for a discussion re: Britain).

Although the postwar reconstruction documents provided the founding policies for the

welfare state, Pascall (1986, p.8) proposes that it is in T.H. Marshall that she finds one of its most influential theorists. His 1949 essay, "*Citizenship and Social Class*" established one of the major political concepts of Western democratic thought: citizenship. In his elaboration of the progressive citizenship rights - civil rights, political rights and social rights - Marshall discusses women's *political* rights through suffrage but he does not address their *social* right. It is the social rights of citizenship, that is a 'modicum of economic welfare and security (...) to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in society' (cited in Djao, 1983), which he associates with development of the welfare state (see Williams, 1989).

The concept of citizenship while implying neither class nor gender and refusing all differences (Riley, 1983, p.170), refers to a fulltime male worker with capacity to build up lengthy, unbroken contribution to social welfare through his employment records. Women's social citizenship, i.e., full access to the benefits of the social insurance programs, remained problematic not only for the married woman, whose eligibility was, by design, through her husband (Eisenstein, 1981, p.344; Pascall, 1986, p.9). Working women, as many feminist authors remark (e.g. Lister, 1995, 1991; O'Connor, 1993; Orloff; 1993), also had restricted access to the benefits of social citizenship due to their limited employment possibilities and, as well, the lower value attached to traditional women's occupations. In addition to the exclusion of women, the history of citizenship rights is linked to the consolidation of nation states to which citizens belong and have claims against. Its provides a rationale not only to allocate rights and entitlements in Western European nations but also to deny such entitlements (Taylor, 1989). Resting as it does on a series of mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion of particular gender, immigrant and

racialized groups (Taylor, 1989), Marshall's citizenship focuses on the ideal of rights and responsibilities of certain individuals and implies a supportive and enforcing role for the state (see Riley, 1992a).

A result of developing the idea of welfare based on the notion of citizenship was the widespread use of the postwar language of egalitarianism which had profound consequences for women raising children alone. The rhetoric of motherhood during the postwar became the universal representation of women's aspiration and destiny. Riley (1983, ch.6) argues that the woman-worker, the category under which the single mother finds herself, is implicitly desexed and there is no discussion of her needs. Working women with children became an invisible category, overlooked from virtually all perspectives. In the postwar, a perspective that continued to address mothers who worked is the new psychiatric social work or casework which applied corrective inspection to "problem families". Increasingly single mothers' families were associated with pathologies as these discussions of out-of-wedlock mothers shows:

Dependent, irresponsible and unstable, they respond like small children to the immediate moment (Young, 1954 cited in Fraser & Gordon, 1994, p.325).

Illegitimate pregnancy may be a sign of inability to meet satisfactorily the pressures and responsibilities of adulthood. Like stealing, setting fires, and difficult behaviour in school, it may be a symptom of a fundamental problem. And in later life similar problems may result in, for example, alcoholism and marital discord (Canadian Welfare Council, 1957, p.5)

Also based on the concept of citizenship is the notion of responsibilities. Gordon (1994a, p.33) notes that in the postwar period, although the single mother appeared less often in policy discussions, they continued to populate the caseworkers' universe. It is in analysing these sources that she notes that their diagnoses acknowledged other than widow categories of single mothers but were, at the same time, less sympathetic and more blaming than those of the interwar years. Equality meant that women had to assume more responsibility for their "sexual immorality". The

emphasis was put on the importance of motherhood in promoting child wellbeing and rearing citizens capable of contributing to society. The postwar period was dominated by John Bowlby's influential theory of maternal deprivation: the psychological needs of the child required fulltime motherhood for a healthy development (Riley, 1983). In these circumstances, a single mother family, where the pattern was a working mother, was by definition deprived and in need of counselling and rehabilitation (see Gordon, 1994a, p.296).

Responsibility continues central to a current welfare collectivist perspective, the welfare pluralism. Plant (1988) suggests that the citizenship approach assumes that there are real common values between groups and classes and these secure the framework of rights and resources within which the individual can pursue their own conception of good. In other words, the communal basis of society is reflected in the agreement about the shared resources and means of citizenship rather than in terms of common ends. The democratic rights of citizenship, in this perspective, provide a secure basis for assessing different groups' claims, and the respective roles of the market and the state. The role and limit of collective provision is seen in terms of the liberty of the individual citizens to use the state as an enabling power to secure a sense of real freedom. Freedom, an ability to do something, is secured by the state by opposition to freedom for the new right where the absence of coercion and the market secure the resources to realize freedom. Rights are also based on reciprocity and the community has the right to insist on obligations as a condition of some benefits of membership.

Central to that position is the doctrine of personal responsibility under virtually all social circumstances. People act under favourable and unfavourable conditions but remain responsible moral agents. (...) In light of this political morality I see incontrovertible evidence of a weakening of the norms of the traditional family since the 1960s. It is not that I see a golden age of traditionalism. Material deprivation, and inequality between the classes and the sexes were integral to British society in the first half of the century. There was no utopia. There was cruelty, a double standard of sexual morality, incest and child abuse, savage treatment of unmarried mothers, desertions and separations. Nevertheless the traditional

family system was a coherent strategy for ordering of relations in such a way as to equip children for their own eventual adult responsibility (Halsey, 1993, p.x-xi).

In similar context, single motherhood is denounced in the US by Etzioni (1993), Galston (1991, 1990-1991), Whitehead (1993) and Wilson (1987) among others, as having consequences that affect society at large because 'we are all made poorer by the inability or unwillingness of young adults to become contributing members of society' (Galston cited in Young, 1994, p.89). In their recent overreaching review, McLanahan & Sandefur (1995) build an argument that single parent families are not only detrimental to a child's wellbeing but also to the mothers, fathers and children living in intact families through the spatial, cultural and economic effects of single motherhood upon society as a whole. Measures to privilege two parent families, encourage parents to take care of young children at home and thwart divorce procedures are justified by the increased risk children growing up in single parents home face (Elshtain, 1994).

Social administration: the state as a redistributive agent.

By the 1950s and 1960s the study of social policy became established as an academic subject in the British universities and this new social science marked the directions of postwar scholarship on welfare. Richard Titmuss, the Chair of Social Administration at the LSE from 1950 to 1973, is credited (Mishra, 1989, p.65; Pascall, 1986, p.10; Rose, 1981, p.482) as giving the discipline academic visibility and wide social relevance. Proponents of the social administration approach, following the welfare collectivist reform tradition, believe in improving the operation of capitalism. For them, however, capitalism had evolved into an inherently unjust and diseconomical form which, in order to offset these effects, generated state welfare. In their view state welfare is a mechanism necessary for the survival of capitalism itself. In one of his main works, Titmuss describes this symbiotic relationship as follows:

The emphasis today on 'welfare' and the 'benefits of welfare' often tends to obscure the fundamental fact that for many consumers the services used are not essentially benefits or increments to welfare at all; they represent partial compensations for disservices, for social costs and social insecurities which are the product of rapidly changing industrial-urban society. They are part of the price we pay to some people for bearing part of the cost for other people's progress; the obsolescence of skills, redundancies, premature retirements, accidents, many categories of disease and handicap, urban blight and slum clearance, smoke, pollution and a hundred-and-one other socially generated disservices. They are the socially caused diswelfares; the losses involved in aggregate welfare gains (Titmuss, 1968, p.133).

State welfare is, hence, not a support to certain individuals as welfare collectivism has it, but a natural and necessary companion of the market economy. This role is also extended to other formulations such as, for example, Briggs (1967, p.45) argument that the welfare state is a corollary of the decline of the extended family. Titmuss, furthering his assessment, suggests that state welfare contains the kernel of a new moral order based on a sense of concern and responsibility for others and implemented through universally available services supported by taxes. This belief on the state as a promoter of integration and social harmony (Williams, 1989, p.9) leads social administrators to view the state as an initiator of change, almost acting independently to counter the effects of capitalism. In this process the state is supported by the professional (researcher, bureaucrat or practitioner), whose task is to explore the ways to enlarge and facilitate the change process. Taylor-Gooby & Dale (1981) argue that these positions lead to a tendency to view social problems from the perspective of the state: what can governments do to bring about reforms and improvements; and professionals are the ones to propose and carry out these reforms.

The increased scope and expenditure of the postwar social services underlined, in the view of social administrators, the need for systematic study. Here empirical observation and social analysis are the tools for determining the directions in which the state welfare should proceed. Of particular importance to the formation of social policy methods were Titmuss' empirical studies of

poverty and welfare (Pascall, 1986; Rose, 1981; Williams, 1989). His areas of study - the sphere of inequality and the family: population control, demographic changes, childbearing, the elderly, female dependence - and his sensibilities, make marginalized groups, including women, a constant presence in Titmuss writings (Pascall, 1986, p.10). His work remains, however, strictly empirical, operating in the absence of an explicit body of theory and refusing to make explicit the assumptions built into it. As observed by Pascall (1986), Titmuss' empiricism naturalizes, among others, the male-breadwinner/female-dependent categories connected to the economy through a family wage. For example, although described in sympathetic detail, single mothers were automatically regarded as "problem tenants" in Titmuss' discussions of housing (see Rose, 1981, p.494). This naturalization of the assumptions can also be traced to other social administration documents. In a report on *Family Desertion*, for example, the Canadian Welfare Council (1961) discusses among the causes of desertion the 'problem that the man cannot carry his "role" as the earner in the home. As his responsibility increases he feels more and more inadequate (not always consciously) and eventually walks out of the situation that has been creating so much discomfort for him'(p.3). The proposals to tackle this situation do not include questioning of the explicit male and implicit female role, but recommend actions to strengthen family life including 'education of young people ... , marital counselling ... and reduction of social and economic pressures through provision of: I. subsidized and low-rental housing; ii. realistic minimum wage levels; iii. educational courses on buying, budgeting, etc; iv. a more realistic family allowance program' (p.8).

In the 1970s a renewed social administration approach emerged: radical social administration (Townsend, 1984; Williams, 1989). It is distinct from earlier versions by a

radicalization of the themes, namely a focus on poverty and a clear commitment to improve and enlarge the provision of state welfare. Social administration continues, in the 1970s, the belief in morals and values to counter capitalism but also attributes to the state an important role in promoting change and social justice. Thus social policy assumes, here, a creative and preventive character rather than a reactive role focused on compensating for the economic system. This approach to welfare remains a strong force both in contemporary Britain and in Canada conferring to social policy the characterization of 'a mixture of down-to-earth investigative pragmatism and evangelical moral uplift' (Klein, 1988, p.99).

The object of scrutiny is poverty and the aim is to find solutions based on redistributive strategies and centred on disadvantage (note a certain influence of Marxist class critique). This approach is, hence, driven by a search for 'enhanced efficiency, social justice and equality through systematic investigation, public debate and legislative reform' (Mishra, 1989, p.65). Aided by the newly popularized computer technology, studies and research assumed enlarged proportions and statistical scrutiny. The extensive documentation of poverty was seen as providing the necessary tools and rational arguments for policy adjustments. Consequently most studies after detailed examination of the phenomenon of poverty propose policy implications and governmental actions.

Empirical investigations and assessments of poverty levels among single mothers examined the impact of the postwar welfare state - especially the impact of pensions, assistance and allowances in preventing poverty among families. Poverty of women, including single mothers, was 'largely interpreted as a residual problem, a consequence of minor technical deficiencies within the benefit system and, in particular, of the failure by individual women and men to take up the benefits and other opportunities now assumed to be available to all' (Glendinning & Millar,

1991, p.21). Studies done by Abel-Smith & Townsend (1965), for example, document a massive number of women with incomes below the national assistance rates in Britain. These findings, however, signal to them not a system that reproduces relations of gender and poverty but the need for technical adjustments in the benefit system. Also in Britain, Marsden's (1969) meticulous interviewing and observation exposed the painful experiences of single mothers receiving insufficient benefits and interacting with authorities. In another example, a detailed study on mothers in poverty in the US (Kriesberg, 1970) argues against the subcultural approach to poverty and suggests the structural factors that affect the poor: social assistance programs and housing are seen as determinants of poverty. This tradition can be traced in recent views of the Canadian Council of Social Development (1992) regarding the single mother issue: 'These poverty rates are not surprising considering that many single mothers depend on social assistance payments that are often well below the poverty line' (p.29). In other words, single mothers are poor because social assistance payments are not above the poverty line. Social administration remains committed to improving the welfare state interventions to a point that it obscures the processes which created poverty and, in particular, the gender, race and other dimensions of those processes.

In situating the single mother as primarily a victim of poverty, investigators brought to light a variety of related aspects that affected these women's ability to mother: adaptation to a drop in income upon divorce; social isolation; stigma; lack of appropriate services (for Canadian summary see Gautier, 1986). The pressures of divorce on the mother are discussed also as causing parenting breakdowns and inconsistencies (see Hewlet, 1986, p.69) resulting in the development of a pathological profile for these households and a series of interventions to address their

“dysfunctional structures” (e.g. Isaacs, 1987). The number of studies and problems documented multiplied suggesting ‘several dimensions in which further studies are necessary’ (Ishwaran, 1983, p.302). The radical social administration is strongly criticized by proponents of the new right perspective regarding its approach to single mothers:

It was assumed that, in so far as there were differences, these were not due to lone parenthood as such, but merely to low income. Alternatively or additionally, they were due to the fact that the non-academic public erroneously believed that lone-parenthood was the disadvantage of children, and this erroneous belief itself, this stigma, had the effect of creating disadvantage. There was nothing a dollar and a dose of enlightenment would not fix (Dennis & Erdos, 1993, p.3).

Reacting to accusations of provoking an enlargement of the state apparatus and its costly bureaucracy; of fostering dependency and leading to an apathetic clientele of claimants; and of excessive interference with the private market, a current version of the social administration perspective is attempting to promote a revitalization of state welfare. Some, such as Hadley & Hatch (1981), argue for a need for decentralization and participation. Deakin (1987) and Glennerster (1983) emphasize democracy and accountability in welfare services. A contemporary debate promotes a mixed economy of welfare, where provision of services is a pragmatic balance between the state, the informal sector (family and community), voluntary sector and private market (see Wistow, Knapp, Hardy & Allen, 1995 for review of implementation in England). Keane (1988) proposes a plurality of democratic public spheres in which the citizen can participate by ‘making the state policy more accountable to civil society and by democratically expanding and reordering non-state activities within civil society itself’ (p.3).

These various attempts to democratize the administration of the welfare state, Ng (1988, p.23-27) argues, have lead to *the politics of citizen participation* which serve the function of ‘defusing criticisms directed at the welfare state while meeting the growing demand for social programs’(p.27). Using Morgan’s analysis of the battered women’s movement in the US (1981),

she proposes that these attempts turn political and economic problems into social ones through processes of bureaucratization, individualization and professionalization. Participation and democratic administration have, however, contributed to bring different marginalized social groups, including women who raise children alone, to a very visible position in society and assign to these groups the role of advocating for their interests and proposing solutions to society's problems. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the criticisms levelled by Ng are not to be dismissed and point to a critical interfacing between participation and democratic administration.

Mainstream: children in unstable families and insecure economic situations.

The mainstream welfare theories, here classified under anti-collectivism, welfare collectivism and social administration, although with some variations, maintain an approach to women who raise children alone that highlights the social function of the family and the role of the mother. First and foremost the single mother, within mainstream thinking, is a mother. But a mother referred to just as a *mother* - or an unqualified motherhood - assumes a family unit including a male breadwinner responsible for his wife and their children. The mother is responsible for the reproductive, socialization, and caring functions of the family supported by her male partner. This model of socialization is understood as the most effective in terms of resources spent and results for society. Single motherhood announces a mother that is qualified by the adjective *single* - a qualified mother - and, hence, a disruption in the normalized male/female family roles. It refers to a particular situation where "normal functions" have to take place in "abnormal circumstances". It is as a mother that is in the outside of "normal", one that incites a possibility of not fulfilling her social responsibilities to maintain and socialize her children, that the single mother is problematised within mainstream. The solution to this problem has been subject

to much debate.

Anti-collectivist theories acknowledge that unfortunate situations, such as the deserving widows with children, may occasionally happen although preventable through insurance schemes. In these cases, temporary public support, in the form of philanthropy, may be necessary to restore these families to the condition of self-supporting and independent units. Other non-morally sanctioned fatherless families are considered undeserving and their situation should be such as to discourage other members of society from following in their footsteps. Anti-collectivism also consider that those deserving should, in addition to maintenance support in the form of income, be subjected to intensive supervision and moral strengthening in order to return to a condition of self-support. High among the strategic interventions advocated by this group is the provision of certain goods, such as philanthropic housing, which not only represent a high budget expenditure for these mothers but also can be used to instill values of ownership and pride on possessions.

Welfare collectivism, as a separate theoretical approach, believes in society developing some common goals to balance the negative effects of capitalism. High among these goals is an investment in children which, they argue, can prevent a series of social ills such as the spread of disorder, poverty, and moral decay as well as encourage responsible citizenship and empower individuals. Single mothers, when in need, may receive state or philanthropic support to enable them to carry out their function of guardians of the future citizens, provided this support does not undermine those who fulfil their family responsibilities independently.

A further set of theories, social administration, propose that, due to the unjust and unproductive effects of capitalism, the common social goals can only be achieved with the participation of state welfare. The extent and multiple consequences of single mother's poverty

and disadvantage require increasing state support in a myriad of aspects to enable her to care for growing number of children in this family form. Empowerment and individual character modification constitute central pieces of the interventions proposed.

Being a mother in a basic unit considered "incomplete", within mainstream rationality, may qualify the single mother for welfare but it poses several difficulties both for the family itself and for social functioning. The several variants of mainstream understand and systematize these difficulties in particular ways. In solving the single motherhood problem, these different variants struggled with two aspects of the problem, as they see it. On one hand, women raising children alone should be supported in order to be able to adequately carry out their social reproduction functions. On the other hand, single motherhood should be socially discouraged through hardship, in order to contain the numbers of those entering it and to limit the costs to the system. The collective definition of who is deserving of support and who is non-deserving has been one of the mechanisms that mediated between these two aspects of the problem. Anti-collectivists of the turn of the century in Ontario, for example, proposed that only widows with two or more children under a strict code of conduct should receive public support while in 1990s they proposed that only those willing to participate in workfare programs can receive state support.

A second very important mechanism that mediated between the two aspects of the problem is the concept of less eligibility: that is public support should not enable those in receipt of social assistance to have the same standard of living as members of society who earn a minimum wage. The support given to fatherless families should not encourage members of society to choose that path. It should, in all circumstances, confirm moral standards; and the normalized family's socialization and educational functions as a preferable path. Single mothers are supported in their

role as mothers but that support cannot enable them to actually mother their children since it may undermine the individual self-sufficient family model. This dilemma, situated at the very core of mainstream approaches, is addressed by attributing a pathological profile to the single mother and her children transferring to her the ultimate responsibility for their situation. Single mothers are, then, considered as incapable mothers and unable to run a household either due to their low self-esteem or laziness; to their own socialization; or to their own specific disadvantaged situation such as violence or abuse.

In the process of developing their understanding of women who raise children alone, mainstream scholars of welfare have extensively observed, quantified, analysed, and documented them through qualitative or quantitative methods. Scientific knowledge, based on the understanding of truth as the empirically observed, or reality as a given, constitutes another important mediator in this relationship. Mainstream scholarship has produced many detailed, careful descriptions of single mothers and their conditions which constitute important documents of these women's life histories. These, however, have generated, as argued by the critiques introduced in the next section, an extreme form of empiricism in which observable facts are assumed to be the direct generators of concrete practices without questioning their assumptions. This empiricism proposes regularities and main characteristic features disregarding the effects of science in the construction of the object of observation and the forces interacting in a given situation. Although mainstream departs from a concrete situation and some studies do indeed document concrete historical forms and the diversity of such forms, these approaches lack a reflective theorization of the observed and of individuals capacities, and produce a reality which basically naturalizes their assumptions.

Critiques: Class, Feminism, Diversities and Post-structuralism

The core approaches encompassed by the mainstream have been the subject of many critiques and, on the whole, have been substantially affected by those critiques. Of particular relevance, in terms of challenging established dominant theories and achieving changes, are the class and feminist contributions which have exposed powerful omissions and misconceptions within the mainstream. But also of increasing relevance are the diversity and the post-structuralist critiques which have, specially in the last five years influenced and shaped the themes, methods and analysis of mainstream social welfare work. On the one hand, the intense cross-fertilization among these critiques makes it difficult to define the clear boundaries of a particular critique and almost impossible to classify authors within one or the other stream. The central elements and innovative approaches introduced by the several critiques are, on the other hand, unclouded and constitute the focus of this review.

The political economy of the welfare state.

The 1950s and 1960s saw both state expenditure with welfare and its administrative apparatus grow rapidly in most Western nations. The economic crisis that followed these, so called, golden years of welfare threatened the very fabric of the postwar welfare system and its policies of white male full-employment and social security. Great discontent started brewing within the ranks of social activists and welfare theorists regarding the failure of welfare collectivism and social administration to deliver its promise of greater equality and prosperity for populations. A wealth of studies, throughout the 1960s, documented the resilience and growth of poverty in Western welfare countries. In Canada, the rediscovery of poverty (Guest, 1985, ch.11; Struthers, 1994, ch.7) exposed both in studies and reports the contradictions of the postwar

welfare system and the large income inequalities within the country (e.g. *“Report of the Special Senate Committee on Poverty in Canada”*, 1971; *“Poverty in Canada, the Real Poverty”* by Adams, Cameron, Hill & Penz, 1971; and the *“Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women”*, 1970). The US civil rights movement, political demands on governments worldwide and a generalized economic slow-down aggravated this situation worldwide. Even inside the influential School of Social Administration at the London School of Economics, the embodiment of mainstream social policy thought, having had both Marshall and Titmuss as directors, there were criticisms that the discipline could not account for the economic constraints as they affected welfare, and that it was not sufficiently grounded in theory and thus lacked explanatory power (Glennester, 1989, p.110).

It is in this context that Marxist applications were developed into theories of the modern state as provider of social welfare and constituted into a radical theory of the welfare state which challenged established liberal formulations on welfare. This section reviews these Marxist applications rather than the Marxist or class critique in general or the early propositions and struggles for a proletarian state. The emphasis here is on how the relationship between the Western democratic welfare system and single mothers was viewed by the theories of the welfare state. One of the most important works in these applications is Gough’s 1979 book: *“The Political Economy of the Welfare State”* (see Djao, 1983; or the summaries by Abramovitz, 1988, p.17; and Gordon, 1990, p.16) which gives name to this section. This book represented a comprehensive application of Marxist theory to the development of welfare in capitalist economies based on earlier debates about the nature and role of states and welfare (e.g., Althusser, 1971, Gramsci, 1971; Miliband, 1969; O’Connor, 1973; Offe, 1974; Poulantzas, 1973).

As Whitaker (1977) states 'Marxist economic science demonstrates that there is a developmental logic of capitalism and that it is possible to situate specific state activities in relation to that logic'(p.29). Opposing the liberal view of the state as counterbalancing the negative effects of capitalism through the neutral arbitration between groups and classes, the political economy of the welfare state returns to "*The Communist Manifesto*" to assert that the state consistently serves capital (see Panitch, 1977). In his "*Fiscal Crisis of the Welfare State*", O'Connor (1973) discusses state expenditure partly as a result of the needs of capital expansion and partly as a result of organized working class demands. Its growth is financed through cuts to welfare expenditure or a confrontation with capital generating crisis in welfare capitalism. The development of the welfare state, then, is viewed as a consequence of class struggle and, according to Gough (1979), has three goals: accumulation or maintaining the conditions favourable to accumulation of capital; reproduction or ensuring the reproduction of the labour force; and legitimation, that is maintaining political stability, social harmony and social control (for discussion see Djao, 1983; Panitch, 1977; Williams, 1989). For Gough, although social reforms and welfare policies are an expression of the struggles of the working class and non-working population to maximize their welfare, they also fulfil the needs of capital for a healthy, educated, abundant and productive labour force. It is, then, the state's role in providing welfare, i.e., as a representative of capital, that is particularly problematic for the political economy of the welfare state.

Using this basic framework, the welfare state theorists addressed several aspects of contemporary welfare arrangements. In advanced capitalist societies, welfare is associated with the state 'gradually usurping the role of kinship and community in the past and voluntary bodies in

the more recent past' (Gough, 1979, p.47). Work related aspects of welfare, such as workers' benefits; insurance; and struggles for improved working situations receive particular attention within these theories. Domestic work, however, posed a challenge to this perspective and it generated a long polemic. Some relied on the separation of two types of work: domestic work was *private* and produced use-value; while wage labour was *public* and produced exchange value hence directly relevant for capital (Seccombe, 1974). Gough (1979) describes the family and the labour of housewives as important in the reproductive sphere of the welfare state and essential for the everyday upkeep of the workers and non-workers, children, sick, elderly, disabled. Ginsburg (1979) discusses a further aspect of women's domestic work highlighting how the ideology of domesticity supported women's position as low paid casual workers and as a unique stratum of the reserve army of labour. Hartmann (1979) observes that most Marxists analyse women's oppression in relation to production and define women as part of the working class hence focusing the analysis on workers' relation to capital. She distinguishes three aspects of this analysis: first, the incorporation of women into the labour force promotes women's independence from men; second, housework constitutes the particular form in which capitalism incorporated sexism arguing that 'the housewife emerged, alongside the proletarian, the two characteristic labourers of developed capitalist society' (Zaretsky, 1973, p.114 cited in Hartmann 1979, p.4); and third, women's work produces surplus value for capital which should pay wages for housework.

The working mother, single or married, within the political economy of the welfare state, belongs in the world of production and workplace struggles. She is associated with the demands for child care, maternity rights and benefits since struggles that directly challenge capital are given

by the theorists of this critique an implicitly superior validity to those pertaining to other aspects of life, such as community or social services. Specific references to single parent families are rare but sometimes found under themes of poverty and wage policies. Typically these studies do not address single motherhood directly or centrally. It is through issues pertaining to labour and employment that both their portrayal of single mothers as a problem and their proposed strategy to address this problem become evident. The following example illustrates this point:

Our view is simple enough to state. In principle, there are two ways of dealing with relief explosions and the underlying economic and social dislocations which they reflect. One is by reforming the economic policy that would lead to full employment at decent wages, and the other is by relief reforms. If jobs were created on a large scale, whether by public or private investments, and if the wages paid were adequate, many AFDC mothers would immediately take jobs. Over the long run, however, basic economic reforms would reduce the rolls by a more fundamental process: that of restoring lower class occupational, familial, and communal patterns (Piven & Cloward, 1971, p.345).

In this example, there is a 'simple' solution for the problems of welfare: AFDC mothers, or American single mother receiving income support benefits, would have, to paraphrase the above citation, their occupational, familial and communal patterns 'restored' through adequately paying wage work. The alleged simplicity of the solution invests single mothers with the air of innocent victims of a system which does very little to support or change their dependent and inferior status. Another example shows the sentiment of victimization, but specifically excludes the possibility of the women choosing wage work:

Finally, Canadians should once and for all get it into their heads that welfare recipients are not people who do not want to work. The majority of those who receive welfare are by the strictest criteria outside the work force. They are the aged, the physically handicapped, widows and mothers who are single heads of families (Adams, Cameron, Hill & Penz, 1971, p.22).

Approaches within the political economy of the welfare state, as Pascall (1986) comments, place the dimensions of any problem clearly within its relation to capital and, in addition, make productive relations the centre of the analysis placing all other aspects in subordinate roles. The nature of the subordinate relations between men and women are not explored and the family as

well as the relations within it are in the last instance obscured by their relationship to capital (see also Rose, 1981). The family wage system which, historically, formed the basis of trade union wage bargaining has not only reinforced the male wage-earner family model and wife dependence with a complementary wage but also obscured discussions of equitable distribution within the home (Fraser & Gordon, 1994, p.318). Williams (1989, p.139) argues that the implicit unity of the working class under which the category women is understood, has placed gender at an accessory place and has ignored the consequences for women of reforms and policies identified as benefiting the working class (e.g. in Canada, unemployment insurance). Some of these reforms, as discussed earlier, had profound significance for the welfare approach to single mothers.

Since the 1970s and the early formulations of the political economy of the welfare state, a large group of Marxist-feminists has been engaged in broadening this approach with incorporation of several feminist critiques and formulations. This group is included in the next section. In addition, a variety of authors, although remaining clearly within the parameters of a political economy of the welfare state, have broadened its original formulations by incorporating elements of their critics in an exploration of the reforms to the postwar welfare state and its various manifestations (e.g., Esping-Andersen, 1990; Jessop, 1990; Myles, 1985; 1989; Pierson, 1991). Among them, Offe (1984, 1985) is, perhaps, the most widely read. He proposes that the design of the postwar Western liberal democratic welfare state was based on three central arguments: capitalism as the most efficient way of producing growth; organized labour as the form of distribution of wealth and security; and a representative form of political democracy mediated through party competition (p.822). In this model public policy had the role of creating security (i.e.; social welfare, defence and social control) and thus the conditions for the continuation of the

process of growth and production. The model assured the working class as a whole institutionalized political and economic representation and some claim to security and protection but implied a political and class accord which limited the goals of working class movements and specialized their organization forms (p.835) yielding, in the long term, to a new configuration of class forces and class politics.

More concretely, struggles and successes that were won on behalf of people as workers, employees, and recipients of social security transfers were accompanied by a cumulative de-emphasis of the interests of people as citizens, as consumers, as clients of state provided services, and as human beings in general (p.836).

Demands upon and conflict in the advanced capitalist society began to be staged by a social alliance of individuals from different class positions and excluding the main traditional class representatives. A myriad of issue-lead *new movements* emerged reflecting the broadening and deepening of a variety of effects of capitalism and the 'increasing *irreversibility* of the forms of domination and deprivation' (p.845, italics in the original). Offe (1985, p.854) understands feminism as one of these issue-lead movements which holds the potential to challenge the postwar Western democratic consensus through initiatives exposing the functionalist and productivist logic of male dominated institutions. Interesting to notice, however, that 'family-centred social policies for women' are explicitly mentioned by Offe (p.860) as pertaining to an alliance of feminism and Conservative-Liberal Right and do not pose any threat to the 'old politics' while 'redistribution of work within production and household' is situated in the opposite camp. Offe remains at a level of analysis which is broad and structural, dedicated to an understanding of general laws and movements of capitalism. His analysis, although less monolithic than the 1970s political economy of the welfare state, offers little understanding of everyday life and issues. The broad strokes with which he addresses women' situation, particularly by separating family policy and household

work, suggests that work related activities remain the primary focus of challenge to advanced capitalist.

Jessop (1990, 1994) has also provided a neo-Marxist analysis of the current changes in the welfare state which has roots in the political economy of the welfare state. In his view, a new form of welfare state is emerging and its main characteristics are a drive towards enhanced competition in the context of globalization, the complete subordination of social policy to the market, and growing variation and flexibility in patterns of employment and labour. His argument is that these processes change the axis of importance from the nation to globalized or international agencies and organizations. The national Western welfare states become instruments for the maximization of economic competitiveness and concerns about welfare shift to supra-national bodies towards which political action should be geared. This global perspective leaves very little room for advancing understandings of national or provincial level policies, such as those addressing single mothers, transferring to an identified general and structural change the roles of actor and director.

This approach has, arguably, influenced a multiplicity of current studies focused on the role of policies addressing marginalized groups in a welfare state conceived as an instrument for maximizing economic competitiveness. An example is Low's (1996) study of work incentives for single mothers in Canada which, in a particularly thorough and well researched work, show the contradictions of designing 'public policy to create a more flexible labour market and to punish those who end up depending on social assistance' (p.199)(for another Canadian example see Scott, 1996). These studies fulfill the important function of documenting current welfare reforms and the human cost for the groups involved, in particular the single mother. Yet, as Low points

out (p.189, 199, 200) the measures do not follow from the empirical evidence, hence there is little chance of the arguments advanced having any effect on the policies criticised. As Penna & O'Brien (1996) comment, the theoretical perspective advanced by Jessop does imply a detachment between objective social scientific research on social problems and the policy agenda at the level of the state. The over-deterministic and functionalist analysis of the role of the new welfare state prevents this perspective from exploring contradictions and escaping the almost fatalistic conclusions anticipated at the beginning of the study.

The political economy of the welfare state provides a powerful critique of arguments based on the natural complementarity between capitalism and the welfare state and highlights the contradictory aspects of welfare measures. This Marxist inspired perspective, reacting to the empiricism of mainstream, theorizes welfare through an analytical framework of structural forces which exist outside of individuals but frame and are animated by their lives. The emphasis is on abstract, superstructural models superimposed on the reality in order to derive explanations. These structural and global forces, however, dismiss the subject and limit the factors that can be given primary or causal status. The collective agency of the working class, conditioned to the establishment of universal goals among the ranks of the working class, assume traditionally in this critique the central role of resisting the state actions in the name of advancing capitalism.

Theories, explanations or studies about the family when articulated are subordinated to the class issue. Hence, the single mother is almost absent in this critique. She is seen primarily as a worker, a segment of the working class, and women's choice between motherhood and employment or women's specific claims to welfare due to her family responsibilities do not have a place in the analysis. Within an strict political economy of welfare state perspective women's

work is understood and portrayed in terms of its role in keeping down the costs of the welfare state and, in productive relations, as the reserve army of labour. As such single mothers are implicated in working class struggles against capital and its representative the welfare state. By theorizing women's interests as coincident with those of a genderless working class, the political economy of the welfare state theorists ignore and, hence, maintain many of the social arrangements which prevent women from achieving the equality. Struggles for day care, maternity benefits and an adequate wage for her family are informally associated with single motherhood but the general thread is their importance for the working class as a collective. In this role the single mother loses her pitiful character, since she is part of the working class, but also her specificity, such as the claims arising from the need to raise children alone, and become nothing more than a genderless worker. Recent perspectives informed by the political economy of the welfare state, although influenced also by the feminist and diversity critique, maintain a certain over-deterministic approach to the analysis.

The gender critique: the value of women's labour.

In parallel to the Marxist political economy of the welfare state, a feminist critique of welfare theory gathered momentum as of the 1970s, situated within what is commonly referred to as the re-emergence of feminism (Pascall, 1986, p.20). This feminist perspective developed around the transformative notion of gender, seen critically as a social and cultural construction, and as distinct from the traditional notion of biological sex. As in the case of Marxism, feminism certainly existed prior to the 1970s, but a particular feminist critique of the Western democratic welfare - the gender critique of welfare - began during this time specifically to target approaches to welfare. However, unlike the political economy of the welfare state discussed earlier, the

gender perspective did not have its origins in the academic ranks. Rather, the 'renaissance of women's studies' (Gordon, 1990, p.18) is particularly linked to poverty and urban activists of the 1960s and their demands for rights and equality. The women's movement re-emerged with an immediate focus on welfare and its gendered and unequal operations. Its origins - the women's movements of the turn of the century - had a considerable tradition of women's research and writing which connected welfare to the family and to women's economic position within it. These early women's movements represented a variety of class, ethnic and cultural groups (particularly in Britain, and less so in the US and Canada) with diverse foci, opinions and activities. Women's position in the family constituted a topic of special relevance for most of them as reflected in a considerable body of investigative social reports - such as Eleanor Rathbone's "*The Disinherited Family*" (1924) and others (see Dale & Foster, 1986; Gordon, 1994a; and Pascall, 1986).

Pascall (1986) gives a general assessment of the contribution in Britain of these works:

On the whole these works did not criticize women's identification with marriage and motherhood. They did identify and criticize women's economic dependence. And they recognized that economic dependence went with the love and care that women invested in children. Financial support for children was a common prescription, as was support for maternity through health services and financial maintenance. (...) These works did not offer a radical critique of the family or of women's work, but they revealed the conditions of women's lives and the effects of their economic dependence (p.16-17).

In part due to the links to women's activism of the 1960s the gender critique of welfare assumed initially a focus on rights and inequalities in the operation of welfare. This important body of work demonstrated the dimensions of discrimination and inequality within welfare (Cummings, 1980; Land, 1978, 1979); challenged the sex bias embedded in the laws and regulations (Land, 1979; Pearce, 1985); as well as exposed the sexism of researchers (e.g., review of measurement of poverty: Glendinning & Millar, 1991), administrators and providers (Leeson & Gray, 1978). It also demanded improvement of conditions by showing the gaps and lack of

services for women: clinics (see review in Foster, 1991); day care (see review in Cohen, 1988); better maternity provision (see review in Joshi, 1991); and housing (Diamond, 1982) as well as extension of welfare (Land, 1971). Important examples of this inequality work, in Canada, include Wekerle's and associates (1980) environmental equity approach, addressing women's unequal access to housing, transportation and public services; and McClain & Doyle's (1984) revealing analysis of the gender discriminatory practices embedded in housing demand models.

Gradually, the gender perspective moved towards a structural critique of welfare, in part, perhaps, as a result of the way the inequality critique was being popularized: just added on to the theory texts as a paragraph or a chapter (Maclean & Groves, 1991, p.2; Milroy, 1991; Pascall, 1986; Williams, 1989). Solutions to the exclusion of women, viewed through the lens of the inequality critique, seemed obvious and the 'problem that has no name' (Friedan, 1963, p.11) seemed easy to repair. The structural critique focused on the centrality of women's experience as essential to an understanding of social welfare and not merely as some appended aspect of it (Dale & Foster, 1986; Lewis, 1983; Pascall, 1986).

A pioneering critique in this vein was Elizabeth Wilson's "Women and the Welfare State" (1977). In her words '[O]nly feminism has made it possible for us to see how the state defines femininity and that this definition is not marginal but central to the purposes of welfarism' (p.7). Starting from a critique of the economism of the left and the liberals she shows that 'social welfare policies amount to no less than the *State organization of domestic life*' (p.9, emphasis in the original). Mimi Abramovitz (1988), through a historical analysis of welfare in the US, shows how its policies functioned to reinforce and reproduce women's subordination. Among others (e.g., Hartmann, 1979; Rose, 1981), she discusses the 'two major political theories of modern

times - liberalism and Marxism - as gender-blind and uninformed by an understanding of patriarchy' (p.13). Gillian Pascall's "Social Policy: A Feminist Analysis" (1986) provided a widely accepted interpretation of the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy based on the welfare state developing to articulate the needs of production but doing so through male dominance.

Some structural gender critiques of welfare were articulated through the concept of social control, that is the idea that social policy controls women by keeping them out of public life and assuring their availability for reproductive work. Ehrenreich & English (1978), for example, argued that the welfare state, through professionals, has taken women's own expertise to control their work and identity. Another aspect of the social control discussion is the characterization of welfare as a public or state patriarchy by opposition to family patriarchy transferring women's dependency from men to the state (see discussion in Gordon, 1990, p.22). A more complex model of social control has explored how social definitions of conduct and respectability have roots also in feminist and working class movements (see discussion in Gordon, 1990, p.21). The social control theories, Pascall argues (1986, p.26), tend to ignore the contradictory effects welfare has for women as well as the issue of agency and resistance that are part of women's shaping of welfare. As Gordon (1990) noted, social control theories highlight important aspects of the discussion but, as, primarily, a functionalist explanation, they

assume that welfare policy is coherently beneficial to some group or groups. Thus they cannot explain its often contradictory, even self-defeating aspects. These emerge both from the fragmented and inconsistent goals of policy makers, but also, most important, from the fact that most welfare policies represent the jerry-built compromises that are the artifacts of political and social conflict (p.23).

On the whole the gender critique of welfare pushed to the forefront of social policy theory not only issues of women's lives but also an approach that primarily emphasized the centrality of

these issues to an understanding of welfare. Key to many scholars' work has been the demonstration of the role of welfare in maintaining the system of the family wage and power differentials within the family (e.g. Land, 1980; Lewis, 1983; and McIntosh, 1979 in Britain; Roe, 1983 in Australia; Abramovitz, 1988 and Gordon, 1988 in the US; and Callahan, 1992 in Canada). That implies a social system based on the wife/mother's economic dependence on the husband/father and his economic dependence on wages and personal dependence on her (Gordon, 1990, p.19). By supporting this particular kind of family - 'structurally complete, emotionally fulfilled and autonomous' (Callahan, 1991, p.145) - welfare enhances women's dependence on marriage and increases the difficulties of leaving these types of families or of creating different types of relationships. The history of social security, some argued, has shown how welfare policies - such as the principle of the dependent allowance observed in the Beveridge and Marsh reports or the cohabitation rule - has assumed women's dependence within marriage (McIntosh, 1981; Wilson, 1977). A further aspect of women's economic dependency on men is that in reality most men's wages are not enough to support a family and women join the labour force in a characteristically complementary role taking up low paying, unskilled and part time jobs, often similar to the jobs they used to do at home (Gordon, 1990; Hartmann, 1979, p.19; Sapiro, 1990).

Gillian Pascall (1986) argues that to fully capture the contradictions of welfare it is necessary to shift the grounds of the analysis from a focus on production to embrace the importance of reproduction. Groves & Finch (1983) show that an understanding of day care and invalid care must incorporate an analysis that is not production centred. Reproduction, it is argued, constitutes a terrain occupied by both women and the welfare state and must be rescued from the status of 'handmaiden to production' (Pascall, 1986, p.22).

My conclusion is that reproduction is best understood as the process of creating and sustaining human life. This includes conception, birth, and the care of children; it also includes daily maintenance (of labourers and others). The reproduction of human life also means the reproduction of social relations and human consciousness (p.24).

As Callahan (1991, p.148) points out, within mainstream theory, reproduction is considered women's duty or role; for theorist of the political economy of welfare it represents women's unpaid labour hence the capitalist exploitation of women; but feminist thinking focuses on women's experiences in doing such work, its complexity and links with women's predominance among the poor. Examples of such foci are the edited collections of Finch & Groves (1983) in Britain; and Baines, Evans & Neysmith (1991) in Canada which discuss the content of women's work caring for the young, the old and the dependent. A particular aspect of this work is what Land & Rose (1985) call 'women's compulsory altruism', that is most women do not have the choice not to care without damaging those whom they care about or their self-esteem. The caring work done by women within the family, though necessary, is very little valued or supported and often leads to poverty and lack of training or education. And women's caring work when done in a paid form through employment receives very little social recognition as skilled and important labour.

Some authors (e.g. Eisenstein, 1984), on the other hand, emphasize contradictions in the operation of patriarchy within the modern state and suggest the possibility of feminist political action exploring these contradictions. Ursel (1992), following Eisenstein, shows how, in Canada, the move from an agrarian to an industrial society involved the transition from a family patriarchal system to the generalized subordination of women through centralized social patriarchal structures. In this process 'the state became directly involved in the dismantling of particular familiar patriarchal relations in order to facilitate a better fit between production and reproduction

in the new economic order' (Ursel, 1994, p.75). Hence, she argues, it is possible a convergence of state interests and women's interests on certain issues such as the introduction of the Married Women's Property Act from 1860 to 1870 and the 1970s Maintenance Enforcement Act. In recent work Ursel (1997) has taken this theme to the battered women's movement and has concluded that state initiatives, particularly with respect to services and legislation, has substantially improved the situation of women in Manitoba.

The gender perspective brings single mothers back into the picture of welfare theory and there has been a wealth of studies criticizing their social invisibility. Pearce (1978) coined the term *feminization of poverty* and opened the way for studies in many different countries showing single mothers as a special and predominant segment of the poor (see Abowitz, 1986 and Harman, 1992 in Canada; Norris, 1984 in Britain).

What is the "feminization of poverty"? Whether as widows, divorcees, or unmarried mothers, women have always experienced more poverty than men. But in the last two decades, families maintained by women alone have increased from 36 percent to 53 percent of all poor families (Pearce, 1990, p.266).

Many early studies under the gender perspective showed the discrimination and inequality single mothers suffered under welfare systems. In Canada, Fran Klodawsky and her associates, for example, have focused on the area of housing and single parents (1983, 1985). Their discussion centred around the increase in the proportion and number of single parent families since the enactment of the divorce legislation in 1968 and how housing comprises a major concern for a large number of single parents. This concern is characterized in terms of income constraints, concentration in public housing, accessibility and availability to housing and existing paths to address these concerns. Pat Evans, another example of Canadian scholar dedicated to studying single mothers, has since early 1970s documented the income and work situation of women

raising children alone as well as the social welfare initiatives implemented in Canada and abroad (e.g. 1983, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1995).

By the late 1980s issues of single motherhood were seen from a variety of angles and their connections were explored using feminist critiques in articulation with a variety of mainstream perspectives. Critics pointed out that the single mother was required to assume the complete family model and fill in the gaps for the incomplete family (Callahan, 1991). Sands & Nuccio (1989) argued that single motherhood is the "other" of family forms and that this status has enormous economic consequences in a variety of situations: low earning capacity; lack of child support; and low benefits levels of public assistance programs. Lewis (1989) notes that the liberal view of lone parents treats 'these predominantly female headed families' (p.595) as a specific problem: that of adult women not dependent on a partner for her maintenance. She suggests that the single mother is primarily a woman with children and as such she is neither a worker nor a mother as these roles are defined by liberal thought and argues that:

income maintenance policies affecting all adult women should hinge on their work status not on the presence or absence of a partner. But the concept of work must include unpaid work and policies must take a positive rather than a punitive approach to those parents seeking to secure a greater proportion of their income from wages (p.600).

Single mothers are also discussed in terms of the variety of needs and stresses they experience. For example, divorce has been described as a period of adverse experiences and adaptation although offering some benefits for women and children (Arendell, 1986; French, 1991; Hardey & Crow, 1991; Shaw, 1991). Some have also argued that single motherhood represents the liberation of women from dependency on nuclear family structures and an increased freedom of choice and reintroduction in the labour force (Agbayewa, 1991; Itzin, 1980; see discussion in Harding, 1993b). A growing body of literature suggests that single mothers

experience certain positive aspects in their situation primarily regarding increased control over the family's finance and time; and relief from marital disagreements or abuse (Graham, 1987; Sharpe, 1984). Attempting to change the depiction of single mothers as helpless victims, some studies have discussed the creative "coping strategies" they use to deal with the economic and social marginalization (Cashmore, 1985; and Graham, 1987).

A group of self-identified Marxist-feminists welfare theorists, in particular, produced a wealth of studies with specific focus on single mothers and social welfare. Orloff (1993), for example, emphasize that women make claims as workers but also as members of families and as such their claims assume specific aspects that reflect the marriage division of labour and the need to raise children alone (p.308). Her interest is not engaging in a debate with other perspectives to demonstrate their inaccuracies but to advance the understanding that a gender perspective brings to the existing analysis of the welfare state (p.304). In this sense she suggests incorporating an analysis with gender dimensions such as 'capacity to form and maintain autonomous households' (p. 323) and access to paid work in order to examine advances and aspects of different welfare states (see similar formulations in Hobson, 1994; Lewis, 1992; and O'Connor, 1993).

In summary, reactions and alternatives to the mainstream approaches to welfare using a feminist point of view have existed for as long as feminism itself but a specific critique of the liberal welfare state emerged as of the 1970s. This gender perspective on welfare is concerned with the specific historical oppression of women under capitalism and with the relations between class and gender. Through its various contributions, it has exposed previously overlooked aspects of welfare highlighting issues that affect women; demonstrated inequalities between men and women in welfare; and elaborated structural critiques of the assumptions and functioning of

welfare. The gender perspective also brought the private - the family and the household - and with it the single mother to a central position in its analysis. The pressures and difficulties of the single mother's role as a poor mother are highlighted and a wealth of aspects is discussed: structural inequality; discrimination; assumptions of the nuclear family model; and policy approaches. The feminist approach to single motherhood, however, maintains the state, contradictory as well as paternalistic and oppressive, at the centre of their formulations and the focus of their action. To the structural class analysis of the political economy of the welfare state, the gender critique added another structure, that of gender. It drew the experience of individual women raising children alone into the text of the analysis as an illustration of the structuring effects of gender in parallel to that of class (see following section for current debates).

The gender perspective posits that single mothers be seen neither as mothers nor as workers but as a group of women particularly vulnerable and made specially dependent on the state by the family assumptions of welfare. In this sense they have specific claims on social welfare - e.g., the right to constitute independent households, the right to a safe, non-oppressive home, and access to paid work - and constitute a particularly important group for understanding the functioning of social welfare. The feminist critics draw attention to the value and importance of the role of women raising children alone as mothers, to their poverty and to the failure of policies to address their structural poverty. There is an implicit understanding that single mothers need to be independent or free of state supervision and financial support which represent the male dominance embedded in the system and does not allow these women's emancipation. The themes of resistance and change have been a constant in the gender critique and have characterized their contribution through a commitment to practice and political action.

Diversity and the challenge of differences: the example of the race critique.

A further site of critical contestation to welfare thought is expressed in a number of works that I will, here, loosely group together through their exploration of *differences and diversity*. The rationale for grouping them together rests on the fact that these critiques showed that the mainstream social thought as well as the political economy of welfare and feminism each relied on the all-encompassing formulations of market, class or gender reducing the nature of the social world to one main explanatory factor. Differentiation and diversity embedded in these concepts questioned their utilization as unitary and homogenous notions. The emphasis on a diversity of aspects has implied a rich, complex and sometimes confusing portrayal of social welfare challenging the technical or scientific conclusions of studies and placing decisions regarding interventions within the political arena.

Moreover, the theories of *differences* argued not only that there was a variety of different people such as able and disabled, black and white, men and women but that the formulation of differences itself was not value neutral and empirically demonstrated. The establishment of these different categories involved the construction of a norm and of the *other*, that deviates from that norm. In this sense, in Canada for example, the policy of multiculturalism, which itself relies on an emphasis on the cultural differentiation of immigrant groups, came under severe criticism through the political understanding of the construction of differences. As Stainton & Swift (1996) summarize, '[w]hat both the proponents and critics of liberal multiculturalism ignore is the role of the dominant group in defining the *other*, a process through which hegemonic aspects of difference are masked' (p. 79, emphasis in original).

As applied to social welfare the diversity critique has highlighted a variety of aspects such

as race, physical and mental ability, sexual preference, religion, culture and ethnic origin in addition to class and gender, all shaping social welfare. The starting point for this critique is an understanding of social welfare as an institution grounded in Western traditions and history rather than the expression of universal values. It brought with it the discussion and re-definition of a series of central concepts for social welfare such as social justice and equality and it inaugurated a variety of critiques to particular aspects and approaches of the welfare system. These were formulated by several different groups of people, of whom the most outspoken in Canada are the aboriginal populations (e.g., Armitage, 1995; Battiste & Barman, 1995; Fiske, 1993; Tait, 1993 and Wharf, 1991); the abilities group (e.g., Crichton & Jongbloed, 1998; Neufeldt, 1993), the gay and lesbian community (e.g., Kinsman, 1994; O'Brien, 1994; Ross, 1995; Stone, 1990); and the visible minorities (e.g., Bannerji, 1993; Cairns & Williams, 1992; and Elliott & Fleras, 1992).

The diversity perspective, however, has encountered strong opposition. Taylor-Gooby (1994), echoing responses from the labour tradition and elsewhere (e.g. Sypnowich, 1993), characterizes the search for a more complex understanding of power and inequality in society as 'a great leap backwards'. His argument is based on the assumption that introducing an analysis of diversity necessarily obscures in 'a cloud of detail' (p.389) the major social welfare issues of the present, i.e., trends towards economic liberalism, privatization of services, deregulation of labour markets and the increased inequality between population groups. Similar feelings are expressed by authors who, from a sympathetic point of view, accept that the emphasis on differences has exposed dichotomous and universal concepts as static and unmalleable. In their view, however, this emphasis has also acted, in cases, as a substitute for concepts such as privilege, oppression and subordination, thus moving the theoretical emphasis away from discussions of power and

social change (L. Gordon, 1991). Walby (1992) argues 'that the fragmentation has gone too far, resulting in a denial of significant structuring of power, and leading towards mere empiricism' (p.31).

Both Barrett (1987) and L. Gordon (1991) propose a qualified use of diversity. To avoid the pitfalls of pluralism, in which the power differential is masked by a concept of equality and democracy, it is important that differences be approached from the point of view of helping to envision how varied social and individual capacities can be exercised without suffering diminished power, without surrendering the attempts at theorizing particular experiences as part of the whole (L. Gordon, 1991). Fraser (1992, p.17) calls for a need to think pragmatically about differences in ways that promote fundamental social change without invocations of universal and eternal categories. Riley (1983) suggests a fine line of proceeding with political demands without losing sight of the constant need to problematize key concepts. For example, child care demands can be made in the name of women's needs but with the emphasis that these demands pertain to a particular point in time and not to the essence of women's nature or to the ideal and universal motherhood. Stainton & Swift (1996, p.80) attempting to maximize the potential for collective action among different marginalized groups, propose an emphasis on mechanisms of oppression and emancipation embedded in the cultural construction of differences.

In order to provide a clearer picture of how the diversity critiques have affected the formulation of single mothers as a subject of welfare interventions, I will explore a particular critique that has profoundly influenced discussions regarding single motherhood and welfare: the race critique of welfare. Although Black and other excluded groups have theorized difference and otherness for a long time it is only in association with the diversity thought that race and racism

assumed an emblematic position in critical approaches and it was through this process that other groups have articulated their own welfare critique. The centrality of race and racism to understanding welfare has been, until recently, much under-examined. Related scholarship in planning education and youth studies, for example, have incorporated the importance of race much earlier particularly in Britain and the US (e.g. Coard, 1971; John & Humphrey, 1971). Even though the history of welfare is marked by the action of white middle class women teaching their Black and immigrant working class sisters how to be good wives and mothers, it is only in the 1960s, and primarily in the US, that a racism critique, with a focus on Black-Americans, emerged and assumed central importance for the social welfare debate. In Canada, an articulated critique of race as a structuring factor of welfare has been somewhat recent (for discussion see Agnew, 1995; Bannerji, 1993; Daenzer, 1993; Ng, 1988) in addition to the substantial contributions of historical studies documenting racist aspects of welfare (e.g. Comacchio, 1993; Iacovetta, 1992; Valverde, 1991).

The Black critique of welfare, however, due to its centrality both in Britain and the US, remains of primary relevance for an understanding of welfare issues in Canada. On the one hand it calls attention to the pivotal location of race and differences for an understanding of welfare, and, on the other, it provides a model for understanding the specific developments these issues had in Canada. The race critique in the US and Britain, Williams (1989, p.87) comments, crystallized around studies of race relations and associated policy recommendations constituting a separate policy specialty which addressed issues of integration and later multiculturalism. Race was, in these formulations, considered as just another dimension of inequality, treated as ethnic or minority aspects of the inner-city or poverty. These works moved from inequalities to a focus on

accounts of Black oppression and its relations to class exploitation, hence the mechanisms of oppression. The race critique of welfare found expression in some studies done in the vein of the political economy of the welfare state (e.g. Doyal, 1981 examine the role of Black immigrants and the National Health Services in Britain), but predominantly exists in the works of Black feminists.

Originally focused on the understanding of the differential experience of institutionalized power between men and women, feminism was charged with being oblivious to the various experiences of oppression lived by women of different classes and races. Joseph, in 1981, pointed out that the white feminist movement made no reference to the 'incestuous child of patriarchy and capitalism. That child, now a full grown adult, is named racism' (p.92 cited in Williams, 1989, p.69). Black feminists argued that white feminism had omitted from the writings of feminist history ("herstory") Black women's struggles against slavery, colonialism, imperialism and racism. Struggles as recent as the 1960s civil rights movement, one of the origins of the second wave of feminism, ignored Black women's contributions. And delivering a fundamental blow to the core of feminism, Black feminists questioned the universality of concepts such as women and patriarchy (Carby, 1982; hooks, 1982). Instead they argued for an understanding of differences of power among women and for greater complexity in the concept of patriarchy. They also stressed the non-homogenized experiences of Black and immigrant groups. The analysis of the interactions between patriarchy and sexism and class varied widely: Davis (1981) stressed struggles against economic exploitation; Lorde (1984) argued for the need to recognize differences due to domination through racism, sexism, ageism, heterosexism, elitism and classism; and hooks (1989) stressed the fundamental importance of an analysis of racism for understanding patriarchy.

As women, Black or white, interact with welfare more frequently and more intensely than men, the first critiques of white welfare policies came from Black feminists who argued that racism and sexism compounded and reconstituted their experiences with and oppression by welfare in particular ways. Motherhood constitutes a clear example of this point. Although not documented in Canada, both in Britain and the US white motherhood is encouraged by welfare while Black and immigrant motherhood is greeted under the eugenicist notions of limiting the children of the unfit and undesirable. Williams (1989) illustrated these points with accounts of the split within the white abortion movement and the Black campaign for reproductive rights in Britain (p.69). Equally problematic is the characterization of the family as a site of oppression for women. Black families in England have, in many cases, been a site of resistance and struggles against oppression and contemporary struggles against police and deportations (Williams, 1989).

The basic welfare assumption of a male breadwinner and his dependent wife and children has never really been fully applied to Black families. Carby (1982), demonstrating the links between immigration policies and welfare, shows how in the immediate postwar Britain, when white women were encouraged to stay in the home, Black Caribbean women were recruited into the labour market to perform jobs with low pay and unsocial hours (e.g. auxiliary nursing) under the condition of leaving their partners and children in their country of origin. The differences are further demonstrated by the substantially higher proportion of Black women in fulltime employment as compared to white women and the larger proportion of female headed household among Black households (Amott, 1990, p.281; Williams, 1989, p.77). Gordon (1990, p.24) describes similar trends for the turn of the century US: Black women and mothers were more likely to be employed; and less likely to depend on a male wage than their white counterparts. A

similar disregard for separation within the family unit of Black populations is demonstrated by Canadian policy of recruiting farm labour. Black women have also found that their relation with paid employment further differs from their white sisters' in the sense that they are predominantly recruited as domestic workers, and in earlier times, as agricultural labourers and laundresses (Carby, 1982; Gordon, 1990, p.25; for Canadian study see Calliste, 1991).

Policies regarding extension of welfare benefits to immigrants and foreign workers and the racist practices of their administrators have also contributed to the differential experiences with welfare. As discussed before, citizenship implies the exclusion of all *others* and Black populations have been the persistent others in many national contexts including the Canadian. Daenzer (1993) has documented both the structural exclusion, through the domestic occupation, and the racial exclusion, that Black domestic workers suffered from the measures of the postwar social welfare system (see also Arat-Koc, 1989; Calliste, 1991). Ng (1986, 1988) has discussed the conditions of immigrant women in Canada. In addition, in the practice of social workers, teachers, doctors and other social welfare providers worldwide, the domesticity of Black families is pathologized and their cultural characteristics have been considered the cause of poverty, poor housing, poor schooling and other social problems (e.g., Wilson, 1987).

A more complex, non-exclusive historical understanding of welfare has emerged showing the considerable difference among Black and white women's struggles and priorities for welfare as well as power differentials and exclusionist structures within women's groups. Gordon (1990, p.24) points out that in the turn of the century US feminist struggles, white women's strategies relied upon wealth; connections; administrative power; and appointments to committees and commissions while marginalized groups, such as the National Association of Coloured Women,

focused on *private* welfare and their struggles became undistinguishable from civil rights activities (see also Gordon, 1994a, ch.5). Although committed to the family wage ideal, Black and immigrant women tended to accept mothers' employment as a long term reality and fought for programs, such as child care, to facilitate this endeavour. White women's welfarist organizations excluded Black women and took for granted the structures that maintained Black women's subordination. An important aspect of the historical analysis, however, is its clear demonstration that groups of either white or Black women were not homogenous and that their alliances were tactical and shifting. The understanding of this reality demands a framework of analysis that can incorporate complexity and diversity.

An attempt to capture this complexity is Amott's study of Black single mothers (1990). She contends that the relationship between the extension of welfare financial support and the rise in Black single motherhood in the US 'is complex and mediated by a number of factors, including structural changes in the economy, shifts in the occupational distribution of Black men and women, and political mobilization among Black women to secure basic economic rights for themselves and for their children' (p.280). She proposes an interpretation of the relationship between welfare and single mothers which contrasts with the predominant promotion of independence based on feminist distrust of state sponsored programs:

During the 1980s, a broad public consensus developed around the idea that "welfare dependency" was a social problem, that this social problem was concentrated among Blacks, and that the "disintegration of the Black family" was a matter of urgent public concern. (...) Welfare need not be seen as a social problem but rather as a vital source of income to single mothers whose economic choices are constrained by the myriad of ways that racism and sexism structure economic life in the United States (p.280).

The discussion of race exposed the naturalization of white assumptions within welfare and challenged as hollow the homogeneity of concepts such as gender and class. It contributed to the development of a number of aspects of social policy in the 1990s. Primarily, it helped to establish

race as central to the study of welfare. In addition, it helped bring to light the need to explore and theorize many other differences where critiques have more recently been developed, e.g., religion; geography; physical and mental ability; and sexuality. It may also have contributed together with other discourses, particularly in the US, to a separation of Black single mothers from other groups of single mothers and to the constitution, by certain racist forces, of the label welfare mothers, distinct from white single motherhood.

Unlike the US, in Canada, although Black women have developed a decisive race critique of welfare practices (see Bishop, 1994), single motherhood has not been associated with Black women. The Black critique of welfare and the Black single mother is, however, relevant in the Canadian context to explore the question of how race and culture have informed a particular image and approach to single mothers' issues. Although not documented in the academic press, it is pertinent to comment on the assumed relationship in the Canadian prairie provinces, between poor urban aboriginal women and single motherhood (e.g., 'We're the poorest of the poor in this society - single aboriginal and Metis mothers', *Winnipeg Free Press*, June 26, 1997, A9). The framework of the race critique of welfare, as formulated in the US and Britain, may constitute a useful tool in the aboriginal and Metis single mother's struggle for respectful and dignified treatment from social welfare programs.

In summary, the emphasis on differences has broken up the category of single mothers by drawing attention to the diversity of trajectories, life experiences and material situations this category represents. It has undoubtedly set new agendas for welfare by emphasizing cultural plurality and legitimacy of specific differences and stressing, above all, that generalizations about single mothers require a great deal of caution (Hardey & Crow, 1991). With the diversity

critique, the understanding of single mothers gains complexity and depth. It was exposed to contradictions and differences; and *the given*, the observed social superstructures were questioned and the natural became varied. In parallel to the diversity of formulations to which single mothers have been approached, some groups (e.g., Black feminists in the US and Britain) have demanded that they be considered as a family in their own right and not some form of mutation from normality. Their struggle has profoundly influenced the directions of social welfare. In the whole, the diversity critique has questioned and multiplied the axe through which social welfare is understood and has introduced a focus on mechanisms of oppression and construction of otherness. In addition it has also raised important political questions regarding demands and needs of different groups as well as the recognized forms of organization to achieve those demands.

Post-structuralism and social welfare.

The various “post-” formulations and their implications for an understanding of welfare constitute a difficult terrain to tread. Influenced by postmodern thought (see general manuals by Harvey, 1990; Jameson, 1991; McHale, 1992), the fact that these recent formulations can only reluctantly be grouped together is a result both of the nature of the critique itself and of the reluctance of welfare scholarship to acknowledge the critique. In fact *nature* may not be the appropriate word since the various post-perspectives do not claim any affiliation, unity or commonality, and this umbrella denomination refers to a diversity of commentaries. It is difficult to propose a single name for these perspectives, but it is not just a question of name. Post-modernism is usually associated with critical assessments of cultural manifestations of modern society which may encompass a period from the eighteenth century to the 1970s. Post-

structuralism is more time specific and, generally, pertains to a critique of the rational structural thought predominant in the postwar. Post-structuralism, Weedon (1987, p.19-20) comments, encompasses a variety of works which may include 'the apparent "apolitical" deconstructive criticism' of American literary critics; the discussions of the meanings of gender and language inspired by French feminists; or the historical analysis of discourse and power undertaken by Foucault.

Howe (1994) distinguishes two broad features of these perspectives: the denunciation of the totalizing and universalist tendencies of 'grand narratives' (Lyotard, 1984) and the relentless de-mystification of rationality that characterize Western theories (Barrett, 1992; Fraser, 1992; Singer, 1993, ch.6; Walby, 1992). In some cases the post-perspectives focus on an analysis of a new and still confusing period. Singer (1993), for example, relates the replacement of the 'rational and divinely originated world' for 'the more episodic and unpredictable connections of network - modelled on information and communication networks which disperse, circulate, and proliferate exchanges in a way that belies any myths of unitary origins, foundations or essences' (p.189). At another level, these perspectives may take issues of fragmentation and multiplicity to discussions around causality, origins and a progressive philosophy of history (Barrett, 1992, p.202) highlighting uncertainty or incoherence and questioning the basis of Western science and common sense. The post-perspectives have, following Lyotard (1984), demonstrated a disbelief in the progress of science, reason and human fulfilment. Haraway's *Cyborg Manifesto* (1991), for example, represents, with unchallenged energy, the very nature of the post-modern and the opportunities it opens through the discussion of the complex process of displacement, substitution and transposition from one discursive code to the other. The cyborg is neither wholly human,

machine nor animal and its existence although not derived from its origin (e.g. human) is opposed to domination. It challenges the authority and legitimacy of dominant humanist narratives freeing 'us of the need to root politics in identification, vanguard parties, purity and mothering' (p.176).

Until very recently, studies of welfare or social policy, unlike those in disciplines such as sociology, geography and history, have remained, with few exceptions, at considerable distance from influences of the post-perspectives. The nature of postwar welfare theory, grounded in the ideals of the universalism of collective provision, the gradual progress and the elimination of inequalities, was considerably shaken by critiques aimed at these very ideals and not, as was the case in both the Marxist and feminist critiques, at the contradictions of their application. It is only in the mid 1990s that social policies studies have undertaken, under much criticism, frontal examinations of the *post* formulations and their contributions to understanding welfare (see particularly Hewitt, 1994; Penna & O'Brien, 1996; Williams, 1994). In general these have typically been focused on attempting to introduce professionals and academic social policy analyst to the concepts, ideas and challenges of the post-perspectives. Commenting on this reluctant engagement for the Social Policy Association in Britain, Hewitt (1994, 36-37) states:

The growing output of works on postmodernism since the early Eighties would suggest that this is a term whose time has finally arrived. Yet the term is ambiguous in denoting both an arrival and departure. Indeed ambiguity and indeterminacy are central to postmodern culture, and to dividing those who endorse postmodernist values founded on ambivalence and the loss of foundations (Bauman, 1991; Lyotard, 1984) from those who see ambivalence as the irrational consequence of postmodernism (Habermas, 1987). (...) Postmodernism, serves as rubric for these significant cultural changes associated with the global reorganization of industrial society, and for new intellectual perspectives which might provide insights into these changes.

Within the analytical framework of social welfare, the call for a different set of tools for understanding the social, economic, cultural and political societal changes of the late twentieth century is not a novelty. From the standpoint of post-Thatcher Britain, Williams (1992) remarks

on several aspects of welfare which demand a new theorization: the breaking up of the monolithic power of the public sector; the diversification of provision to private and voluntary organizations; the recognition of specific needs of different groups; the trend for time limited grant funding substituting program funding; the contradictions of fragmentation bringing greater centralization; and emphasis on equal opportunity paralleled by cuts to service and access (see also Oppenheim & Lister, 1996). Among the perspectives fulfilling that role, and classified by some authors (Hewitt, 1994) within the post-perspectives addressing welfare, is post-Fordism, also addressed as disorganised capitalism, Schumpeterian workfare state or post-industrialism (Allen, 1992; Jessop 1990, 1994; Offe 1984, 1985). Post-Fordism attempts to characterize the fundamental social and political changes in welfare since its modernist postwar era (e.g. Burrows & Loader, 1994; Jordan, 1991; Offe, 1984): the new international economic order; a restructured labour force; and cultural diversity. However, the theoretical affiliations of authors in this perspective are, arguably, that of neo-Marxism (Williams 1994) and I discussed them in this review under the current tendencies of the political economy of welfare state.

Other recent approaches also classified (e.g., Hewitt, 1994) under post-modernism and related to welfare issues can equally be discussed under the diversity critique. The boundary between these two perspectives is a tenuous one since many authors have pushed the exploration of diversity to a dominant theoretical problematization of the established and a renunciation of all hierarchical thought. A strict classification or the delimitation of clear boundaries and divisions seems, in many cases, a futile classificatory attempt for which the only purpose may be to illustrate modernist thought.

A case in point would be the theorists of need who focus on the discussion of universal

concepts such as need or inequality and the problematics of contemporary welfare. Can a theory sensitive to differences conceptualize central universal concepts that lie at the very basis of social welfare such as need and inequality? A theory of need has been the subject of much attention in the late 1980s and early 1990s and some of its analysts do not, in fact, break their commitment to some form of universality. Doyal & Gough (1991), for example, propose a new approach where *higher needs* are conceived in universal terms but recognize that *intermediate needs*, require actual conditions of and satisfiers interpreted in culturally relative terms (see also Taylor Gooby, 1992). The discussion over needs has, however, been approached from positions which recognize not only issues of individual autonomy but also, and importantly, the social processes required to make autonomous claims and to negotiate those claims. Fraser's (1989, ch. 7 & 8) groundbreaking work has proposed that needs have been theorized under what she calls thin/thick duality. The thin concept conceptualizes needs as abstract, objective and universal. Hence, a thin concept of needs carries the moral weight socially recognized and used in welfarist claims making discussions (e.g., Penz, 1986). The thick concept on the other hand incorporates the cultural context in which people name their needs, relying on interpretative methods to develop the meanings of needs in its everyday context. The focus here is on a politics of needs interpretation highlighting the limits of the universalistic needs discourse (see review and discussion in Drover & Kerans, 1993).

What distinguishes the post-structuralist perspectives in the study of welfare, in my view, is their recognition and insistence in the multiplicity of identities, origins, contexts and circumstances without attempts to establish a hierarchy, order or structure among them. In doing so post-structuralism theorists destabilize and reformulate the established parameters of what is accepted

as normality. It is the reversing of the expected, the questioning of the obvious and the exposing of the multiplicity of dimensions and constructions of the given that constitutes the full movement from the structural to the post-structural. Penna & O'Brien (1996) comment:

Poststructuralist work shows how 'social problems' (the object of social policy) are part of much wider discourses such that political struggles for welfare occur in many different sites: in the social and cultural relations of sexuality, gender, 'race' and ethnicity and age, for example. Each of these take equal policy priority with economic relations of class.

But rather than proposing a contrasting formulation of principles, the post-structuralist critiques can be better characterized as commentaries or explorations of aspects which, without claiming central importance, demonstrate their contribution to constituting or illuminating aspects of the topic or subject. They do not represent finished, closed or end products although definitely making a contribution. Understandably, the clear fixing of authors or specific works in this perspective is not a subject of consensus or a particularly rewarding endeavour. A much more fruitful pursuit is to identify, in contemporary contributions, the footprints of certain themes and methods which can be associated with post-structuralism. First, an accent on language and discourse seems to underpin the post-perspectives emphasising the part language plays in the formation of human selves, human thought and human subjectivity. An example of this type of work applied to welfare studies is Fraser & Gordon's "Genealogy of Dependency" (1994) which has focused on deconstruction, as a method, to trace the welfare related meanings of the word *dependency*. They show how the discursive formation of social welfare associated increasingly negative meanings to dependency which substituted the social relations of dependency (see also Naples, 1997).

Second, the issue of risk is a theme which has a certain recurrence. Castel (1991) has discussed the meaning of risk in assessments and preventive care of the mentally ill; while Scott,

Williams, Plat & Thomas (1992) edited a collection of applications of the concept of risk to systems of care and wellbeing. Controlling risk and attempting to impose an artificial sense of security embody for Parton (1998, 1996, 1991) a series of emblematic concerns with a modernity approach to child welfare. A further theme is the discussion of the universalist tendencies of welfare state theories (Pringle & Watson, 1992). The notion and weight of the state as a coordinating agent of capitalism and patriarchy has been displaced by questioning the homogeneity and origin of such forces and stressing the variety of agents and processes within welfare (Giddens, 1985; Little, 1994a and other articles in Valverde, 1994). Another common theme is the question of knowledge formation and power. The themes of knowledge and power have produced in social work some applications to the teaching of social welfare practice (Leonard, 1994; Stainton & Swift, 1996). Applying the post-modern to planning, Sandercock (1995, p.85) proposes that:

all of the writers I have discussed are concerned with epistemological questions, with how knowledge gets produced, by whom, and for what purposes and to what effects. They are concerned with who is included in and who is excluded from theoretical discourses and with how theory is defined. They call for an acknowledgement of the fact that there are different ways of doing theory, that the voice of Western abstract logic and reason is not the only possible theoretical voice.

Despite these valuable contributions and commentaries there is a sparsity of applications of the post-structuralist critique to social policy and studies of welfare. The single mother has remained a central figure in the political and popular discourses of welfare but has not been the object of much examination under the new frameworks. In sync with post-structuralist thought, she has been cast under the light of different constitutive influences and an emphasis has been placed on the assumptions, similarities and ambiguities this group of women has assumed (Fraser, 1989; Gordon, 1994a; Nelson, 1990). The influences of these perspectives are increasingly visible

in the variety of groups single mothers have been subdivided and the emphasis on their dissimilar needs and claims. In many ways, single mothers as a label for a specific group lost its meaning and unity. Studies today address specific groups within the broader classification of single mother: the adolescent mother, the aboriginal mother, the addicted mother or the lesbian mother. Consequently the group lost the political weight it held in the welfare discourse and the modest but somewhat certain support women raising children alone won during the postwar settlement is becoming increasingly contested in the policy arena. Studies addressing single mothers emphasize either - as argued by post-Fordists - the policy changes which follow the logic of increasing the nation's competitiveness in the world market or - following the diversity perspective - they question universal categories and concepts such as justice, needs and citizenship.

And here lies one of the main challenges of the post-structuralist critique to date, i.e., its difficulty in proposing understandings of how a diversity of manifestations and a multiplicity of causes generate political action without reverting to either the pluralism of liberal or the superstructural forces of the Marxist and feminist critique.

The postmodern perspective offers more wisdom: the postmodern setting makes acting on that wisdom more difficult. This is, roughly, why the postmodern time is experienced as living through crisis. What the postmodern mind is aware of is that there are problems in human and social life with no good solutions, twisted trajectories that cannot be straightened up, ambivalences that are more than linguistic blunders yelling to be corrected, doubts which cannot be legislated out of existence, moral agonies which no reason-dictated recipes can soothe, let alone cure (Bauman, 1993, p.245).

While a "post-modern" reality has settled in, the struggles of many marginalized groups have remained tied to a "modern" framework while, for others, the politics of interpreting and negotiating needs have substituted the rights to basic needs embedded in the postwar social welfare system. A concern with inclusivity, diversity, an aim for equality in difference and a concomitant consideration to the particular and universal have all proved to be clear guiding

principles but have remained a challenge to implement in a context where guidelines themselves are losing their status (see proposals in Fraser, 1994). The discourses of social policy are still to come to terms with flexibility and ambivalence although they have incorporated some aspects which demonstrate their permeability to the new perspectives. For example, experts are increasingly renouncing their authoritative knowledge based on central scientific principles and developing renewed practices guided by the participation of many voices from a multiplicity of stake-holders (Rose, 1993b); communicative skills; empathy, openness and sensitivity (Gomez-Penna, 1993). A further influence of the post-perspectives on practices related to single mothers is the increased attention to policy rationales, e.g., questioning the meaning of empowerment (Drolet, 1997), specific aspects of single mothers' relationship with social welfare and its implications for a multi-dimensional concept of citizenship (see review in Lewis & Hobson, 1997).

In summary, within the boundaries imposed by normative classification, the post-perspectives represent a difficult set of influences to discuss due to their varied and broad scope as well as their refusal to become just a new label. It is primarily through the influence of some of their common postulates that both post-modernism and post-structuralism found expression in social policy. These may be represented by the emphasis on the diversity of origins, manifestations and circumstances, and the questioning of universal concepts. These brought to the study and practice of social welfare an attention to discursive manifestations of phenomena; emphasis on the variety of voices, subject position and causes; as well as a rejection of rational, universal scientific principles. While single mothers in the West have reached a high visibility position in the political agendas of most welfare regimes, scholarship addressing this group has focused on contextualizing the development of policies and approaches to single motherhood as

well as exploring particular aspects of single mothers relation to social welfare and the various subject positions implied by this group. The post-structuralist formulations, however, have not produced a substantial scholarship on single mothers and their influence can be mostly felt in attempts to formulate political alternatives within instability, fragmentation and uncertainty as well as a sense of responsibility to the otherness of single motherhood. The next chapter will explore these openings further. Closing this chapter, I will summarize the relationship between single mothers and social welfare as proposed by the dominant mainstream theories and their critiques and, I will also comment on some of their accomplishments, common assumptions and shortcomings.

Welfare and Single Motherhood

Under mainstream thought, the single mother, although representing a variety of situations, constitutes a social problem that is addressed through collective provision. A fatherless family is, in this theoretical framework, an incomplete unit thus a unit which may be unable to perform its social roles and a potential burden for society. Any social support they may receive - cash or in-kind - cannot, however, undermine the drive for self-sufficiency that is, in this approach, the only way to achieve the welfare of society and of the individual. Consequently the single mother is placed in the contradictory position whereby she may receive state support to function as the norm of two-parent family while at the same time this support not only restricts her individual freedom - through the deservedness clause - but also - through the less eligibility condition - cannot allow her equality of conditions to function as a normalized family. A variety of mainstream approaches attempted to minimize these effects through references to the need for a

common welfare for the development of capitalism and the state as the natural mediator and promoter of this joint development. Nevertheless, these approaches are strongly criticized by others as encouraging moral degeneration and state support for single mothers continues to be a highly contested issue.

The political economy of the welfare state, one of the most powerful critiques of mainstream theories, has at its centre the relationship of production and the class struggle. Its primary contention with mainstream approaches is their empiricism and lack of understanding of the structural forces shaping the development of capitalism. Hence this Marxist inspired critique problematised the natural cooperation between welfare and capitalism and developed a theory of the welfare state as serving particular functions in managing the affairs of late capitalism. Poor women with children, and single mothers in particular, are here predominantly seen as a segment of the working class, performing cheap labour or kept in the reserve army of labour. Their rights to full employment are hindered by their condition of motherhood and their other domestic duties. Their struggle with capital is primarily represented by the demands for child care and the right to waged jobs. The political economy of the welfare state pointed out the general forces that condition workers' lives and make the relationship between worker and welfare contradictory. As well, it highlighted the power of collective action in guiding change and shaping struggles. This perspective, however, remains at a general and abstract level. The single mother can only be seen through struggles of the worker, the universal concept of class and a limited range of economic causal analyse. In addition to the many relevant angles it brought to the understanding of single mothers, political economy entailed an emphasis on the state as the focus of all struggles; a death of the individual as agent and a lack of interest in the private sphere of the family.

The feminist perspective is centred on the gendered operations of welfare. It criticized the lack of understanding and value placed on motherhood and women's domestic work in both the mainstream and the class critique. It exposed the patriarchal assumptions in the operation of welfare and their centrality to the current social organization. The single mother is viewed by the gender critique under a variety of aspects: the feminization of poverty; the inadequacy of services; and the assumptions embedded in the concepts of family and motherhood for women's position in society. The relationship between welfare and single mothers is seen as dominating and controlling but also, in some cases, beneficial and sympathetic. Independence from state supervision is, however, implied as the main goal for poor mothers. The emphasis on the family and on women's non-wage labour activities open up new areas of the relationship between single mothers and welfare, such as possibilities of emancipation, the role of motherhood and reproductive labour in general within capitalism. In spite of these breaks with other theoretical approaches, the gender critique of welfare maintained the state at the centre of the analysis delimiting, hence, the scope of understandings of and solutions to single motherhood to the sphere of the state. Gender is proposed as a further structure operating, in connection with class, from an idealized and global perspective to determine the patriarchal capitalist form. In terms of social welfare practices, the gender critique generated a new emphasis on empowerment of women, attempting to equip single mothers with the individual tools to confront the effects of gender discrimination. It also drew attention to important aspects of mothers' lives, in addition to wage and working conditions, such as safety within the home, housing, and ability to maintain an independent household. Shelters for battered wives joined the range of single mothers' services and housing becomes as central an issue for single mothers as income.

A further set of critical argumentations about welfare and single mothers emerged from the diversity perspective. It focused on differences as a social construct and generated a series of angles to examine both welfare and single mothers, including the investigation of the different groups of women that the concept of single mother encompassed. Of special relevance for the formation of the single mother and building on an existing race critique - which was of particular importance for both Britain and the US - Black feminists problematised the monolithic concept of women and demonstrated how Black women, families and mothers differed from their white sisters in their relationship with welfare. The articulation and circulation of this analysis was important not only for demonstrating the centrality of race for an understanding of welfare but also for radically breaching the cohesiveness of the predominant categories of analysis with a variety of differences. It brought specificity and multiplicity into the analyses of welfare but the functioning of diversity in the policy context remained a challenge. Most of all it created a generalized freezing effect on the progressive political practices of welfare despite the strong calls for a focus on the processes of oppression embedded in the specification of differences. It produced critiques, focused on structures of oppression but was unable to generate popular strategies for emancipation.

A few other critiques were here grouped under the label of post-structuralism. Above all these critiques have brought ambiguity, fragmentation, hybridization and specificity to the centre of social policy thinking. They did so by addressing a series of themes and methods which challenged universal concepts, main effects and causality. The post-perspectives emphasize constitutive aspects, discursive variations, hybrid interactions and singular effects. While they moved social policy and its scientific claims to a less privileged location in the welfare discourse,

they elevated negotiation, politics and interpretation as preferred tools of social welfare. Post-structuralism produced, however, little scholarship regarding single mothers.

The effect of these critiques on mainstream understandings of single mothers has not been negligible. The discourses of single motherhood diversified and gained sophistication and depth while being challenged from a variety of fronts. Women's natural role within the family and motherhood became the object of public discussion and, although not an exclusive effect of the above critiques, the single mother no longer represents a unified deserving poor group. The figure of the woman with children working out of the home has become an acknowledged necessity for most families but in a position complementary to that of the male breadwinner in a two wage earner family.

A mother who is the solo breadwinner continues, then, to be in a very difficult position. As Piven (1990, p.254) proposes, she is in a weak position in the marketplace (at the very time the number of single mothers is increasing both the salaries and the high level entry jobs are declining); and the prospects for improvement either through individual mobility or collective bargaining are grim (see Baker, 1994 for a description of these trends in Canada). Despite the decreasing likelihood of a single mother to be able to maintain her family through the market, the rationalities for public support are increasingly being questioned. While motherhood has begun to encompass increasingly the role of worker, the appeal to moral and economic values of motherhood have prompted, among certain social commentators, a renewed emphasis on the importance of women's domestic role. The contradictions implied in these positions maintain a heated debate around single motherhood especially in light of the fact that single mothers, despite their diversity, remain in their majority a disadvantaged group whose relative position has not

improved significantly considering repeated social policy efforts to do so (see Lewis & Hobson, 1997 for international comparative data).

One of the assumptions that unifies the current body of literature addressing the single mother is that both the mainstream and its critiques have assigned to single motherhood the status of a phenomenon in itself: an autonomous reality that becomes understood with increased and more appropriate studies and practices. The diversity critique exposed this uniform reality as in fact a multitude of experiences; i.e., Black single mothers, teen mothers, and so forth; but did not really question their existence as a phenomenon in itself and, in this sense, maintained their natural existence as the *other*. Can we, however, applying one of the central post-structuralist critiques, deconstruct this unified concept of single mother?

Contemporary Canadian scholars of the family (e.g., Baker, 1990; Eichler, 1988, ch. 4; Kitchen, 1990; and McDaniel, 1994) propose that the family is undergoing changes in its structure and dynamics. In their view, in the last instance, the failure of current policies to address single mother families' disadvantages lie at their lack of understanding of these changes and their reliance on idealized versions of the family. That is, adequate policies can be developed once the "true" reality of family structure is shown and traditional thinking discarded. In fact, however, the increased knowledge about family realities has multiplied the number of problems to be solved and their complexity. It seems that as a spiralling number of studies demonstrates the variety of experiences and prevalence of single mother families - for example Desroisiers, le Bourdais & Lehrhaupt (1994) study show that as many as 40% of Canadian women may experience single motherhood some time in their lives - the rigidity of the discourse of the normal two-parent family expands and the problems of single motherhood proliferate. The changing character of single

motherhood, that seems to evade all scholarly depicting and professional solutions, suggests avenues of investigation which understand single motherhood as a social construction through the same policies that attempt to address them.

An additional shared underlying assumption of the current theoretical body is the nature and place allocated to the state. The focus on the state, as an overall force determining and controlling welfare, has been central to understandings of single mothers as well as their status and position in society. In doing so these understandings restrict themselves to one particular and specific manifestation of the concern with the wellbeing of populations: that of state organized and funded public programs and services. Hence most of the current scholarship addressing single motherhood stays focused on state welfare policies and their effects on single mothers. As discussed by Little (1994b, 1998), moral regulation functions, for example, are central to the contemporary practices of the Family Benefits program despite their situation in the literature as marginal or under control or, perhaps, as a result of individual case-workers' attitudes. A further consequence of the focus on the state is that its special characteristics and functioning are imprinted with the concern with welfare. Hence the range and scope of the events and arguments from which theorisations about single motherhood are drawn are defined by issues of the nature of state power; relations between on the one hand the state and, on the other, the classes, and the diverse social groups; and the role of the state in maintaining and recognizing single mothers. As a result the failure of the state to support women parenting alone has been a standard way to conclude many analyses of specific policies.

Overall current scholarship around single mothers' issues, although providing a description of discrimination and segregation as effects of government policies, do not address how these

effects are produced. They fail to present an account of how the state and other social institutions actually function and in doing so leave a vague and all encompassing state to blame for single mother's problems. They fail to account for the multitude of struggles and interests embedded in the rationalities and practices of welfare since state theories have, in general, been dominated by general structural accounts of the relationship between infrastructure and superstructure. Scholarship on single motherhood has been quite comfortable with a mere description of the effects produced by the system of welfare. It has avoided, for the most part, not only a discussion of how power operates from a multitude of points and the way it operates but also, and in particular, it has ignored the individuals as active parts of these processes.

The next chapter will explore further these questions and discuss some theoretical avenues for examining single mothers and the social welfare practices addressing them. It will return to perspectives classified under post-structuralism as well as to contemporary feminist formulations to restate the aims of this thesis and to propose a conceptual framework to achieve them.

Chapter 3:

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS AND METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES: THE SINGLE MOTHER COMPLEX

For many years, we have been all living in the realm of Prince Mangogul: under the spell of an immense curiosity about sex, bent on questioning it, with an insatiable desire to hear it speak and be spoken about, quick to invent all sorts of magical rings that might force it to abandon its discretion. As if it were essential for us to be able to draw from that little piece of ourselves not only pleasure but knowledge, and a whole subtle interchange from one to the other: a knowledge of pleasure, a pleasure that comes from knowing pleasure, a knowledge-pleasure; and as if that fantastic animal we accommodate had itself such finely tuned ears, such searching eyes, so gifted a tongue and mind, as to know much and be quite willing to tell it, provided we employ a little skill in urging it to speak (Foucault, 1990, p.77).

Introduction: What is *Single Mother*?

In the previous chapter I examined the theoretical perspectives and the policy frameworks articulated within them which formulate the welfare system as an arrangement dealing with social problems such as single motherhood. In this chapter, as the opening quote suggests, my intention is to question the stability and foundations of this state of knowledge, to denaturalize the existence of single mothers as a self-explanatory subject to be discovered by social policy research. In the previous review, I organized the predominant perspectives and frameworks around welfare and its interventions regarding single mother around two broad groups: the various assumptions and constructions that formed mainstream thinking and the critiques that have challenged and modified it - class, gender, diversities and the post-structuralist perspectives. In general, approaches to single mothers have accorded a special place to the role of the state and the market in the allocation of resources and in the formulation of solutions. In these perspectives and frameworks the expression *single mothers* emerges as the natural or obvious representation

of a chain of social problems, at times too encompassing and too complex to be tackled within the boundaries of the welfare system. Single mothers are often problematised through reference to social norms regarding the family responsibility for maintenance, care and upbringing of their children. They pose a problem for the organization of Western societies and for the functioning of their economic systems. In this sense they are measured, counted, interviewed, and seen on the streets. They are visible and material women raising children alone struggling to support their families. And the more they are studied, targeted with interventions, and measured the more the problems associated with them seem to multiply and their numbers to expand.

There is also associated with this view of single mothers an understanding of them as the embodiment of particularly conflicting combination of roles in modern societies - mothers and workers - exposing the rigid division of labour between the state and families in these societies (see for example Lewis, 1989; or Evans, 1995 for a discussion of this conflict). In this sense they are used, on one hand, as a catalyst for struggles around the issues of social citizenship and the right to form an independent household without the risk of poverty, violence or marginalization (see Hobson, 1994; Orloff, 1993). On the other hand, they are portrayed as one of the most powerful threats to the foundation of liberal societies and constitute the preferred target to groups advocating the return to traditional ways (e.g., Richards, 1997). Here, one may argue, they are no longer individual beings but rather an almost mythical entity, an allegory with greater meanings, powers and threats than the condition of poverty and squalor of women raising children alone would suggest.

Yet this extraordinary entity has no existence without the concrete form of the women raising children alone. In parallel, these women become visible, are targeted with social

programs, employment training and financial support through references to the allegorical entity. Further, social policy interventions have attempted to address threats to the family form represented by the single mothers through the subjectivity and body of the woman raising children alone: empowerment, emotional support and parenting training are the urgent activities accompanying limited financial support. How have individual women become the standard against which the stability, functioning and health of fundamental social institutions are judged? How did single mothers become the emblem for various struggles encompassing women's social roles, state responsibilities, rights of citizenship, and the meaning and implications of family, class and race? Can we talk of an abstract ideal or image of single mother, using, for example, Havas' (1995) treatment of the family as an ideology? If so how can it be counted and described, and assume the materiality of a human person? Why and how did single mothers or an allegory associated with them come to assume such centrality in political agendas of left and right, of traditional as well as radical proposals? How can this whole discussion be used within social policy to promote change, select paths to follow and influence social struggles? In summary, what is the single mother?

These questions suggest that talking about single mothers is also talking about the very fabric and workings of welfare as a system and also that it refers to understanding ways of changing and influencing the directions social life. The theoretical apparatus reviewed in the first chapter is, perhaps, not quite adequate to tackle such questioning. To say this is not to deny the contributions that the mainstream and its critiques have made to understandings of both single mothers and welfare as well as to the formulation of interventions which have indeed improved many of the conditions endured by a variety of marginalised groups. Keys to the mainstream are

the concepts and methods for the description of problem populations; the assessment of their needs envisaging their independent functioning in society; and the devising of ways to satisfy those needs. Critiques of mainstream approaches to welfare have focused on the examination of how this system is structurally organized around class, gender, race, sexual orientation and physical aptitudes among others (see Chapter 2). Accessibility, discrimination, and differences become the central concepts to highlight how the structural processes of impoverishment, subordination and dependence constitute the effects of welfare on many groups. Both the mainstream and its critiques have yielded important debates and policies which have focused on developing and implementing more equitable and accessible distribution of services (e.g., in Canada Andrew & Rodgers, 1997; Baker, 1994; Callahan, 1992; Wharf, 1994) as well as on challenging guiding practices and norms of welfare around the axis of class, gender and differences (e.g., in Canada Bishop, 1994; Low, 1996; Pulkingham, 1995).

The doubts cast here on the adequacy of this apparatus refer, rather, to the levels at which the questions formulated earlier are situated. While these questions may be inspired by post-structuralist thought current scholarship has not addressed them. The mainstream and its critiques see single motherhood as a fact or a given which happens to be particularly problematic for contemporary welfare due to the increased numbers of single mothers and the subsequent enlarged state expenditure required to deal with these numbers (e.g., Evans, 1988; Kitchen, 1992; or for international context Lewis, 1997). What they fail to address, borrowing from Fraser's (1996, p.535) discussion in another context, is how these particular observations become the central aspects to explain not only some women's lives but also how they became central elements of the discourse of welfare and social life. Single mothers must first be noticed, separated from

the social body, studied, attributed a series of characteristics, interpreted and inserted in a framework for the management of social wellbeing. Both the mainstream and its critiques restrict their inquiry to a description of certain conditions lending to them an aura of self-evidence while the questions proposed above probe into the composition and formation of this reality. The reviewed perspectives and frameworks are content to capture a constructed reality as the truth or what exists and to propose interventions. They exclude from their analysis existing dimensions that are constitutive of what they call real or true; and, more than that, they fail to see what allows the formation of that welfare discourse. For example, single mothers are usually characterized as having a disadvantaged position in the labour market (e.g., Kitchen, 1992; Lord, 1994) but that is already a characteristic defined and shaped by a labour market centred analysis and intervention. Or, an alternative example describes single mothers as dependent on welfare (see review and analysis by Fraser & Gordon, 1994) when it is difficult to think of single mothers without thinking of the welfare system itself. That is not to say that welfare causes single mothers (e.g., Richards, 1997) but to suggest that single mothers, as such, are bound to the discourses of welfare.

To ask what is the single mother is, therefore, to inquire into the very nature of the processes that constitute the complex set of relations and interactions embedded in this constantly changing construct. It is an attempt to grapple with the full complexity of the construct rather than a schematic representation of it. This inquiry is different from methodological questions familiar to qualitative research paradigms where what is at stake is the inability to capture a multifaced reality with one voice (Miller, 1997a, p.7-9). Here the debate is not about the method of capturing reality but the assumption of a pre-existing reality itself. This begs an exploration of constitutive processes and their effects.

In this chapter I will map the territory in which my investigation of single mothers is situated and discuss the tools I intend to use for its exploration. First, building from the contributions of the critiques of the mainstream, I will review the central propositions of a contemporary body of literature - situated reluctantly among the post-structuralist perspectives - which concerns itself with welfare as a system of rule: the governmentality literature developed from Foucault's work. In the following section, I will review feminist critiques and uses of Foucault's insights to address the questions raised by these critiques, namely the issues of resistance and political programs. I will then arrive at a sketched map of the terrain in which I will situate the problematic of single motherhood and, subsequently, at a discussion of methodological issues. Finally, in the conclusion, I will restate the central questions driving this research and discuss its usefulness for policy analysis today.

The Direction that Refuses to Point the Way: Governmentality

It has become somewhat expected to start the discussion of new analytical frameworks with a demonstration of the complete inadequacy of the traditional modernist approaches. Here the task at hand is of a different nature. That is so, first, because the previous chapter has already explored the critiques and accomplishments of core theoretical frameworks and applied perspectives dealing with welfare. Second, because instead of closing avenues of investigation I would like to open up new aspects and themes in an attempt to contribute to an enlargement and renewal of the understandings of welfare. What I intend is not a negation of previous critiques but an engagement with them, sharpening and in some cases refuting certain concepts, avoiding, however, incompatible pluralistic formulations. Here I will review the main aspects of a body of

literature self-identified as governmentality after its affinity with Foucault's discussions of the liberal regimes of government (see Foucault, 1991a). As Burchell, Gordon & Miller (1991; see also O'Malley, Weir & Shearing, 1997. p.514, Osborne , 1994) propose, the characterisation of a body of literature is more appropriate than that of a particular school of thought or of a certain methodology since it shares primarily certain interests and it has, as well, produced varied and diverse contributions. Foucault's (1991a, p.102-3) own summary outlines three facets for *governmentality*:

1. The ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analysis and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very special albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security.
2. The tendency which, over a long period of time and throughout the West, has steadily led towards the pre-eminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, etc) of this type of power which may be termed government, resulting, on the one hand, in the formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of savoirs.
3. The process, or rather the result of the process, through which the state of justice of the Middle Ages, transformed into the administrative state during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, gradually becomes "governmentalized".

With this suggestion of an ensemble of practices and institutions; a tendency of power; and a process of government, Foucault triggered new understandings of political power. These understandings drew attention to certain ways of thinking and acting common to attempts at 'the management and reconstruction of social life in order to produce security for property and wealth, profitability and efficiency of production, public virtue, tranquillity and even happiness' (Rose, 1989, p.5). Foucault's own work on governmentality was extensively expanded and built upon (see among others the contributions in the collection "The Foucault Effect" by Burchell, Gordon & Miller, 1991; Dean, 1991, 1994a, 1994b; Donzelot, 1979; Rose, 1993a) and, in many ways, substantially developed through recent interfacings with Marxism and feminism (e.g., see authors in Pearce & Valverde, 1996). The central focus, however, has remained around the

understanding of 'government as a practical exercise' (O'Malley, 1996, p.310) or, in Rose's words, a concern 'with the ways in which authorities have asked themselves practical questions' (1993a, p.288).

This demarcation of focus is purposefully open and un-prescriptive since these new understandings are 'not to be applied but thought through' (Valverde, 1994, p.xi). There are, however, some distinct features of the governmentality literature which may form its shared analytical framework. These are, naturally, rooted in Foucault's work but used in a variety of forms and applications. A first feature, upon which most authors would agree, is a distance from state centred analysis and perspectives. These include approaches which tend to discuss social practices and actions in terms of their function or purpose within the state or as originating within the state. This is not an exclusive feature of Foucault's thoughts. As Dean (1994a, chap.8) proposes, many theorists in the 1980s and 1990s have challenged the Marxist theories of the state developed in the 1970s (see review in Jessop, 1990). Mann (1988) with the notion of *the infrastructural power of the state* interrogated the capacity of the state to actually penetrate civil society and implement political decisions. Giddens (1985) outlined the idea of *power containers* to describe the complex and detailed ways in which administrative power operates. Corrigan and Sayer (1985) discussed the role of the state in normalizing the process of moral regulation through the concept of *state formation*. These challenges, however, Dean continues, remained focused on the state and, as well, their highly abstract formulations have generated a profusion of hypothetical debates around the relationship between civil society and state (Valverde, 1994, ix).

Separating themselves from these debates, authors in the governmentality literature relocated the state within the problematics of government (Rose & Miller, 1992, p.173-179).

Government for these authors assumes a very specific meaning, different from the traditional calculating political subject operating the state, or from the executive or legislative arms of the state. Within the governmentality literature, government is, in fact, understood as a calculated activity or practice upon individuals to reach social and political ends (Dean, 1995, p.569; C. Gordon, 1991, p.3). Rather than the state extending its domination and control throughout society this literature proposes a governmentalization of the state. This means, in effect, a gradual transformation of the state into a mechanism for the exercise of political rule (Rose, 1989, p.5). For Foucault the state is an institution whose nature is a function of its practices (C. Gordon, 1991, p.4).

The welfare state is seen as a particular form of governing populations common to liberal Western democracies where a concern with the collective wellbeing becomes, as of the eighteenth century, a way to exercise power. Welfare, in these particular locations, is a constantly changing resultant of a variety of power struggles and their effects. This body of work has examined welfare not as a state practice by nature but as practices for the management of the collective wellbeing undertaken by the family, philanthropic groups, unions, and associations, for example, which in many instances 'came to colonize, constitute and recast the state itself' (Dean, 1994b, p.156). Rather than strategies of social control of one group over another, (e.g. Cohen, 1985), welfare is seen as a creative approach to understanding and governing social life: it manufactures its new urban, hygienic and social problems, its actors' needs for a disciplined and organized way of life and its individual-centred interventions. Satisfying needs becomes not the end but the means of rule (Foucault, 1979, p.26). Far from simply addressing existing groups of people and their problems, operating within a particular set of defined parameters and understandings of the

world, welfare constitutes the institutional environment that allows for the development of knowledge which in its turn invented and shaped these parameters and understandings.

Individuals themselves, as well as groups, are involved as active agents in these practices of self and group management.

A second common feature of the governmentality literature is the suspension of traditional assumptions about the necessary functioning, locus and source of power. Power has traditionally (see discussion in Dean 1994a, p.155) been approached in a global fashion with a central location, possessed by an unitary agency or force such as the king, the state or the people. Interpreted in this way power is expressed as a repressive force. Central to Foucault's work is the notion of 'micro-physics of power' (1979, p.26) also referred to as 'analytics of power' (1990, p.81-91), where modern forms of power are seen as local, continuous, non-repressive, productive, capillary and exhaustive.

It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolated them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies. Power's condition of possibility, or in any case the viewpoint which permits one to understand its exercise, even in its more "peripheral" effects, and which also makes it possible to use its mechanisms as a grid of intelligibility of the social order, must not be sought in the primary existence of a central point, in a unique source of sovereignty from which secondary and descendant forms would emanate; it is the moving substract of forces relations which by virtue of their inequality, constantly engender states of power, but the later are always local and unstable. The omnipresence of power: not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere (Foucault, 1990, p.93).

As explained by C. Gordon (1991, p.5), power can be understood as action on others' action. It should be thought as positive as well as creative of productive forces, relations and identities rather than residing in a specified locus. It is at the same time very broad and very fine

operating on the minutia of the body in everyday practice and it is at these multiple points, in its actual exercise and forms, that it should be analysed rather than in the consolidated form of the state. 'This suffices' according to Fraser (1989, p.18), 'to rule out state-centred and economic political praxes, since these praxes pre-suppose that power resides solely in the state or state economy'.

Does this mean that there is a basic inconsistency between the governmentality literature and Marxism? Some Marxists and feminists (e.g., Hartsock, 1997, p.370; Hekman, 1997, p.345; McLennan, 1996, p.59-60) argue that there is a significant overlap between Marx and Foucault and even complementarity since it is not Marx but vulgar Marxism which adopts a generalized economism where capitalist economic structures are the centre and locus of control or domination (see Barrett, 1991). O'Malley et al. (1997, p. 505) acknowledge a tension between Marxism and Foucaultian work traced to the later emphasis on rupture and contingency. The degrees of articulation with Marxism vary within the governmentality literature but the constant feature is the latter's accent on power processes and government rather than economic processes. Welfare, in this literature, is understood as having multiple origins, as a non-monolithic assemblage which emerged gradually and is constantly transformed in the course of key debates, initiatives, confrontations or disagreement between groups and individuals involved in welfare. It is seen as a complex web of discourses and practices which, through multiple interactions and events, creates and transforms the vision of problems and the scope of possible solutions embedded in it. Welfare programs are not, therefore, a particular solution for pre-existing problems caused, for example, by individuals' improvidence or by the economic and patriarchal structures. It is part and parcel of these problems not in a causal relationship but in a constitutive sense: they are part of the same

ensemble. This suggests, for example, that the problematics of single motherhood cannot be understood without an examination of the welfare practices that address and at the same time constitute it.

A further feature of the governmentality literature is the distinctive emphasis on means and apparatus of government in liberal constitutional states (Dean, 1995). This refers to *how* government occurs, the complex and irreducible field of practices and techniques that mould the circumstances of operation of rule. Here 'power is decomposed into political rationalities, governmental programs, technologies and techniques of government' (O'Malley et al. 1997, p.501; see also Miller & Rose, 1990; O'Malley, 1992). Political rationalities are formed by the coherence of diverse relations of power which once constituted into a unit are in turn capable of acting upon the multiple relations that form them. They are the moral justification for particular ways of exercising power (Rose & Miller, 1992, p.175) and are both intentional and non-subjective (Dean, 1994a, p.158). Rationalities use governmental programs as part of the attempts to make *the real* governable and administrable rendering it into an instrument for certain ends. Programs, the second aspect of the power analytic, are assemblages of techniques and inventions (Dean, 1994a, p.159) which establish a transferability between what is desirable and what can be made possible through the calculable activities of political forces (Rose & Miller 1992, p.181). Programs are not merely applied rationality since they involve many other relations as well as an element of thought. As Dean (1995, p.570) explains, they exist in relation to particular knowledges, forms of expertise, discourse and rationales of government but are better understood as a *transcoding* (Haraway, 1991) of them into another dimension. In Rose & Miller's (1992, p.182) words they represent 'both a movement from one space to another, and an expression of a

particular concern in another modality'.

Addressing issues of rationalities, programs and technologies, governmentality authors are not concerned with sociological or historical approaches of explaining how reality really was or the underlying forces controlling and explaining reality (O'Malley et al., 1997, p.502). Their concern is with making explicit how a certain reality was made possible and thinkable. These understandings differ radically from explanations associated with an autonomous sphere of ideal representations. As proposed by Fraser (1989, p.18):

Foucault's genealogy of modern power establishes that power touches people's lives more fundamentally through their social practices than through their beliefs. This in turn suffices to rule out political orientations primarily aimed at the demystification of ideologically distorted belief systems.

Is this, then, an explicit conflict with certain Marxist theories which are centred on the concept of ideology? For Althusser (1971) ideology is composed of the imaginary relation of individuals with the real relations in which they live. Nevertheless, for him ideology is not an illusion since it is supported by the structure of material reality and it is manifested within an apparatus and its practices. Governmentality thought diverges radically from this terrain. Rationalities in the governmentality literature are not ideal articulations and neither do they have the functional connection with material relations of production. Nevertheless, governmentality analysis achieves similar illuminating effects in the examination of welfare institutions as those identified by Swift (1995, p.23-5) for the framework of ideology: it incorporates antagonistic and diverse relations in the understanding of welfare. And, in fact, Harding (1997) argues, in another context not related to Foucault, that analysis of socially constituted discourses can provide better understanding of aspects traditionally undertaken under the framework of ideology. Within the governmentality literature welfare is approached through a focus on *how* a concern about the

wellbeing of certain groups emerged, as well as on the forms, means and processes that this concern assumes (e.g. Dean, 1991; Katz, 1992; Walters, 1994 and studies in the collection edited by Burchell et al., 1991). Rather than the uncovering of imaginary relations, this literature applies itself to 'identification of programmes and practices of rule in micro-settings, including those "within" the subject' (O'Malley et al., 1997, p.501). No general or overall cause is highlighted and neither welfare nor the groups involved enter the analysis as formed entities. They mutually and constantly constitute and redefine each other through multiple and changing practices, calling, hence, for a focus on *how*.

Analysis in the governmentality literature has primarily been done through the examination of the 'texts of rule' (O'Malley *et al.*, 1977, p.502): programs and processes as recorded textually. 'It is through language that governmental fields are composed, rendered thinkable and manageable' (Miller & Rose, 1990, p.7). Dean (1994b, p.158-9) argues that the methodology used by Foucault in the study of ethical practices can be applied to governmental practice through the isolation of four dimensions: 1) ontology, or *what* governmental practices seek to govern; 2) ascetics, concerned with *how* government is exercised; 3) deontology, concerned with the *why* we govern ourselves or others in a particular manner; and 4) teleology, the aim, end, goal, design, or *telos* of the mode of being we hope to create (Dean, 1994b, p.159). Others (O'Malley et al., 1997; Osborne, 1994) find this "disciplining" of Foucault's work highly questionable. They argue that rather than a methodology, Foucault offers a variety of principles that can be taken in different directions. In my opinion, the four dimensions specified by Dean should be treated not as steps or rules but as examples of different emphases which governmentality studies can assume.

This body of literature has many and diverse contributions. Some have focused on

practical government through the transformations in rationalities and programs across a broad span of time. Foucault's "*Discipline and punish*" (1979), for example, has provided a genealogy of punishment. Dean (1991) uses the Poor Laws to construct the formation of the worker and the poor. Walter (1994) describes the emergence of unemployment as a category of governance. Donzelot (1988) discusses the development of social rights and the formation of the liberal family. Rose (1989) presents the growth of technologies of self government in the postwar (see also, among others, Defert, 1991; Procacci, 1991). Another set of contributions has focused on specific programs, their technologies and functioning. Examples of this set are Cruikshank on self-esteem (1993), and empowerment (1994); O'Malley (1992) on crime prevention and on indigenous self-government (1996); Dean (1995) on the neo-liberal initiatives under the active society banner; Weir (1996) on the management of risks associated to pregnancy; and Rose (1996) on the emergency of community as a site of political activity.

In all, these applications of Foucault's insights have brought to the forefront a different focus on practices. Practices are traditionally addressed by the professional disciplines such as social work and planning. In these disciplines, practices are treated as implementation issues and considered, although complex, primarily subordinate to design or rationalities.

Depending on how detailed the program design is, a large part of the process of policy formulation may be left for this stage [implementation], when the concrete translation of action principles to programmatic elements may be accomplished through practice, precedent and experimentation (Gilbert, Sprecht, & Terrel, 1993, p.27).

This emphasis on rationalities excluded the practitioner from theoretical discussions. A caricature of the process is expressed by many practitioners as programs being developed by theoreticians and implementation left with practitioners, or front liners, who in the process assumed the blame for the impossibility of making it work. 'Normative policy analysis', Penna & O'Brien (1996,

p.51) add, 'presumes that "good" policy can be implemented via existing institutional structures and that any problems can be ironed out by tinkering with the procedures or operations of those institutions'. The renewed focus on practices introduced by the governmentality literature brought to the discussion of practices a broad critical and tactical thinking contrasting with the evaluative and implementation thinking which is focused on specific projects and their success. It also introduced a novel way of joining rationalities and technologies without subordinating practices to rationalities, with the result of engaging theory and practice within an issue under the same analytical framework. This, in it self, is a major advantage for social work approaches since they have traditionally maintained a sharp distance between theory and practice.

Social welfare practices are seen in this literature as the product of a complex web of interactions and not an attempt to implement rationalities. Particularly relevant for an understanding of welfare is the analysis of the macro-level of the state from within a methodological framework continuous with the micro-physics of power (Dean, 1994b, p.160). This analysis, however, distances itself from the micro-focused work common in some qualitative methodologies, such as ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967), where the aim is to discover unconscious or pre-discursive individual positions, but it does not abandon the realm of the individual or the private as did the economic analysis of the 1970s. The governmentality literature, by focusing on practices in contemporary neo-liberal societies, offers new, different ways of thinking about political power which can be used to create spaces for identifying critical assumptions of interventions and to open trajectories and directions for action.

Challenges from Feminism: Agency and Change

In the previous section I presented a summary characterization of the governmentality literature and discussed briefly its contributions to the analysis of welfare. Foucault's principles, however, have encountered strong criticism from a variety of fronts. For the governmentality thinking, the most challenging of these criticisms can be captured under two intrinsically linked readings: issues of agency and the question of normative principles. Under these two readings, contemporary feminism has situated itself as the most formidable discussant and fertile challenger, although not the exclusive one (see also challenges from the race perspective, e.g. Taylor, 1996). Feminism offers a diverse reading and critique of Foucault. Hartsock (1990) and Christian (1987) not only reject Foucault but accuse him of contributing to undermine the basis of political emancipation for marginalized groups (see also Cocks, 1989; and Ferguson, 1989). Some feminist writers, such as Bartky (1988), Fraser (1989) and Gordon (1990) for example, clearly distance themselves from Foucault while claiming to use a modified approach associated with Foucault (Fraser, 1989, chap. 7 & 8; Fraser & Gordon, 1994, see also Naples, 1997) and, for that, receiving much criticism (Zylan, 1996). Others, for example, Riley (1992b), Sawicki (1991; 1998) and Singer (1993), entertain a fair number of propositions rooted in Foucault's thoughts. Others still, such as Barrett (1991, 1992,); Butler (1990; 1993; 1997) and Benhabib (1992) explicitly position themselves in alignment with Foucault in most issues.

In proposing some form of plural beginnings for their object of study as well as questioning the universality of concepts such as *women*, contemporary feminists, together with other contemporary writers, have problematised the issue of political action. The concern for feminists is that the plurality of origins and sites of formation does not weaken the commitment to

furthering the position and interests of marginalized groups and the possibility of human agency. Is it possible to conceive of opposition or political action without returning to a certain amount of essentialism, i.e., to the view that things can be characterized by central core characteristics that constitute their essence? What is the essence of woman that would allow beings of different culture, race, gender preference and ability to claim that identity and act in a way to improve their position in society (Riley, 1988)? Some argue that a certain amount of essentialism is indispensable to theorizing complex entities and processes (e.g., McLennan, 1996, p.65). A fixed human nature with pre-given selves and needs is a required attribute for some to justify human agency as an essential drive to achieve a better position in society. In this vein, Mohanty (1992, p.75) has argued that dissolving general categories such as class, race and gender in the name of plurality and diversity has problematised collective struggle and generated individualized political identities (see also Fuss, 1989).

Many feminists have offered alternative readings of these issues. Mouffe (1992, p.371) proposes that the assumption of essential identities is antithetical to radical democratic politics. Fraser (1989) coined the expression *politics of everyday life* where power is understood as 'very broadly and yet very finely, as anchored in the multiplicity of ... social practices that constitute everyday life in modern societies' (p.18). Riley (1988) adds that although there is no such thing as *women* with collective needs and identity, individual women are oppressed as if they were that construction and must oppose this oppression as such, without forgetting the spatial and temporary boundaries of this opposition. This discussion awakes the Lockean distinction between *nominal essence and real essence* (see Fuss 1989) but is nominal essence enough to mobilize identity and summon agency? Butler (1990) rejects any possibility of a category woman because

it pre-supposes an essence prior to the gender relations discourse where it is constituted. This view abandons the search for an *authentic sexual identity* and proposes that the category woman naturalizes exclusions and legitimates positions. Sexual difference 'is never simply a function of material differences which are not in some way both marked and formed by discursive practice' (Butler, 1993, p.1). Identities emerge out of a constitutive process which produce the body as we understand it. In Butler's anti-essentialist theory of subjectivity, gender identity is a *contingency effect* rather than a cause (Butler, 1990). She argues that this effect is the continuous production of a compulsory reiteration of gender norms. It is thus *performative*, that is the subject is constituted through the repetition of norms (see further discussion in Butler, 1997, chap. 4). The claim that subjects are constructed, however, does not imply a personification of discourse, language or the social or, as a common critique of Foucault would formulate, to substitute humans for power as the origin of activity (see discussion in Minson, 1980, p.13-14). As Butler (1993) would put it:

What I would propose in place of these conceptions is a return to the notion of matter, not as site or surface, but as *a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter*. That matter is always materialized has, I think, to be thought in relation to the productive and, indeed, materializing effects of regulatory power in the Foucaultian sense (Butler, 1993, p.9-10, emphasis in original).

The process that materializes gender produces, as well, the *constitutive outside* of woman which, in its otherness, haunts the boundaries of that construction and destabilizes it, opening gaps and fissures in its materiality (Butler, 1993, p.1-23). Agency is, then, located in this process of destabilization as a challenge to what is. In a similar vein, Weedon (1987, p.111) argues that even lacking social power to realize their versions of knowledge, marginal or reverse discourses 'can offer a discursive space from which individuals can resist dominant subject positions'. Singer (1993, p.4) discusses resistance through the notion *radical erasures or constitutive exclusions* in

which individuals recreated as categories become essential as such to the very discourse that excludes them as individuals. It is by redefining or moving outside the consensus of those discourses, she argues, that the individual constitutes a locus of resistance (p.191).

How compatible are these discussions with the governmentality literature? Who is the subject in this literature, can be described as coincidental with Butler's proposals. These are themselves a development of Foucault's preoccupations around how the self is formed and forms itself. In his exposé of governmentality thinking, Dean (1994a, p.211-212) suggests that

If the self is conceived as a spiralling ribbon which folds over and over itself defining a space of interior being without essential substance, then in contemporary political culture, this ribbon of the self is composed of the different cloths, weaves, colours and patterns of the various programmes of government, techniques of the self, and work of the human sciences

Foucault, however, is not consistently clear on issues of resistance and, as Dean (1994a, p.165) points out, occasionally may give the impression of a subject totally dominated by relations of power. Nevertheless, issues of resistance and social agency have acquired an extreme centrality for contemporary Foucault commentators (e.g., see articles in Pearce & Valverde, 1996). This may be a reaction to the proliferation of neo-liberal thought and practice, as suggested by O'Malley et al. (1997), but as early as 1979, Deleuze suggested the 'new possibilities for resistance and liberation' (p.xvii) implicit in the Foucaultian analysis; and around the same time Minson (1980) proposed some socialist appropriations of Foucault's insights. Dean's recent work (1994b) proposes that the formation of political identity, rather than involving the simple naturalizing and normalizing of certain identities or categories through state practices, also relies on the autonomy and diversity of processes of self-identification and construction of the individual self (p.155). Dean reminds us that for Foucault power, differently from subjugation, never acts on a passive force and in this sense it already implies resistance.

There is thus a sense in which the human bodies it operates on are already agents. Moreover, disciplinary techniques may form the condition of agency: not only the corporate agencies formed through the complex division of labour or the units in an army, but the individual agency created through capacities such as literacy or qualifications to act in a particular professional capacity. The possibility of resistance is already implied in the suggestion that disciplinary power could be viewed as a kind of a *dressage*, a training of an already active body and its forces, so that they may be harnessed toward a system of command ... Further, there is no reason to assume that the capacities constituted through disciplinary powers will be used by the same social groups or to the same unvarying ends (Dean, 1994a, p.171-2).

Despite its presence in Foucault's work, O'Malley *et al.* (1997, see also O'Malley, 1996) argue, resistance seems not to belong in the governmentality literature. Noting significant exceptions, these authors add that resistance is interpreted, in most of this literature, as a conflict or failure of programs, since these are seen almost exclusively from the perspective of programs. This view of resistance as a *negative externality* leaves the relationship between resistance and rule untheorized in the literature. O'Malley (1996) proposes a reinsertion of resistance in governmentality as part of rule, as positive and productive and hence opening up the possibility that forms of rule be subjected to transformation.

If resistance and rule actively engage with each other, then rule is at least potentially destabilized and subjected to a transformational politics. ... A further consequence is that, as such an approach directs attention to government as political contestation, it must pay rather more attention to sociological forms of analysis - to investigate 'how it really was' - than has been characteristic of most governmentality work to date (O'Malley, 1996, p.312).

These proposals show an engagement with the feminist literature and highlight their enormous cross fertilization. Butler's work with its highly developed understanding and discussion of resistance (see particularly Butler, 1993) is an essential contribution to governmentality analyses and for assisting actual struggles against rule. She argues that resistance cannot be understood simply as a rejection or an opposition on the part of a subject because the subject is the effect of the very norms that it seeks to resist (1993, p.15). But construction should be understood as an activity rather than an act or a finished product. The subject is, then, always incomplete and in the

process of materialization. It is the instability and contingency of this process that opens up the field of political possibilities allowing for a potential of resistance. Hence, if a subject identity is established through a 'stylized repetition of acts' (Butler, 1990, p.140) it is in the altering of the performance of these acts that their status as natural or necessary foundation can be called into question. For Butler agency 'is to be located within the possibilities of a variation on that repetition' (1990, p. 145).

The issue of the actual application of Foucault's thoughts brings us to the second set of critiques described above, the question of a normative framework. Again feminist scholars have provided a provocative questioning around this issue since, as argued by Fraser (1992, p.5), the point of feminist theory is to change the world and not only to theorize it. What sort of theory can provide an account of internalized oppression that acknowledges its depth and power while still allowing for the possibility in principle of political resistance and social change (see Fraser, 1992, p.12)? In other words, contemporary feminists, and specially those working within standpoint theory (e.g., Harding, 1991; Hartsock, 1983; and Smith, 1981) problematised the type of social production of the subject - what is truth - and the grounds that can justify claims from particular social locations - what is social justice or what claims can be made in name of women or other subject locations. This questioning dramatically changed the expectations and accomplishments within the social sciences.

Fraser (1989, p.33), debating both Foucault and Habermas, concludes that Foucault needs normative criteria to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable forms of power, for example, that of the dictator or that of the people. Habermas has accused Foucault of aiming less at the resolution of modern problems than at a radical critique of modernity as such. His

proposals, he continues, lack the emancipatory character derived from a perspective based on universal values (see discussion in Dean 1994a, chap.7). In fact, as feminist writers have remarked, a normative position does not require a universal or essentialist conception of human beings and human values. Feminist theories have stressed what bell hooks (1990) has described as a *yearning* for a different world.

Desire, the desire to be happy, creates the distance, the negation, that opens the space for criticism of what is. This critical distance does not occur on the basis of some previously discovered rational ideas of the good and the just. On the contrary, the ideas of the good and the just arise from the desiring negation that action brings to what is given (Young, 1990, p.60) .

Dean (1994a, p.130) argues that a normative position, in addition to the possibility that things might be otherwise, also requires the establishment of grounds for deciding what is preferable. In his opinion, both requirements can be found in Foucault. Foucaultian analysis does not have to invoke universal normative values and political visions from which power might be judged since these are themselves contestable and can be seen from a variety of ethical, political and technical perspectives (Dean, 1994a, p.130). Osborne (1994, p.495) on the other hand, commenting on the fecundity of Foucault's empirical analyses, suggests that it is inappropriate to demand from them guidance regarding normative grounds. In his view, this constitutes a limitation but not an error or oversight on Foucault's part and, above all, does not require that those inspired by Foucault's insights forego normative claims themselves. Barry, Bell & Rose (1995, p.485) 'invite discussions of the political in the spirit of Foucault' rather than attempts to 'uncover the political Foucault'. This sentiment is echoed by O'Malley et al. (1997, p.504) who affirm the linking of a critical politics to the governmentality literature as a way of 'maximizing opportunities for difference and contestation' rather than as an imposition of a political program. For them 'the critical orientation of genealogy is being weakened at a time when other critical

literatures, including Marxism, feminism and queer theory, are under considerable political pressure from the ascendance of neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism' (p.507-8). They recall the many contributions to criticism from the governmentality literature (e.g. Cruikshank, 1994; Rose, 1996) and comment on Foucault's (1984) own understanding of critical philosophy as summarized by two aspects: '(1) an inquiry into the conditions of possibility of true knowledge and (2) a practical, historical critique of our present selves that makes thinkable and assists the creation of other possible ways of living' (O'Malley et al., 1997, p.506-7).

Hindess (1997, p.257-8) proposes that, in fact, Foucault creates the conditions for the emergence of a politics and a political reason of a different kind: a powerful analysis of the practices and rationalities of government in the modern West and a radical critique of most forms of government, including the modern government of oneself. The first refers to a critique of the rationalities of government in its totalizing effects, in particular addressing the liberal and neo-liberal rationalities (see also Barry, Osborne & Rose, 1996). The second is 'concerned with the impact of political rationality as a principle of individualization and in fact subjectivation' (Hindess, 1997, p.267). In this sense, Hindess continues, 'why should a political reason such as liberalism, which is firmly committed to individual liberty, nevertheless be regarded as an obstacle to liberation' (p.267). Within liberalism an important responsibility of government is to *secure* conditions for the continuation of processes considered natural, such as those to do with economic activity, without exercising direct control over these activities. Security, however, in order not to interfere with the freedom of the subject is exercised within a liberal rationality of government through a series of indirect means or technologies of the self which ensure a compliant behaviour. 'Liberation, as Foucault understands it, must therefore be counterpoised

not only to political rationality (the rationality of the government of the state and the population ruled by the state) but also to the rationality of the government of the self' (p.269).

These debates and cross fertilization with the feminist and other critical literatures show that it is possible to conceive of a subject constituted through power relations and at the same time as a site of independent conduct without relapsing into an essentialist framework. Sawick (1998) concludes that:

Foucault's rhetoric is masculine, his perspective is androcentric, and his vision rather pessimistic. Nevertheless, his methods and cautionary tales have been useful and productive for feminist intellectuals struggling to combat dangerous trends within feminist theory, and for practice-feminist intellectuals who share neither his androcentrism nor his exclusive focus on subjection (p.105).

The challenges to address questions of resistance to relations of power and domination as well as, more generally, the problems of freedom and autonomy have been taken up by authors following some Foucaultian thoughts with interesting results. Cruikshank's (1994) work on self-formation and empowerment as practised in the 1960s War on Poverty in the US, or O'Malley's (1996) analysis of the policies of devolution and self government addressing aboriginal populations in Australia are just two examples of these results. Moreover it has become very clear that, far from a complete theory or methodology or even an approach, governmentality is, in fact, a few principles and certain foci of analysis which can and should be applied in conjunction with other contemporary analytics. In particular, this literature has resisted the pressures to dictate a political program while promoting critical political engagement. And, in their variety, many authors within this literature have not only denounced the absence of critical politics in this medium but also proposed ways in which it would not be ignored and, as well, opened possibilities for the development of new strategies of social change.

The Single Mother Complex: Thinking a Framework Through

This overview of the analytical features utilized in the governmentality literature and of the challenges brought to it by the preoccupations and emphases of contemporary feminism begins to delineate courses which an investigation of the questions formulated earlier might take. These, I recall, pertained to the nature of what we call single mother and how this construct shaped our understanding of the lives of women raising children alone and, in a far reaching way, of the welfare system and our society as a whole. This questioning, however, is not situated in a general abstract need to know or to articulate a new academic approach, but in a commitment to change which would facilitate diversity and incorporate dissent in its various forms. This is translated into an intention to depart from the mere denunciation of neo-liberal regimes as inefficient or of betraying some general human principles of conduct. In other words, by embarking on this line of inquiry my aim is to open new paths of interrogation and alternative understandings of welfare which may contribute to opening possibilities for change and to enhance strategies for making contestation heard and relevant. It is, in so far as the analytics and discussions around governmentality and feminism allow and facilitate this politics of diversity and inclusion, that it is attempted here in the hope of transcending the current constraints of welfare approaches.

As proposed within the governmentality literature, welfare can be understood as a preoccupation with the wellbeing of a population confined within the boundaries of a nation. This preoccupation gradually became crystallized in a variety of procedures, practices, institutions and rationalities forming what became known as the welfare state. The construct single mothers can be seen as one aspect of this process. I propose we approach single mothers, in the first instance, as an assemblage of ideas, knowledges, expectations, beliefs, judgements and assumptions about

women raising children without a male partner. This assemblage represents relations of power, that is, it represents ways of acting upon these women which bring about relations among individuals. To avoid confusion with common usage, I will use the label *the single mother complex* to refer to these power relations². Gradually these power relations have been governmentalized. They became, in other words, rationalized and centralized under the auspices of the state for the purpose of bringing wellbeing to populations. In this proposal, the single mother complex becomes materialized in a series of governmental rationalities and practices directed at women raising children alone but also aiming at the wellbeing of the population of a nation as a whole. It is gradually articulated with practices of social welfare that attempt to translate these rationalities into interventions and form the programs and technologies of government. These programs and technologies act upon these women and upon the social body as well as, themselves, are acted upon by them.

The complex is not a given, ahistorical and universal; nor is it imaginary or ideological. The complex is a concrete amassing of rationalities, practices, and expectations located in a specific time and place and in constant re-creation. The use of the complex to approach the question of the nature of single mothers brings together the entangled linkages of discourses, policies and practices with their consequences and interactions in the same analytic. It allows a shift from a programmatic focus - for example, Family Benefits with a rather common analysis of its meagre contributions and its dependency effects - or the focus on the individual women raising children alone - with its problematic reification of needs. Instead this shift places the emphasis, on

² The word complex is taken from Rose's work of 1984: *The psychological complex: Psychology, politics and society in England, 1869-1939*. I thank S. Katz for suggesting it to me.

an examination of what is inside the preoccupation with single mothers that has marked Western societies, what this preoccupation leads to, how it is carried out, what its effects are and what its importance is for a politics of inclusion and diversity. Single mothers are not seen as pre-existing beings who generate programs. Aspects such as programs and women's needs are integral and formatively articulated in the single mother complex but are not the reason for its existence and neither do they drive its direction. Both need and programs are seen as the way through which government is carried out, and not its aim. The analytic, hence, allows the opportunity to step out of the limits of current understandings to examine the power relations around single mothers, the program of action generated through these relations, their assumptions and aims, as well as their effects and functioning.

The single mother complex can only be comprehended through empirical studies. It can, for example, be approached from its common formation throughout Western nations without assuming an abstract character or the status of a general idea common to all Western nations. Nevertheless, here, because the aim is to work towards alternative social policy strategies, it will be explored in a particular location: I will use principles and directions from governmentality and feminist insights to probe into the functioning of the single mother complex as it was constituted in Ontario. This probe will take the form of a two part study examining the governmentalization of this complex. The first will reconstruct the trajectory of rationalities and practices that constituted the materialization of a series of governmental practices which cohered around the Family Benefits program. That is, the first part of the study will examine how the relations of power represented by the single mother complex came to constitute a particular way of reconstructing social life through the Family Benefits program. In this first part of the research, I

will develop an understanding of the complex as a codified set of practices of rule and explore what or who is being ruled, by what means and what are the effects of this arrangement. To do so I will trace the trajectory of rationalities and interventions which led to the formulation of the Family Benefits Program in Ontario. I will use events, practices and experiments of the implementation of mothers' allowances in Ontario as a particular process which crystallised a series of power relations in a consolidated governmental initiative. This approach is analogous to Foucault's use of the Panopticon to probe into the nature of discipline: the Panopticon is a strategic example of the range of plans, projects, initiatives and policies that sought to develop and implement a certain regime of discipline. Similarly, the mothers' allowance initiative is considered here as the process of development of a whole technology and rationality of government of certain forms of problematic motherhood that marked social welfare in Ontario as of the 1960s.

Family Benefits as an exercise in government can be seen, then, not through unified and coherent policy but through the complicated history of its contingent components. I will trace the strategic uses and transformations of approaches to the welfare of women raising children alone in Ontario as well as the resistances they provoked departing from the enactment in 1920 of Mothers' Allowance in that province until its transformation in 1967 into Family Benefits. This act addressed deserving widows who raise children in a family unit where the father is absent. Without a male breadwinner, a family unit was considered incomplete or deficient and formulated as a problem. As of the late nineteenth century in the US and Canada, this problem was addressed through collective provision for these families' living arrangements. Initially provision was organized through philanthropic organizations and later, after World War I, through the

province. The first part will pursue the development and implementation of mothers' allowance until 1967 when the program was integrated into the national system of welfare under the CAP umbrella and consolidated in Ontario under the Family Benefits Act. This date can be used as a marker for a series of social transformations and effects that signal the emergence of a new and integrated government of poor women raising children alone as well as the formation of the *dependent mother* as its subject. By capturing and crystallizing these transformations, Family Benefits epitomizes a rupture with mothers' allowances as a form of government, and the inauguration of a different attitude towards women raising children alone in the postwar. It is through the examination of what single mothers was in this period that subsequent transformations and new forms can be understood and delineated. The primary aim here is the search for ways in which the single mother complex became elaborated, rationalized and centralized in a program of government, creating in this process an individual subject - the dependent mother - and her way of life

In the second part, I will examine another effect of the governmentalization of the single mother complex: how the practices and rationalities of this complex develop and interact with other governmental programs and generate not only an expanded web of practices but also a group identity for dependent mothers. As *marginal populations*, dependent mothers assume visibility, specific characteristics and collective interests in society. Here I will look at the public housing program in Ontario and its relationship with women raising children alone. This radical change of social welfare programs between the two parts - from Family Benefits to public housing - is intended to highlight the variety of power processes at play within the welfare system. In a sense, if, following Foucault (1979), satisfying needs becomes the means of rule, the two case

studies examine how income security and housing become two central ways through which women raising children alone are governed. Public housing will be approached as a space where a variety of governmental techniques and rationalities occur but they do not target women raising children alone in particular. These women have often been associated with inadequate shelter and accommodation conditions which in turn exacerbate their ability to perform the normalized family responsibilities. In fact, Pascall (1997, p.75) comments that housing closely rivals money problems as a cause of hardship and stress for single mothers. Innumerable accounts of the inadequacy of poor mothers in early twentieth century Canada used the unsanitary and overcrowded conditions of their living space as the main argument in characterizing this inadequacy (see examples in Strong-Boag, 1979; and Struthers, 1994). Currently in Canada the link between the conduct of poor families, of which a large number are single mother families, is strongly regulated through conditions of the living space as a recent study on the importance of the housing issues in child neglect illustrates (Cohen-Schlanger, Fitzpatrick, Hulchanski, & Raphael, 1995).

Public housing was the result - in its continually changing configurations - of a web of practices, events, discourses and activities involving a variety of agents and groups. It embodied a certain problematization of the lives of specific individuals; the articulation of knowledges and technologies summoned to create a collective solution to problems as well as the resistances or reverse discourses fostered by the life experiences of women who raise children alone. This experiment had consequences and effects for shaping both the ensuing course of the welfare system, its arguments, discourses and programs; as well as the very subjectivities of the women involved. The public housing experiment provides a space for the articulation of a variety of

discourses regarding marginal populations, an observatory for knowledge production and a focus for political activities. It is, as well, the space occupied by a form of life visibly differentiated in the urban space from that of the normalized community and family. In this sense, the second part focuses on the relationship between shelter needs and the single mother complex as well as the many ways this relationship has formed and transformed the dependent mother.

Following the features of governmentality discussed before, this investigation highlights the multiple origins and the constantly changing character of the assemblages that constitute the social welfare practices as well as the historical and geographic specificity of the processes being examined. It focuses on practices carried out in the Province of Ontario but does not consider this level of the state as the origin or the drive behind these practices. Its starting point is not how single mothers are or what their needs were but how they were made to be, how it became thinkable to support mothers in their child raising activities and what forms these practices took. Keeping in mind the feminist challenges to the governmentality literature, it also emphasizes the importance of addressing issues of resistance and change through an attempt to understand how social policy can foster productive relationships with disenfranchised groups whereby categories, needs and services do not become universalized and immutable.

Methodological Perspectives

The two part investigation proposed above will follow the case study design. Case studies traditionally have been a useful way to explore a wealth of aspects, threads and interactions of certain events or phenomena (Nelson, 1990; p.125). Their use has been particularly widespread within the mainstream tradition of welfare, as exemplified by Titmuss' contributions (e.g., 1938,

1958) and those of his followers (e.g, Marsden, 1969), although their popularity was seriously shaken by certain Marxist critiques which attacked their lack of generalizability and, consequently, questioned their adequacy as a building block for theoretical formulations. Post-structuralist thought, however, pointing out the problems with the universality of grand narratives (Lyotard, 1984), occasioned a resurgence of the study of specific practices and their multitude of aspects and with it a revival, of sorts, of the study of cases.

Many contemporary scholars make extensive use of case studies (see Creswell, 1998; and Stake, 1995). From a non-Foucaultian perspective, Nelson (1990, p.125) suggests that comparative case studies of welfare have a fundamental contribution 'both to an understanding of events and to a more richly elaborated social theory' (p.124). Nelson also criticizes the objectification of time into a distinct variable as used in behavioural sciences and proposes instead the use of case histories that highlight contrasting effects and advance theoretical understandings in an inductive manner. Foucault himself expressed his thoughts, in many instances, through what may be termed empirical case studies of madness, prisons or sexuality. Among the scholars sympathetic to Foucault, Dean (1991, p.7) describes one of his works as 'simply a case history of the government of poverty' which renews the 'search for continuity and rupture in the history of poor laws' (p.6). Valverde (1992) uses an interpretative case study of the Dionne quintuplets for the investigation of the construction of childhood. Riley (1983) presented 'a case study of the misunderstandings about gender and work, and its repercussions for both theories and practices to do with children' (p.6) to develop an alternative understanding of how the gendered body acts and is acted upon.

Following this tradition of case studies, the two part investigation proposed here will map

out events, register continuities and ruptures, and problematize assumptions and traditions. They will use *eventalization* as a technique which questions the evident and traces its constitutive parts without aiming at exhaustiveness but at clarity and understandings. Eventalization was discussed by Foucault (1991b, p.76) in the following way:

What do I mean by this term? First of all a breach of self-evidence. It means making visible a singularity at places where there is temptation to invoke a historical constant, an immediate anthropological trait, or an obviousness which imposes itself uniformly on all. To show that things 'weren't as necessarily as all that'; it wasn't as a matter of course that mad people came to be regarded as mentally ill; ... it wasn't self-evident that the causes of illness were to be sought through the individual examination of bodies; and so on. A breach of self-evidence, of those self-evidences on which our knowledges, acquiescences and practices rest: this is the first theoretico-political function of 'eventalization'.

Secondly eventalization means rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies and so on which at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as self-evident, universal and necessary. In this sense one is indeed effecting a sort of multiplication or pluralization of causes.

Classic examples of eventalization, as a technique, are Dean's study of the event of pauperism (1991) and Walters' (1994) work on the event of unemployment. Castel (1991) argues that prevention, as used in social welfare, 'depart[s] in a profoundly innovatory way from the traditions of mental medicine and social work after the introduction of epidemiological medicine' (p.281). In the study of events, Foucault uses evidence to produce intelligibility and not to *exhaust* the possible interpretations of what is under investigation. In this sense, as argued by Cousins & Hussain (1986), the methodological rigour is not judged by the exhaustion of sources or the total completion of the record but by the contributions to the understanding of an aspect of the topic.

An analogy with Freud's case-histories may be drawn. They neither 'demonstrate' metapsychological propositions, nor do they reconstitute the analysand's past as a 'history'. They make a problem intelligible by reconstituting its conditions of existence and its conditions of emergence. This does not make them indifferent to evidence but merely means that they handle evidence in a different way. They may indeed be said to be incomplete and subject to rectification. But this is because there is always unfinished business not because exhaustiveness has yet to be satisfied (Cousins & Hussain, 1986, p.3).

In effect, eventalization produces an interpreting of history not to establish new grounds for the

truth, but to question unquestioned values and assumptions.

Following the governmentality literature tradition, the two cases studies will be undertaken through the examination of 'texts of rule' (O'Malley et al., 1997, p. 502), that is the recorded texts of programs and practical interventions. Here texts of rule refer to language-mediated records of practices of rule. That is, they contain a record of what the government or ruling activity consisted of and how it was carried on. In the first case study, the governmentalization of the single mother complex will be understood through the examination of Annual Reports of the mothers' allowance initiative. That is, the Annual Reports will be used to explicate the processes through which ruling or government of women raising children alone took place and produced certain effects. The mothers' allowance was a provincial initiative which, in Ontario, was implemented as of 1920 until 1967 when it was substituted by Family Benefits. During this period through a variety of processes, the single mother complex, in interaction with a variety of welfare practices, constituted, not an immutable and coherent program but an assemblage of interventions and technologies which were recorded in the Annual Reports. These have generated understandings of women raising children alone in Ontario which, as shown by Evans (1992) are specific and different from, for example, those of the US and Britain.

The Annual Reports of the mothers' allowance initiative were selected as a texts of rule because of their focus on practice and the richness of detail in the accounts they contained. These summary documents represent the administrative voice and convey its perspective. They record program changes, accomplishments and milestones. In the large span of time of this case study, from 1920 to 1967, the formats employed in the Annual Reports varied greatly in language; length; focus; indicators of accountability; and program representation. These different emphases

become a particular aspect to be understood and interpreted. Using these Reports as texts of rule means looking at administrative records of procedures, accomplishments, changes and adaptations as well as the justifications for these. They constitute a record of how the administration of the initiative describes the rationality and implementation of the intervention, that is how they construct and act upon the subject. These texts are analysed to highlight the elements used to portray a reality, to create the real and its factual description. The analysis is neither absolute nor exhaustive.

Following the governmentality literature the questions pursued relate to what governmental practices seek to govern, how this government is exercised, what are its aims, and which aims or effects these practices constitute. The specific questions are used as section headings in each of the case studies. The aim is to show a variety of aspects that produce the gradual formation and transformation of the dependent mother. To avoid the problematic treatment of resistance as failure as understood from an administrator's point of view (see previous sections in this chapter and O'Malley et al., 1997), particular attention is devoted to exploring challenges and difficulties encountered by the initiative and the forms in which they were portrayed in the Annual Reports.

The second case study, that of the government of women raising children alone through housing, will use a different modality of texts of rule: the recorded correspondence of the Ministers responsible for housing during the period of expansion of public housing in Ontario. This source encompasses not only the record of plans, projects and their implementation but also the record of the questioning, resistances and parallel process and activities which affected implementation. Rather than an emphasis on the general effects of the program derived from the

Annual Reports examined in the first case study, here the centre is on the minute, trivial, day-to-day activities and their effects. This source was chosen to contrast with the organized and purposefully crafted information contained in the Annual Reports of mothers' allowances. The accent here is on interactions of practices and, in particular, on aspects that may illustrate and animate the question of agency. The Ministers' correspondence contains letters addressed to them or to their ministry, memos to staff, comments on reports, working versions of documents, press releases, newspaper clippings and records of any potentially problematic issue that the Minister might eventually have to justify in the legislature. All this material is stored at the Ontario archives in boxes that correspond to the different Ministers' files as they were in their filing cabinets during their period in office. Rather than a traditional record of policy practices and implementation, such as the Annual Reports of mothers' allowance, these sources provide an intricate, complex and contradictory record of what seemed important to record at the time of implementation.

This enormous assortment of texts was selectively chosen. First, there was a relatively small time line, from 1964 to 1973, since after 1973 the province attempted to solve the shelter problem through means other than public housing. Hence the focus is on the expansion period of the public housing experiment. Second each text was carefully examined in order to extract any information which directly or indirectly referred to actual tenants or to women raising children alone. Most of the documentation in the files pertained to actual details of construction; architectural detail and plans; land deals and construction companies. As discussed in the presentation of the second case study, tenants were, in general, absent from public housing discussions until the late 1960s and early 1970s and charting the links between housing and

women raising children alone in the practices of public housing was a difficult task. Again, once the texts and information were selected they were organized around the questions that animate the governmentality literature and give name to the sections.

In both case studies the emphasis is on practices of government, on the mechanisms put in place to transform rationality into a practical intervention. The strategies guiding the examination of the texts of rule in both case studies aim at intelligibility of the practices, pursuing questions regarding what is governed, how government is exercised, why it assumes this form and the aim of this particular form of government. In using texts of rule, I avoided considering them as autonomous discourses or self-referential structures but rather I considered them within the context in which they were produced. That is, borrowing a notion proposed by Miller (1997b) in his work regarding organizational texts, they were contextualized. Contextualization, here, aims at locating the texts in the context of their historical production with the help of historical and policy analysis studies, rather than searching for the truth about their production. Historical accounts of mothers' allowances and housing as well as classic descriptive manuals of the practices of housing and public housing in Canada were used to provide this context and are clearly indicated throughout the presentation of the case studies.

Pursuing a Meaning for Policy Analysis Today

I will examine the interactions of the construct single mother and the welfare system by arguing that this construct is in fact a complex of power relations materialized through a will to govern which generates rationalities, programs and technologies of government. Unravelling this complex I will undertake two case studies. The first will focus on the constitution of the

dependent mother in its Ontario manifestation, through the examination of the implementation of mothers allowances until its transformation into Family Benefits. The Annual Reports of the mothers' allowance initiative will constitute the basic texts of rule examined here. The second case study will explore the process of formation of marginal populations through the Ontario public housing program. In this case, a variety of texts collected under the correspondence of the Ministers responsible for housing will be interpreted. Both case studies show specific processes and particular perspectives without claim to an exhaustive or complete portrayal of the processes in place.

The intention of these studies is three fold. First, they intend to explore the concept of single mothers in social policy, with its multiplying meanings, escalating threats and self justifying interventions, as well as its prominent status in contemporary politics and visions of society. The single mother has a paradigmatic importance for welfare. Her several representations - the supplicant deserving widow, the deserted mother left alone with many mouths to feed, the battered wife who fled a life of violence, the children having children - have occupied the pages of the newspapers and posed challenges to a social organization based on the nuclear family and its gendered division of labour. Around the turn of the century women raising children alone became one of the groups around which justification for public provision was first articulated and they still remain one of the most prominent figures today in the realm of public welfare and in the public imagination. 'The family that is working *right*', Havas (1995) points out in her discussion of the family as ideology, 'has no need for state intervention or familial policies' (p.1). They have, in summary, been used as a symbol of the deserving poor and as a powerful image of the need for a welfare system and in contrast they have been associated with the most fundamental threats to

social organization. As for the actual women grouped under this category they have increasingly developed an agenda of rights and demands that while centred on procedures has, in some instances, created a broader basis for an alternative definition of their identity .

These studies are also intended as a reflexion on how welfare functions by providing an analysis of welfare practices regarding single mothers grounded in historical and specific developments. The recent neo-liberal reforms and attacks on welfare have brought to the forefront of scholarly contributions the need to reflect on what the experience of collective welfare has been up to the present, to undo the cohesiveness of the assumptions of current social policy and to describe their functioning and effects. David (1985), for example, argues that it is crucial to understand the complexities of welfare in order to develop a clear strategy for transforming current welfare relationships. Dean (1991) discusses the importance of recasting the terms under which the study of welfare is shaped, and of advancing the parameters and assumptions which confine the present discussion to the already tried. Gordon (1994b) argues that 'thinking about past alternatives reminds us not only that the particular shape of our welfare state was not inevitable but may expand our sense of today's range of possibilities' (p.4). This study aims at contributing to an expanded understanding of the welfare system by providing two case studies of specific programs which have been central to welfare in different periods. Without generalizing the functioning of these programs to the welfare system as a whole, these case studies provide a degree of intelligibility to the conditions of functioning and assumptions of welfare. The studies incorporate in the same analysis practice and theory as well as micro and macro aspects. The focus on practices, in particular, is extremely important for current welfare discussions since one of the central ways neo-liberalism has implemented welfare reforms has been

through budgetary reductions implying, rather than a change in rationalities, a re-articulation of practices at their programmatic and technical level.

Finally these studies are also intended as a discussion on the functioning and implications of resistance and contestation for an understanding of social policy. Investigation of resistance and contestation are rare in social policy which, standing from a programmatic point of view, considers resistance and contestation in terms of program failure to fulfill needs. While both feminism and post-structuralism discuss the nature of agency and resistance, understandings of how both agency and resistance interact with practices of rule continue, in most cases, unexplored. Agency and resistance remain almost byproducts of the analysis rather than its central foci. A primary contribution of this study, hence, is the incorporation of resistance in the analysis with explicit mechanisms for its examination. Social policy is intrinsically linked to change and an understanding of change processes is fundamental to its development. In addition, considering contemporary pressures of neo-liberal reforms, the ability of excluded groups to influence the direction of future transformations of welfare will increasingly hinge on strategies that maximize diversity and contestation. The contributions of this study lie, then, in the particular analysis it performs and on the insights and intelligibility it produces about the government of women raising children alone, the fabric of welfare regimes and the power of resistance and contestation in shaping these regimes.

Chapter 4

THE GOVERNMENTALIZATION OF THE SINGLE MOTHER COMPLEX:

BROAD PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES

Here, at the risk of repeating myself, I would suggest that performativity cannot be understood outside of a process of iterability, a regularized and constrained repetition of norms. And this repetition is not performed by a subject; this repetition is what enables a subject and constitutes the temporal condition for the subject. This iterability implies that "performance" is not a singular "act" or event, but a ritualized production, a ritual reiterated under and through constraint, under and through the force of prohibition and taboo, with the threat of ostracism and even death controlling and compelling the shape of the production, but not, I will insist, determining it fully in advance (Judith Butler, 1993, p.95).

Introduction

This chapter begins to build an answer to the question of what *single mother* is by exploring the tangle of intertwined threads that form the single mother complex and its interactions with governing populations. Together with the following chapter it builds the first case study. They follow the production of the dependent mother as an effect of the governmentalization of the single mother complex through the implementation of the mothers' allowance initiative. I isolate five aspects of the implementation of this initiative to illustrate the gradual production of the subject dependent mother: the administrative structure, the eligibility criteria, the justifications for intervention, the components of the initiative, and its articulation with a national welfare system. These aspects represent processes which, as the quote above highlights, work through 'the regularized and constrained repetition of norms'. This repetition is

performed in many different sites and forms, with various impetus and aims, but never fully completes the subject as a final and achieved product. Both the complex, with its governmental rationalities and practices, and the dependent mother are constantly changing and being recreated.

It is, perhaps, this incomplete nature that leads many current policy analysts to maintain that policies addressing single mothers and their children, despite the amount of literature produced, still operate in somewhat uncharted territory (McDaniel, 1993). Some commentators point out the lack of research that would reflect the needs and circumstances as well as provide longitudinal assessments of these families (e.g., Marcill-Gratton, 1993; McIninch & Pentick, 1993). Others highlight the variety encompassed by the life situations of women who raise children alone (e.g., Desrosiers, Le Bourdais & Lehaupt, 1994; Eichler, 1993). And there are those who draw attention to the total absence of a family policy in Canada, to the domestic division of labour and to women's disadvantaged situation in the labour market as issues that supersede the discussion of single motherhood (e.g., Kitchen, 1992).

It is, hence, surprising that with all these debates and gaps there is unanimity around the issues used to frame the policy approach to unpartnered women raising children: the exponential growth in the numbers of these women throughout the West as of the late 1960s; their statistical association with poverty and several other social disadvantages (e.g., Engeland, Che-Alford, Lo & Badets, 1997; Lindsay, 1992; and McKie, 1993); the social and individual ethical responsibility towards children (e.g., Baker, 1994 and McDaniel, 1993); and the need for some sort of income support measure in the form either of public programs or of regulation and enforcement of the absent father's contributions (e.g., Dooley, Finnie, Phipps, & Naylor 1995 and Hunsley, 1997). The policy literature, hence, has on its own terms recorded its own lack of understanding of the

nature of single mothers but it has cohered around a variety of policy assumptions and principles.

Addressing these difficulties has led some policy analysts to envisage solutions which may be considered as anticipating the analytic of the single mother complex. Lero & Brockman (1993), for example, suggest that single parent families may form *a distinct population* (p.91), which I interpret as meaning a specific grouping with defined characteristic or independent growth and dynamics. McDaniel (1993), extending this suggestion, warns against the perils of confusing the *individual* and the *collective category* of single mothers (p.203, p.210). Evans (1995, 1992), also referring to a distinct grouping, points to the *policy category* in which single mothers are inserted in Ontario as fundamental to defining their status. These references to a special population or a category imply a subject of policies and studies which, although representing the group single mothers, is distinct from the actual individual women that compose the group. Evans (1992), in particular, places an emphasis on the *category* through a cross country comparative study which specifically reports the policy classification or category as contributing to the different ways in which single mothers are approached and, hence, understood in different countries.

These suggestions, however, differ from the single mother complex. The independent existence of a policy classification, that is a composite of eligibility rules, or perhaps of a policy category, i.e., a statistical profile of the women who receive Family Benefits, leads the discussion to some critical studies on the use of statistical methods. In a review of these methods, Freeman (1992) has suggested that aggregate data is successful in predicting the experiences of populations rather than those of individuals. He proposes that 'this is in the nature of social statistics which deals in groups and trends, in probable rather than actual experience' (p.36). These would be

ideal or abstract constructs or ideal representations. As argued earlier, single mothers are clearly concrete and the articulation of their concreteness with any proposed form of an ideal abstraction has to be theorized rather than left implicit. I propose to do that through the use of the single mother complex. The complex should be thought of as an amassing of ideas, beliefs and meanings about women raising children alone which represents a multiplicity of power relations. These in interaction with practices of government generate a specific form of government and its subject, the dependent mother. The focus, hence, is not on a coherent and simplified statistical profile but on an intricate way of governing social wellbeing which has the effect of creating a particular way of life with implications for society as a whole.

This chapter will discuss the broad programmatic issues that transformed the intentions, feelings, judgements and beliefs about women raising children alone into a governmental practice with definite effects. The next chapter will introduce the technologies used in the governing practices and the consolidation of these practices that took place with the introduction of the Family Benefits Act. These two chapters will reconstruct the development and implementation of mothers' allowance in Ontario in an attempt to highlight, first, the manufactured nature of single mother, and, second, the creative functioning of practices. Their aim is not a historical interpretation of events but rather the implementation process is examined with the intention of making explicit the creative and transformative processes embedded in the *ritualized and performative* practices of social welfare.

As discussed before, the period covered in the case study is delimited by the first policy initiative to address the needs of women raising children alone in Ontario, the 1920 Mothers' Allowance Act, until 1967 when it was replaced by the Family Benefits Act. Prior to 1920 there

was not a concerted social policy addressing women who raised children without a male partner but a series of traditions and conventions undertaken by individuals, institutions, organizations and local governments with old roots. In Britain, the Poor Laws specified different treatments to widows, deserted and illegitimate mothers and these traditions, although not implemented in Ontario, influenced the charitable approaches to these women throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century until the institution of mothers' allowance in 1920. Allowances to mothers constituted, both in Canada and in the United States, the first experience with direct public financial aid to a group. As argued by Gordon (1994a, p.38), the debates and resulting program design in the US context have strongly influenced the model of welfare in place today.

American feminist welfare historians have argued that mothers' pensions are central to an understanding of the gendered character of the welfare state in the US (see Goodwin, 1992; Mink, 1990, Nelson, 1990 and Skocpol, 1992). In his book *"The Limits of Affluence"*, Struthers (1994, p.19) extends this observation to Ontario. In agreement but also expanding this observation, I argue that through the implementation of mothers' allowances, a complex entanglement of ideas, beliefs, practices and expectations regarding women raising children alone emerged and these forces coalesced into a surface forming a subject of welfare: the dependent mother. I use the Family Benefits Act as a marker to represent the consolidation of these rationalities and practices in a specific policy with a singular subject. The complex is constantly reconstructed and re-signified at the same time that it constructs and signifies its subject and constitutive elements. While this is an artificial fixing of the effects of the complex in a specific form it is undertaken in order to highlight its overall meaning and functioning in the period of maturing of the welfare system in Canada. The policies of this period are undergoing, at the

moment, radical transformations in the Province which can perhaps use as a departure point the demise of the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) in April 1996. Future developments are currently being shaped and the meaning of the experience of Family Benefits can only be developed from an analysis of what it represented as of its formation.

I will trace the formation and unfolding of the governmentalization of the single mother complex making use of the Annual Reports produced by the administrators as the core source to capture the practices of mothers' allowances. These represent the texts of rule for this first case study in the sense that they specify the mechanisms of ruling utilized by the practice and implementation of the initiative. They offer a written account of the processes and mechanisms being developed and, at the same time, a rationality for their utilization in ruling. These texts present the sanctioned voice of the provincial government regarding their activities towards interventions addressing women raising children alone. They are carefully constructed to portray the initiative in the form its administrators judged more appropriate. Hence their format, the topics and issues addressed, and the tone of the reports were used to reconstruct the practices of mothers' allowances. They provide, for example, records of the numbers of beneficiaries, categories of allocation, record of new practices, administrative transformations and other program implementation indicators.

In addition, I have also contextualized the analysis with the examination and incorporation of the professional debates regarding the legislation and its subject, and the policy proposals for the articulations of mothers' allowances with a comprehensive system of welfare which yielded the Family Benefits Act. These texts are representative of social welfare practices but not exhaustive and other elements contributed to the shaping of Family Benefits such as the political

discourse, economic processes and the actual women who the policy addresses. Although the American literature on the topic of mothers' aid and maternalist influences on social policy is considerable (see Brush, 1996 for review) very few authors have addressed the actual practices of the program in that country (notably Goodwin, 1992 and Gordon, 1994a). The Canadian literature on mothers' allowance is of a much reduced volume although significant contributions have recently joined the pioneer paper by Strong-Boag (1979). In particular Little (1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1997, 1998), with a focus on moral regulation and control, and Struthers (1994), illustrating groups of the poor and marginalized in Ontario, have produced historical analyses of the mothers' allowance scheme in Ontario. An extensive policy analysis of practices of implementation of the scheme throughout its 47 years has not, however, been attempted and its effects cannot be inferred from these scholars' work although I will build on their research and findings.

The chapter will open with a review of the problematization of widows and deserted women raising children alone in Ontario and the emergence of the idea of payment for mother-work. This will provide a brief review of the rationalities for mothers' allowance referring to results of Canadian and American scholarship. Proceeding, the chapter will address the broad elements of the transformation of these rationalities into practical activities. First, in the section "Why This Form of Government", I examine the development of an administrative structure and its role. Next, under the title "Who is Governed", I look at the definition of administrable categories of subjects through the transformations in eligibility rules. Then, I present the metamorphosing of the justifications for ruling in the section "What is Governed". Closing the chapter I will summarize these processes and situate them in the context of the case study.

The next chapter will examine the remaining processes in the governmentalization of the complex: the gradual development of the components of the intervention, and the integration of the initiative into an emergent national welfare system.

A Payment for Mother-Work: Motherhood and Normal Family Life

This section reviews the multiple rationalities and practices which coalesced around the proposals for an allowance for deserving mothers in Ontario early in the twentieth century. It shows the multiple origins and sites of these proposals as well as a variety of practices from which the initiative drew different mechanisms of ruling. Above all it denaturalizes the existence of single mothers. Paid motherhood was one of the various reforms advocated by the late nineteenth and early twentieth century women's movement across Western nations which also included women's suffrage, birth control, sexual freedom, child welfare, labour reform, civil rights and other demands. The importance and value of women's labour as mothers, mother-work, were placed at the forefront of these early feminists' arguments (Zaretsky, 1986, p.103). In a critique of the practice of institutionalizing needy children in orphanages, refuges and industrial schools, the early feminists argued for the family as the best environment for optimal child development. These arguments, however, operated in articulation with a series of other discourses such as those of citizenship, class relations, gender differences, race and national identity (Koven, 1993; Little, 1994a, p.235). Hence by stressing the importance of motherhood in child socialization and advocating that women be allowed fulltime dedication to this activity, maternalism, in the versions common in North America, implied an acceptance of the family wage and the gender division of labour (Goodwin, 1992; Gordon, 1994a, ch.3). As well, motherhood, in these discourses, was

defined by the moral, physical and material standards privileged by the white middle class. The mothers' allowance campaign in Ontario was hence based on a variety of sentiments and beliefs among which preventing the dissolution of family ties and a concern for the plight of dependent poor children were at the core (Little, 1995, p.93; Struthers, 1994, p.21).

Alongside the feminist themes of the value of motherhood, the family - a male headed and supported unit - also became the focus of discussion from the point of view of urban reformers. Gordon (1994a, p.24) describes how in the US the themes of illegitimacy and dissolution of the family through desertion and divorce became at the turn of the century associated with industrialization, urbanization and an anxiety about immigration. These were blamed on the new ease of travel, urban anonymity, unemployment, work opportunities in new communities and women's employment (p.28). Similar movements were occurring in Canada (Guest, 1985; Ursel, 1992; Snell, 1991; Valverde, 1991). By the First World War, these arguments were articulated with the threats of family instability, of juvenile delinquency and of the importance of maternity to national survival (Comacchio, 1997). The anonymity of the city was linked to the miserable conditions of the industrial worker, child labour, neglect, infant mortality, the growth of slums, the incidence of poverty, crime disease and family break-up (Guest, 1985, p.24).

While it is possible to identify common strands in terms of general concerns with the family and motherhood, the discussion around their solutions in Canada, as Strong-Boag (1979, p.24) documents, was far from unified. Some proposed state protection of a morally and physically healthy family, others favoured voluntary philanthropy as the best type of intervention. Liberal suffragists, such as Nellie McClung, argued for greater appreciation of women's maternal qualities and more humane values. Conservative forces, represented by Leacock, emphasized

female weakness, questioning women's ability to support themselves and their families on their own. Struthers (1994, p.29) documents some differences in the campaign for mothers' allowances in Ontario according to advocacy group. The public health movement, children's aid workers and the labour movement seemed to favour the inclusion of all poor mothers, i.e., widowed, deserted and unmarried mothers, into a scheme of support for children. The infant mortality health campaigns used a generic poor child as a victim deserving help:

poverty means poor health for the mother, lower intelligence, lack of energy and general inefficiency ... poverty forces mothers to work for a living, depriving their babies of breast milk and, as a consequence, these infants are unable to thrive and develop in the poverty-stricken homes into which they are born (Brown & Campbell, 1914, cited in Comacchio, 1993, p.38).

On the other hand, women's organizations and social service leaders, who came to dominate the mothers' allowance campaign, were against such broad inclusion on moral grounds. They argued that most deserted women would fail home and worthiness standards and that such inclusion would induce men to leave their families. In agreement with these arguments, government officials were also in favour of restricted eligibility on moral grounds but also, and most importantly, their reasoning followed budgetary considerations (Struthers, 1994, p.30).

The mothers' allowance legislation in the Canadian provinces was also influenced by a series of events around the 1914-1918 War. War widows and their children popularized as victims of misfortune were prominent images in the discussions about the lack of adequate child care services and the need for the propagation of a physically and morally fit generation to inherit the nation. Examples of action on this front were provided by the implementation of the mothers' aid programs in some of the American states and, as well, by experiences of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. The latter provided material resources and character building interventions to fatherless families during the War. It relied on a local committee of volunteers and visitors to implement a

program of strict supervision in exchange for an allowance sufficient for a decent living (see Struthers, 1994). This allowance was a recognition for services of the husband, and hence was not attached to a stigma of charity. These interventions were evaluated as positive in a number of indicators: improved school attendance; better housekeeping; lessened mortality; and increased family stability (Strong-Boag, 1979, p.25). These compiled and publicized indicators of success show that the program was primarily directed at children and their socialization. In addition to these international and national experiences, the Toronto Local Council of Women, as councils in other jurisdictions (see Strong-Boag, 1979), ran a demonstration project which provided a monthly subsidy and supervision to six worthy poor widows and their families. This project was evaluated as successful and its design profoundly influenced the future Ontario scheme (Irving, 1987a; Little 1995, p.93; Struthers, 1994, p.22). Advocates, using these experiences, emphasized their differences from the indiscriminate giving of charity: careful selection of the recipient families, intense supervision, and regular advising to the widows.

This design reflected the beliefs and experiences of middle class women and urban reform advocates. Middle class women's organizations started the work with the poor through the moral reform movement of the turn of the century (see Mitchinson, 1987; Valverde, 1991) and developed their trust in education as the major tool for introducing the disorderly masses of urban immigrants to white middle class standards. Their motivation was, as Mink (1990) documents for the US, a compassion for the plight of the poor urban dwellers but they also shared with their class and male colleagues an anxiety about the threats to the social order and an assumption of women's reproductive role and dependence on men. The women in this movement also saw a role for themselves in the public world defined by positions of authority and social recognition

(McCarthy, 1990). An emergent political identity was forged based on a middle class female career in family management which used professional tools for direction of the deviant and distressed families of the lower classes. Hence in Canada, as in the American states, '[t]he mothers'-aid campaign benefited not only some poor single mothers but also some professional and proto professional women' (Gordon, 1994, p.45). These early social services workers, despite their condescending, racist and dismissive interactions with those they wished to rescue, provided in many cases material help and support appreciated by the few impoverished single mothers they managed to reach. They were, with their education work, as Mink (1990) remarks, unlike many of their contemporaries, asserting the possibility of uplift for the poor urban masses and hence promoting a certain vision of political equality.

The first province in Canada to pass legislation granting an allowance to mothers was Manitoba in 1916 and others followed suit. In 1920, when Ontario enacted the Mothers' Allowance Act, the four Western Canadian provinces and 39 of the American states had similar legislation already in place (Struthers, 1994, p.19). Implementing this legislation, as we will see in the following sections, the Province developed an initiative modelled on the charity approach. It was characterized by restricted categorical eligibility, stringent moral requirements, domestic supervision and meagre financial relief. Nevertheless, in adopting this legislation, Ontario recognized the popularity of the idea of some sort of financial contribution to a deserving mother for the rearing of her children, hence acknowledging the value of mother-work as advocated by the women's movements.

These articulations of practices with the rationalities of motherhood support represented some novel arrangements for the social organization of wellbeing in Canada. For the first time the

Provincial government accepted responsibility for the welfare of a specific group of people and commit itself to help and support them (Struthers, 1994). Particularly important is the fact that what is being supported is mother-work and family life aiming at healthy citizens. This support is accompanied by an evolving structure and form of delivery; stringent although enlarging eligibility criteria; changing rationality for support; and a variety of interlinked components or means through which the initiative is carried out. This novel arrangement for the wellbeing of certain groups inaugurated a precedent for Provincial direct intervention in certain types of motherhood: those outside of the family norm of being supported by a male parent. In doing so, the initiative separated these group of mothers from other mothers and developed a variety of mechanisms through which their lives was ruled and their subjectivity defined. Later in the postwar the integration of mothers' allowance in a national system of welfare further specifies the form of life of these mothers and the Family Benefits Act captures and crystallizes these transformations. The following sections will follow the implementation of this program of action and the development of this rationality.

Why This Form of Government: An Administrable Subject

The Ontario Mothers' Allowance Act was assented to in June 4th, 1920 but it took some months to become operational. The novelty of government sponsored aid and its Province wide coverage at a time of much remoteness required considerable planning and deliberation. Much thought and organization went into developing the program components as well as a credible system of delivery and accountability. It is this slowly forming administrative structure and its role in constituting a subject that is the focus of this section. This formative process is described

in the Annual Reports of the initiative in its yearly occurrence and overall format. As a summary document the Annual Reports contain the resulting changes rather than the debates around the changes in the structure of delivery. The initial structure and its *modus operandi* is discussed first and, following, I introduce the transformations these structures of program delivery undertook. I conclude the section with a discussion of the legacies of this administrative structure to the materialization of the dependent mother.

Administrative Structure.

Following the Patriotic Fund model, the Act established a central Commission composed of five persons to administer the Mothers' Allowances Act. Its members were appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and two positions were designated for women, indicating the influence that women's groups had achieved on shaping the legislation. Members served without remuneration except for a per diem allowance for attendance at meetings (Mothers' Allowance Act, 1920, 4-7) and paid expenses. The Commission answered to the Provincial Labour Department but had autonomy of decision regarding the allocation and amount of each allowance within a budget defined by the provincial government. This organizational structure, in the words of the Ontario Premier of the time, Simcoe County farmer Ernest Drury, was much superior to that of the prevalent departmental administration:

Governments are, after all, dependent upon the good will of the people and are always under the temptation to do things that would bring them popular support, either in the mass or individually. To give to any Government power to say who shall or shall not be beneficiaries under such an Act as the Mothers' Allowances Act, would be so dangerous that it should not be for one moment considered. It would open a way to practices which, in the public interest, should not be allowed. It would become almost inevitably a means for the exercise of patronage and favouritism. For that reason, the Mothers' Allowance Act provides for the administration of the Act by a Commission, which is, properly I think, as independent of the Government or any other influence, as the Judges on the Bench (Ontario, Mothers' Allowance Commission [OMAC,], 1920-21, p.12).

Respected members of the public were considered better adjudicators of deservedness than civil

servants, politicians or, as was the case in the US, judges. The Commission also appointed Local Boards, constituting a total of 96 Local Boards in the Province; designed forms for application and investigation; prepared instructions and bulletins; and developed the regulations for the administration of the Act.

Reproducing the central Commission structure, each Local Board was composed of five members, of whom at least two were women. They served gratuitously with only travelling expenses reimbursed. Mayors of cities and separated towns, the wardens of counties and the judges of judicial districts could nominate two of the Board members but appointment was ultimately a responsibility of the Commission which insisted on 'citizens of good standing in the community, and sympathetic to the Act' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.9). Members were, as Little (1995, p.95) has documented, associated with the local political, social and economic elite. The Local Boards received applications for mothers' allowances, considered them in relation to the Act, and forwarded them with their report and recommendations to the Commission. They were also responsible for publicizing in their community the meaning and purpose of the Act as well as its functioning. The Boards reported quarterly to the Commission which supervised their work and granted the allowances based on their recommendations and the reports of investigators. By the end of the 1920s, 110 boards were in operation, comprising over 500 people. Williams (1984, p.37) calculated that the Boards handled not more than 37 cases on average yearly. Nevertheless they usually met monthly, or in some cities, weekly. 'The boards certainly implemented the ideal of *community involvement in decision making* but one wonders about the validity of these frequent meetings' concludes Williams (emphasis in the original). Others (Little, 1995, p.95; Struthers, 1994, p.41) have remarked, also, on their extreme familiarity with personal details of

applicants' life circumstances and how their class, ethnic, religious and moral prejudices as well as local rumours shaped their opinions (see also Little, 1994b). This public structure of delivery, through its reliance on appointed rather than elected representatives, suggests, perhaps, an attention to handling the private matters of the family outside the public sphere of the state government.

For the purpose of investigation and supervision, the Province was organized into 17 districts and each was assigned an investigator including two who spoke both French and English (OMAC, 1920-21, p.10). They were all women which was 'notable in a civil service that had historically been male dominated' (Hodgetts, 1995, p.160). Initial proposals for the program recommended experienced social workers for the role of investigators, but the Commission chose, among the more than three hundred applicants, women with public health or educational backgrounds (Struthers, 1994, p.33). This suggests an expectation that the supervisory function was primarily one of a medical health and educational nature, as popularized through child health campaigns following World War I (see Comacchio, 1993). However, it also illustrates the complexities of the gender and professional struggles, in that women were considered more akin to the nature and function of motherhood.

Through asserting a need for the protection of the working class family, and particularly of mothers and children within it, middle-class, college-educated single women could define a professional field for themselves, linked closely to women's traditional nurturing identity (Struthers, 1987c, p.130).

Although the investigators had a local role, they answered to the central Commission which passed to them the applications approved by the Local Boards for investigation and home visit.

This model of delivery, hence, was instrumental for the development of local administrative practices which gradually were translated into a unified set of provincial procedures

written in the regulations as acknowledged in some Annual Reports (e.g., Ontario Minister of Public Welfare [OMPW], 1952-53, p.9). As a result of this model these practices had very specific characteristics which profoundly marked the dependent mother. They involved intense, close and direct contact with beneficiaries; compilation of key observable aspects to indicate good motherhood based on specific class, racial and moral values; development of central and uniform decision making structures linked to individualized plans for family life; and central decisive budgetary control of the scheme.

Supporting these specific characteristics, from the beginning, these practices were sustained by an elaborate administrative structure requiring extensive personnel. Understandably, then, the monetary savings of volunteer services were appreciated by the government, which kept close tabs on administrative expenditures (OMAC, 1922-23, p.5). The use of volunteers, as pointed out by Hodgetts (1995, p.161), functioned as well as a buffer for the government around the delicate issues dealing with individual distributive decisions. The participation of white, middle class, Protestant citizens in these decisions was seen as representing the general tax payers' feelings and social commitments accounting for the modest levels of opposition to the scheme recorded in the Annual Reports (e.g., OMPW, 1932-33, p.3). Furthermore the discretionary character of decisions cultivated support among a wide range of labour, women, business and charity interest groups who felt represented in the operation of the Act, particularly in the local boards.

In summary, this initial delivery model was very responsive to the dominant groups morality, opinions and judgements. While relying on a central structure of control of budget and decisions it also incorporated a labour intensive decentralized system of individualized information

and contact anchored in a white, middle class participation and surveillance. It generated popular support for practices developed around direct contact with beneficiaries, key indicators for good motherhood, individualized plans for family life, and central budgetary control. These main traits provided the core parameters around which administration was gradually transformed.

Transformations.

During the 1920s, the administration of the allowance proceeded on its 'calm and dutiful course' (Williams, 1984, p.28), accumulating experiences and skills in assessing, granting and monitoring families. Its model was copied when, in 1929, the Old Age Pension Act was implemented. The depression, however, brought a magnitude of deprivation previously unseen and both the Province and the local governments were unprepared to handle the crisis. In 1930, the Royal Commission on Public Welfare of the Province of Ontario recommended the creation of the Public Welfare Department to strengthen the various institutions, agencies and schemes for support and relief maintained by the Province (Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare, 1930b). In the words of Hepworth, Draper, MacKinnon, Rogers & Splane (1987, p.26), '[t]his greater coherence in administrative terms gave previously lacking identity to social welfare matters and extended such matters beyond provincial borders'.

The Department, although maintaining the main elements of the model, emphasized efficiency and cost reduction in an attempt to save the tax payers money. One outcome of this emphasis within the mothers' allowance scheme was a gradual reduction of the time-consuming volunteer allocation decision making processes to facilitate completion and disposal of applications (OMPW, 1932-33, p.14). In this sense, in 1932-33, the Mothers' Allowance Commission was compressed to three people and its composition changed to include one

volunteer chair, and two civil servants, the deputy Minister of Welfare and the chief investigator. Local Board's functions were directed towards preventive advice, gathering of files and visiting (OMPW, 1934-35), rather than making recommendations. Later, in 1944-45, the volunteer chair of the Commission was replaced by a civil servant and the Local Boards were eliminated in 1948.

These changes in the administrative structure resulted in greater reliance on paid staff, rather than volunteers, for allocation decisions. But the effect of the direct and intense local participation on recommendations was maintained. The centralized and non-volunteer decision-making process grew to rely on a myriad of written regulations, procedures, and indicators which were based on the intrusive, discretionary and biased practices of local boards. These written practices inscribed discretion of administrators and investigators as a permanent feature of support to poor mothers.

A second effect of the cost cutting focus of the department was the attempts to combine aspects of the administrative structure of mothers' allowance to that of other schemes under the Department. In 1933-34, the 18 mothers' allowance investigators were eliminated and the newly created local relief officers helped by the Local Boards assumed their functions. This combination of the two investigative processes encountered fierce opposition. Discussions about the distinctiveness of mothers' allowance relative to emergency unemployment relief pointed to the variety as well as to the specific needs of the families in the mothers' allowance caseload (Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare, 1933, p.45). Two years later the investigators were re-instituted. The next year, their number was enlarged to 56 and together with the Local Boards they were reorganized to serve also under the Old Age Pension Act. That proved to be an acceptable combination since both schemes called for delicate investigation and selection of

beneficiaries which distinguished them from indiscriminate relief. These experiments made explicit, public and further consolidated the differences in the nature of the relief program and that of mothers' allowance and old age pension. Mothers' allowance maintained this independent identity and administration in Ontario even after 1967 when, joined with other schemes, it formed the Family Benefits component of social assistance.

The depression and later the War years weathered yet a third effect of efficiency and cost cutting focuses through attempts to improve professional training and investigation procedures to contain increases in the caseload: greater reliance on documentation, development of scientifically rationalized investigative methods, implementation of policies of closer inspection as well as training and skills improvement for staff. One example is the increased medical scrutiny of families eligible due to incapacitation of the fathers. In 1931-32 procedures for medical investigations were developed through the incorporation of a medical officer to the staff of the Commission who routinely performed medical examinations, studied hospital reports and consulted with local physicians attempting to reduce the numbers of families in this category. The consequences of his work can be seen in the number of files made ineligible for medical reasons: prior to 1931-32, these cases represented an average of 16.5% of all ineligible cases, while in the 1930s this average climbed to 29.4% of all ineligible cases (see Table 1, Appendix).

Perhaps the most pungent example of administrative measures geared to containing the caseload was the intensive attention devoted to the task of investigation. During the depression, the Commission boasted about the efficiency of their field workers in keeping the numbers down (e.g., OMPW, 1932-33, p.15; OMPW, 1938-39, p.12). With the economic prosperity of the War, the investigation process became the main focus of administrative attention in an attempt to guard

against abuse and fraud (OMPW, 1941-42, p.23). The investigators' job required 'continued vigilance in a changing picture of social conditions' and emphasis was placed on follow-up in order to adapt the allowances to new earning conditions in the home (OMPW, 1942-43, p.14). The number of investigators was gradually and consistently enlarged: In 1941-42 it was increased to 67, in 1943-44 to 95, the next year to 99, and in 1945-46 to 103. In 1941-42 district supervisors were established with the function of developing and training investigators; interpreting and clarifying regulations; and establishing uniformity among workers and in the system (OMPW, 1943-44, p.23; OMPW, 1945-46, p.15). The investigators were considered 'a fact finding body' (OMPW, 1941-42, p.23). Procedures were standardized, their function increasingly scrutinized and routines established (e.g., 4 visits per year as of 1943-44, reporting times).

By the postwar, mothers' allowances had produced a substantial team of professional field workers and had set the standards and meaning of investigative and supervisory practices. Direct contact with the family, although extensive and intrusive, was filtered through the requirements of the regulations and the fact finding purpose of reducing the caseload. In search of efficiency, the centrally regulated decision making and allocation process, instead of relying on full contextualized life stories, became based on snap-shot indicators and secondary documentation. Actual decisions, hence, became based on a reconstruction of the reality of individual families through pre-established indicators. At a time when administration and trained personnel for the emerging social welfare programs represented a national priority (Cassidy, 1948), these developments defined the public social service worker's expertise as closely linked to cost containment investigation and the skill to transcribe life stories into rational facts and indicators.

Cost cutting trends were consolidated through the postwar. In this period, however, the focus was the administrative machinery itself. In 1952 a new administrative structure was put in place: the Commission was abolished and the director of the Mothers' Allowance Branch was made responsible for decision making and management of the program. Applications were received by the local authorities and forwarded to the director who distributed them to newly created district offices. Field staff, at the district level, were responsible for investigation and supervision allowing for consideration of local conditions in each individual case. Allocations were then made by a district office clerk, reviewed by the supervisor and signed by the director. Although decisions were made at a level closer to the family they remain based on file information. The administration prided itself as integrated, with orderly procedures, centralized controls, consistent treatment and stable legislation (OMPW, 1953-54; OMPW, 1954-55). It, however, incessantly pursued efficiency undertaking comprehensive staff training and, with federal funding, extensive research examining size of caseload, operating issues, processing activities, decision making, investigation methods, improved coordination and avoidance of duplication (OMPW, 1954-55 see also Little, 1995).

In 1955-56 the regional offices assumed greater responsibility for all aspects of individual allowances and the Department reported the implementation of several initiatives regarding definition of essential data, numerical system of record keeping, consolidating forms, re-design and simplified questions. Experimentation with the structure of delivery still persisted and in 1957-58 the Mothers' Allowance Branch was extinguished sending the regional offices to report directly to the director of the Department. In 1960-61 Branches were re-established and a Board of Review was created to examine allowances under the special cases clause. Although

apparently an initiative to curb discretionary practices, the Board was set up within the Department structure (Hodgetts, 1995, p.240). The administrative focus continued to address professional social work training and methods (OMPW, 1959-60, pp.7-8); investigation and supervision of specific eligible groups (OMPW, 1960-61, p.11); intake and case recording (OMPW, 1961-62, p.15).

The administrative structure, hence, underwent many transformations and experimentations. These brought to the program standardization and efficiency although maintaining the initial discretionary, intensive, and intrusive practices of the original structure. The regulations and procedures were developed from their roots in the early investigative practices of local boards without breaking with its principles. The professional training and central administration that came to characterize the implementation of mothers' allowance was founded in case containment strategies, simplified indicators rather than life stories, and discretionary practices.

Legacies.

When mothers' allowance was replaced by the Family Benefits in 1967, this 47 years old experience of administering a program for women who raise children without men had a profound bearing on the formation of the dependent mother. The program defined a subject who was above all an administrable subject through central mechanisms of case files and indicators methods but who was, at the same time, admitted, visited and maintained in the program through intense face to face contact. It created hence a practice whereby the mothers although addressed individually are assessed and understood through a reconstructed and standardized file representation. This mode of understanding women raising children alone translated family

situations and life stories into compartmentalized indicators of good motherhood and allowance calculation mechanisms and defined the central elements through which the dependent mother was brought to life.

Articulating this translation from *real* to *file* subject is the central role of discretion. The practice of broad discretionary powers, institutionalized in regulations, allowed flexibility but also carried into Family Benefits the enforcement of personal standards and preferences based on class and cultural assumptions. Discretion is tied to central budgetary control which determined the degree of flexibility with which family needs and circumstances were interpreted. The subject of Family Benefits is marked by the motif of discretion which determines her total dependency on repeated sympathetic and favourable assessments. Also central is the fundamental character of investigation assigned to the administration of the subject dependent mother. Procedures, forms, documentation, family goals and calculation of the allowance are all premised on case containment, elimination of fraud, scrutiny of private matters and investigatory skills.

Nevertheless, this integrated structure of delivery and administration does not follow a central or coherent function derived from the rationalities of the program. Rather it was developed in a piecemeal fashion, under several influences of different times and, importantly, it expanded the ideas and values that originated the program in the first place incorporating technical innovations as they became popular (e.g., numerical and statistical technologies). If they seem powerful and overwhelming it is that they are pervasive and reproduced in the details of program practices. The following sections will illustrate these detailed practices of ruling starting with the eligibility criteria. Eligibility defines exactly who can be a subject of the program and throughout the implementation of mothers' allowance the subjectivation criteria were carefully

and constantly studied.

Who is Governed: Eligible Subjects

I will now discuss how various categories of women raising children alone were gradually included as subject of the allowance and the particular circumstances that surrounded and qualified their subjection. The Annual Reports, as texts that represent ruling practices, provide a careful description of the different categories of families which gradually became eligible to the allowance as well as the rationale for their inclusion. The reports also provide an account of administration of these categories and, although not in a fix format, they contain an indication of numbers of applications and admissions as well as other management indicators.

In its formulation stage, the allowance was intended as a support for mothers with inadequate economic means to care for their children, that is poor mothers. The Mothers' Allowance Act of 1920, however, restricted eligibility to a 'widow or wife of an inmate of a hospital for the insane in Ontario or of a man who is permanently disabled and incapable of contributing to the support of his family living' (Mothers' Allowance Act, 1920) as well as deserted women whose husbands' whereabouts were unknown for seven years or more, that is, women who were legally widows. These women were only eligible if they were living with two or more of their own children under 16 years of age. They also had to be British subjects by birth or naturalization, residents of Canada three years prior to application including the time death or disability occurred, and residents of Ontario for two years before applying as well as during the period of tenure. In addition, eligible women had a limit of \$2,500 in property value and \$350 for liquid assets. To qualify the mother had to be morally fit and proper according to standards set by

investigators and local boards which reflected their class, racial and cultural preconceptions. In the words of a major provincial review of the 1980s '[t]hus began the pattern of establishing specific programs for sub-groups of the poor, a pattern that is continued in today's system of categories' (Social Assistance Review Committee, 1988, p.73).

In 1921 the Act was amended to include married or unmarried foster mothers of two or more orphan children under 16 years of age with no other means; mothers of one child under 16 years who also had under their care an incapacitated husband or a child over the age of 16 who was permanently disabled; as well as the wives of men who have not been heard of or from for at least five years. These groups of eligible women corresponded to a small group of the poor mothers in need of financial help. Studies undertaken prior to the mothers' allowance legislation calculated a larger number of potential beneficiaries than allowed by the budget: the Ridell Report estimated that in 1920 there were 15,524 poor widows in Ontario with 30,159 dependent children; and approximately 400 wives of men who were insane or totally disabled (Williams, 1984, p.36; see also Table 2 and 3, Appendix). In contrast, in 1920-21, beneficiaries numbered 2,660 women and 8,271 children.

Widows.

The widows, in the first year, constituted 87% of the beneficiaries. This proportion, however, declined to 60% in 1934-35, then grew to around 70% by late World-War II, falling below half of the beneficiaries around the 1960 but climbed back to 50% after that (see Table 3, Appendix). Widowed mothers remained, however, the symbolic image of the mothers' allowance. They were particularly visible in the introductory years when the word widow was commonly used to represent all beneficiaries (e.g., OMAC, 1921-22, p.9). The pages of the

Annual Reports were filled with stories about heroic and deserving widows with young children:

The applicant's husband and all his brothers and sisters had died of tuberculosis and she and her children all seemed delicate and undernourished and cheerless (OMAC, 1920-21, p.24).

Mrs A. who, ever since her husband's death three years ago, has supported her family by taking in washing for six or seven weekly customers (OMAC, 1920-21, p.25).

A mother and six children who were living in two rooms after the death of her husband ... (OMAC, 1921-22, p.24).

The farm on which the widow had been left was a heritage of stump and swamp (OMAC, 1921-22, p.32).

Left a widow at the hour of birth of the seventh child, the eldest at that time not quite ten years of age (OMAC, 1924-25, p.13)

These children take great pride in helping their widowed mother to bear her heavy responsibilities (OMPW, 1943-44, p.16).

Wives of incapacitated men.

As the number of widows declined, that of wives of incapacitated men increased as a proportion of all the families receiving mothers' allowance. In 1920/21, families of incapacitated fathers constituted 10% of all beneficiaries but by 1930/31 their percentage had more than doubled, reaching a high in 1934/35 with 30% of the beneficiaries. These families decreased slowly to represent a quarter of the allowance list by 1962/63, when they were transferred to the General Welfare budget under the Dependent Father's Allowance (see Table 3, Appendix). Among the poor families, in the 1920s, the total and permanent incapacitation of the father through mental or other illnesses had devastating consequences: the family was not only deprived of its main breadwinner but was also in charge of caring and providing for the sick man. Granting an allowance to the families of incapacitated men not only contributed to relieve the financial burden of their care but also legitimized the male breadwinner role in the family.

It has been possible in many cases to persuade men to enter a sanatorium because we can assure them that their families will be looked after. What a relief this is to a tubercular man, he can, having being relieved of the worry of his family's maintenance, co-operate with the sanatorium authorities and the result in scores of cases has been that he has recovered and is now again supporting his family (OMAC, 1925-27, p.19).

As Gordon (1988) documented for the US and Little (1994a, 1995) for Canada, a woman

raising children alone was always treated with suspicion of incompetence and moral negligence, hence, I argue, the sanctioning by the Ontario Commission of applications in which the father was present eliminated the doubts that hang over the mothers alone. In addition, it is arguable that these cases also represented the possibility of granting the allowance for a short term, hence, maximizing the number of beneficiaries under the Act to be reported.

A further aspect in understanding the increase of these families in the allowance lists can be found in the role of health workers and doctors, who were among the leaders of the child welfare campaign and strong advocates of the Mothers' Allowance legislation. These professionals saw in the families of incapacitated fathers an important opportunity to further assert their control over the conditions and meaning of government initiatives. As of World-War I, the medicalization of the child welfare campaigns popularized the themes of prevention as a less costly and more scientific way to contend with social problems over the holistic and feminine social workers' view. Doctors argued for medical supervision and education of women in order to save the national asset each child represented (Comacchio, 1993, ch.3). Their recommendations for government expenditure were on scientifically proven causes and curable diseases. For example, under the title "*Tuberculosis a preventable factor in widowhood*", the 1922-23 OMAC Annual Report stated:

This statement is inserted to show how very serious tuberculosis enters into the question of mothers' allowance causing widowhood. If the money expended on the widow had been applied to combatting tuberculosis the number of widows might be less (OMAC, 1922-23, p.14).

Such statements illustrate the struggles for control of the definition of conditions and priorities under which the small sub-group of women raising children would receive an allowance. Even the sympathetic members of the Mothers' Allowance Commission were susceptible to the

possibility of diverting the money from widows to medical treatment. 'Health, education and easily available medical care and protection' (OMPW, 1935-36, p.15) continued to be proposed to prolong the working life of fathers. In 1942 the Province agreed to pay the Ontario Medical Association a per capita grant to provide the recipients of mothers' allowance with medical services and drugs.

By granting an allowance to wives of incapacitated men, the Mothers' Allowance Commission acknowledged one single reason for a man not to support his family: medical incapacitation. This medical emphasis - rather than, for example, destitution, employment availability or pure exhaustion - positioned these families as an object of scientific definition and scrutiny. The theme of prevention associated with the scientific study of causes cultivated a sense of money well spent in the present to save in the future, a feeling of a situation under control (Comacchio, 1993, p.25). The growth of beneficiaries on the grounds of the husband's total and permanent incapacitation was, however, met with increased regulation. The OMAC Annual Report of 1923-24 noted: 'Each application of this nature must be supported by a medical report on our own form, and only if the husband is shown to be totally and permanently incapacitated is an allowance recommended' (p.6). But this group continued to constitute the second largest category of beneficiaries and the number of new applications from them surpassed those of widows in 1933-34. The doctor added to the staff in 1930/31 dealt specifically with the cases of incapacitation: their validation through medical practitioners and institutions (OMPW, 1936-37) and the conditions of their diagnosis (OMPW, 1937-38) in an attempt to contain their numbers. In 1939-40 a Board of Health was established within the Department of Health in an advisory capacity to the Department of Welfare but the difficulties to contain incapacitation cases through

its medical definition continue to be a constant topic of the reports (OMPW, 1943-44). In sharp contrast, such intense scientific standards were not deployed for the scrutiny of mothers whose inability to work was primarily left to the discretion of investigators highlighting the gendered character of these practices.

In the postwar the administrators of the Act targeted particularly the families eligible due to the father's incapacity to work (OMPW, 1947-48, p.12). Due to increased possibilities in the job market, those remaining in the reduced mothers' allowance caseload were described as a 'hard core' (OMPW, 1948-49, p.12; OMPW, 1949-50, p.15) of unemployable families. As their numbers grew relatively to that of widows, so did the preoccupation of the Provincial government with their containment and the prospect of their long term support (OMPW, 1948-49, p.13; OMPW, 1949-50, p.16). Although the medical officer had already experimented with training incapacitated men in 1931-32 with sporadic success, it was in 1954-55, with the postwar high employment levels, that rehabilitation became the primary focus in addressing issues of incapacitated fathers (OMPW, 1955-56, p.44). Counselling, vocational training and job placement were offered to incapacitated fathers but their number continued to grow exhibiting the highest increases in 1955-56 admissions until their transfer, in 1962-63, to GWA budget.

Deserted women.

Although the Commission also considered applications from deserted women whose husbands had not been heard of or from for five years, it did so under the presumption of death. Deserted mothers constituted only 2% of all beneficiaries in 1920-21. But by mid decade their proportion had already doubled reaching 7.5% of the beneficiaries in 1932-33, but towards the end of the depression and during the War their proportion dropped. In 1937, the requirement

regarding ignorance of husband's whereabouts was reduced to three years, then to one year in 1946, to six months in 1956 and in 1964 to three months. In the 1960's, deserted and separated mothers constituted 11% to 14% of the beneficiaries (see Table 3, Appendix).

The Commission was of the opinion that mothers' allowance was not a measure to deal with cases of family desertion and deserted mothers were seldom cited as case illustrations in the Annual Reports. As a phenomenon desertion was, however, frequently discussed in the Annual Reports:

... family desertion is a social problem of real magnitude (OMAC, 1921-22, p.10).
 One of the most serious problems we have to deal with is the case of deserted mothers (OMAC, 1928-29, p.5).
 One of the most serious situations facing society to-day is that of the mother with young children who has been deserted by her husband (OMPW, 1953-54, p.23).
 It is well known that the deserting husband leaves a trail of hardship in the wake of his family (OMPW, 1960-61, p.11).
 Desertion, which basically involves the abandonment of family responsibilities, is an all too common type of misconduct in our society (OMPW, 1961-62, p.10).

In the early days the Commission advocated for exclusively legal and administrative punitive measures for deserters, foreshadowing today's support enforcement programs (see Pulkingham, 1995):

Family desertion is now an extraditable offense between the United States and Canada. This is one step in the solution of the problem, but greater facilities must be provided for bringing back the deserting father. This in most cases must be done at public expense. When brought back he should be compelled to work at remunerative employment in prison or out of prison and his wages should be applied to the support of his family (OMAC, 1921-22, p.10).

In 1921/22, it was reported that an estimated 'one family in ten needing assistance in Toronto is a deserted family' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.10). The proportion of deserted mothers receiving an allowance grew rapidly. Some Local Board members, who came in direct contact with the terrible conditions of these women and their families, were ardent advocates for their specific inclusion in the Act. In 1926, Mr. Bert Menson, Local Board Member of the City of

Toronto as well as officer of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada launched a sharp attack on the administration of the Act and proposed amendments to provide for the deserted mothers as well as those with only one child (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1927, p.30). Miss Gertrud Lawler, chair of the Toronto Local Board passionately described the plight of these mothers:

The mothers apparently ruthlessly deserted by the fathers of their children form a class extremely pitiable. The children are too young to realize the heroic struggles that their mother is making to shield them from poverty and keep them with her in sanguine expectation, the return of their father to his moral and legal duties (Labour Gazette, July 1929, p.748).

Although with actual numbers much smaller than those of the families of widows and incapacitated fathers, the 'alarming extent' (OMAC, 1927-28, p.5) of growth of beneficiaries under the deserted family group was a source of concern for the Commission which lacked the means to locate and enforce support payments on the deserter. The powerful Canadian Council on Child Welfare, headed by Charlotte Whitton, vehemently campaigned against the inclusion of deserted mothers in the Mothers' Allowance Act fearing an encouragement to desertion. It argued for the enforcement of adequate legislation for the apprehension and compulsory employment of deserting husbands (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1929, p.32). The municipalities, on the other hand, under the weight of the 1930s unemployment crisis and the tremendous burden deserted mothers represented to their budget, successfully pressed the Province into a reduction of required desertion period in 1937 (see Struthers, 1994, p.100). Further reductions followed, in the postwar, when sharp increases in the cost of living again highlighted deserted mothers as one of the most destitute groups in the municipal relief rolls. These mothers continued to be blamed for the growing municipal expenditures in public assistance, accounting, in 1954, for half the financial expenditures of municipal welfare departments (Canadian Welfare Council, 1954, p.3).

The proportion of deserted mothers in the mothers' allowance caseload, however, increased slowly reaching 12.5% of the beneficiaries in 1950-51 (see Table 3, Appendix). They faced workers and administrators unsympathetic to their plight and the rules were applied strictly (see Struthers 1994, p.101). They were also to a large extent suspected to have caused the abandonment of their families and blamed for an unhappy marriage (Dobson, 1940, p.4). Deserted wives were submitted to rigorous investigation in an attempt to locate the deserters (OMPW, 1931-32; OMPW, 1934-35). The Department of Public Welfare acknowledged major administrative quandaries regarding locating the husband, encouraging reconciliations between husband and wife, and the continuation of the allowance. Struthers (1994) documents the casework techniques employed:

Mr.R. ... possesses a violent temper, and last fall after beating his wife, he deserted her ... his wife was a somewhat immature girl who might have made a success of a marriage ... but was unable to help her husband adjust to the situation ... [The caseworker] helped Mrs.R. to talk out all her hard feelings against her husband and to think of them more calmly ... Much discussion followed this point in regard to how important the marriage was to her, as to whether she wanted to continue bringing up two children by herself, with only the prospect of living on public assistance for several years, or whether she could herself make some concessions ... Mrs.R., fully cognizant of what her choice would entail, decided that she would make the effort at reconciliation (Analysis of Case Load, 1949 cited in Struthers, 1994, pp.155-156).

In 1960-61 a Special Investigative Unit was created in cooperation with the city of Toronto to locate deserters and negotiate reconciliation or support. The next year, due to its reported success, it was expanded to the Province. The dilemma of granting financial support versus enforcement measures, however, survived into CAP and beyond.

Foster mothers.

Foster mothers constituted the fourth group of women raising children alone allowed access to mothers' allowance as of the 1921 amendment. These women could be married or unmarried, reside with two or more orphan children under 16 years of age and have no adequate

means to care properly for them without the allowance. They had to supply certificates of the children's parents' marriage and death as well as birth certificates following specially prepared forms (OMAC, 1920-21, p.11). The allowance was granted on behalf of the orphaned children in an attempt to keep them together (OMAC, 1921-22, p.26). The proportion of foster mothers among all beneficiaries was small (1.8% in 1921-22) but it doubled by the end of the first decade maintaining those levels until the 1960s when it reached 8% (see Table 3, Appendix).

Mothers with only one child.

These four groups of eligible mothers represented indeed a small portion of the women without means to maintain their children. Many women raising children alone were denied access to support under the Act due to the particular circumstances of their motherhood. Among them the largest group may have been the widows, wives of incapacitated men, deserted and foster mothers with only one child. In 1920, the Commission did not recommend an allowance to widows with one child since they were as many as all other widows put together (OMAC, 1920-21, p.11). Mothers with one child, it argued, could work as housekeepers and provide for their child. There were, however, strong pressures, particularly from labour, for enlarging the scope of the Act to include these women (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1927, p.30). 'Why deny that Canadian boy or girl a home because there is no brother or sister?' campaigned the chair of Toronto Local Board (Labour Gazette, 1929, p.749). The Neighbourhood Workers' Association, the largest family welfare organization of Toronto, was opposed to including the mother with one child as recipient on the grounds of insufficient public support for the measure.

It is very important that changes of this kind involving additional large outlays should not outstrip public opinions. The Province and municipalities put up for the last fiscal year the sum of \$1,886,045. No money is spent to better purpose. There is the danger, however, if the increase is too rapid, of arousing public criticism which might have a very detrimental effect (Canadian Council on Child

Welfare, 1927, p.31).

This kind of argumentation, as pointed out in Gordon's (1994a, ch.4) analysis of the US mothers' aid, is characteristic of middle class women's organizations. Their strategy for social welfare advocacy, she argues, is piecemeal, non-confrontational, gradualist and pragmatic. Women's organizations attempted to reflect their own cautious perception of the mood predominant in their class and social welfare measures addressing women relied on 'bringing one group at a time into the house of public care' (Gordon, 1994, p.45). Some attribute the success of having at least some meagre support to mothers to this strategy (Brush, 1996). Others attribute to this strategy the low status and meagre scale of the program (Gordon, 1994, chap.8).

The depression of the 1930s brought devastating poverty to many widows with one child as attested by their letters to the Premier (see Struthers, 1994, p.99). Municipalities as well as labour strongly pressed the Province to include mothers with one child into the eligible groups for mothers' allowances. The Provincial rationale for their inclusion, however, distances itself from any recognition of need or right. After years of discussion on the question of inclusion of the mother with one child (OMPW, 1935-36, p.13), the reason given for changing the legislation was the unfair treatment to the last child in a family who was under 16. Her or his mother was no longer eligible, since she had only one child under 16, and that last child would be brought up under the meagre and humiliating relief. In 1934 the Commission was authorized to make mothers' allowance payments to those mothers whose older children between 16 and 18 years old remained in school and in 1935 to all women with only one child under 16. This provoked an increase of 38.5% in the number of women receiving an allowance (see Table 4, Appendix).

Divorcees and officially separated mothers.

The text of the legislation also excluded many other groups of women raising children without men. Neither divorcees nor officially separated mothers were eligible under the Act (OMAC, 1921-22, p.65) since legal procedures were expected to provide them with support. Throughout the 1930's the rate of divorce grew steadily in Ontario (Dobson, 1940) and the matter of custody of children and provisions for their support became a grave concern for the Children's Aid Societies in Ontario (Canadian Welfare Council, 1946a). During the War, the rate of divorces accelerated in Canada. In 1947 the number of divorces granted was 63.2 per 100,000 population contrasting with 18.4 in 1939 (Canadian Welfare Council, 1948). In 1952 a divorced and legally separated mother became eligible to mothers' allowance provided she was awarded custody of her child or children but with no provisions made or available for their maintenance or if the father had failed to carry out his obligations. Their eligibility status rested on the argument of the plight of their children. In 1954-55 they constituted 1% of the beneficiaries but this proportion had already reached 3% in 1964-65 (see Table 3, Appendix).

Wives of criminals in prison.

A further group of excluded mothers, who often received attention from social advocates (e.g., Labour Gazette, 1929, p.749), were the wives of criminals serving time in penal institutions. Their support, after much advocacy (OMAC, 1927-28, p.6), was charged, towards the end of the 1920s, to the husband's intra and extra mural employment (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1929, p.32; Lessard, 1932, p.18). As of 1951, although not directly provided under the Mothers' Allowance Act, wives of prisoners were considered under the Order in Council Clause which granted discretionary power to administrators for the inclusion of deserving cases and in 1957

wives of imprisoned men become officially eligible. Their proportion increased from 1.1% of beneficiaries in 1954-55 to 3.8% in 1964-65 (see Table 3, Appendix).

Unmarried mothers.

Unmarried mothers were specifically excluded under the Act and their children's support was delegated to the workings of the Children of Unmarried Parents Act. The Department of Public Welfare attempted the collection of payment throughout the Province on court orders or agreements and administered those funds for the benefit and protection of the child (OMPW, 1933-34). Adoption constituted the primary service offered to poor unmarried mothers. 'The unwed mother was "by far the most penalized by society" and could anticipate only "a wretched existence if she doesn't want to give up her child"' (Struthers, 1994, p.155 citing Toronto 1953 memos re: caseload of District #4).

To those who kept their child, relief constituted the only and paltry source of financial help. The Mothers' Allowance Act required marriage certificates and corresponding birth certificates for each child. During the War, despite the increase in unmarried parenthood (OMPW, 1947-48, p.13), mothers had greater access to employment opportunities and hence improved means of support (Keith, 1942, p.15). They continued, however, to be viewed with a 'gaze of moral disapproval' (Struthers, 1994, p.155). The postwar brought issues of illegitimacy and unmarried mothers to the forefront. A variety of individual treatment and group counselling portrayed these women as pathological: 'difficult to work with', 'likely to be unstable', 'quite defiant at times', 'some are mentally below average', 'extremely dependent and afraid' (see Struthers 1994, p.155).

These new professional approaches, however, began to question the traditional adoption

solution and the established profiles of unwed mothers as immoral as well as to highlight the plight of their children (e.g. Josie, 1955; Mayberry, 1957; Sutherton, 1955). At the same time, municipal authorities, particularly from the city of Toronto, campaigned for the inclusion of unwed mothers in mothers' allowance using not only social justice arguments but also the high cost of the Children's Aid Society (Struthers, 1994, p.159). In 1956 mothers of children born out of wedlock were included as eligible applicants for mothers' allowance. The rationality for their inclusion, however, distanced itself from any recognition of their circumstance or of any sympathy for their plight. The legislation was proposed as correcting a gap:

In other words, if the natural mother abandoned her children, they could possibly be provided for under the Foster Mother Clause. The unmarried mothers, however, who tried to provide homes for their illegitimate children, were unable to qualify for benefits. ... [S]ince we are interested primarily in the child's welfare, the emphasis should not be placed on the marital status of the child's parents (OMPW, 1955-56, p.42).

This rationale demonstrates that rather than an increasing acceptance of single motherhood and all the circumstances under which it occurred, what justified the inclusion of unwed mothers was the articulation of an argument not centred on motherhood. In this sense she is only grudgingly accepted among the deserving. The terminology under which these women were made eligible is also relevant because it marks the departure from eligibility based on the 'cause' of single motherhood to an indiscriminate support to children. They were no longer characterized as unmarried mothers, a historically charged label, but as mothers of children born out of wedlock.

Nevertheless, the legislation was quite restrictive in its application and the mother was required to have the care and maintenance of the child for a period of at least two years prior to application. She would be immediately cut from support if another child was conceived. The Department feared that it would encourage this kind of behaviour as well as relieve the father of

his financial and legal obligations. In 1956-57 the first fiscal year they were included in the statistics, out of wedlock mothers constituted 1.8% of all beneficiaries. The two year waiting period was reduced to six months in 1957 and unwed mothers increased to 7.6% of the caseload. In 1964-65, nine years after eligibility, they were already 14% of all mothers receiving mothers' allowance (see Table 3, Appendix).

Residency and citizenship.

Residency and citizenship requirements also excluded many groups of women raising children alone: those who were not naturalized British citizens and those with recent residence in the Province. The actual implementation of these requirements particularly demonstrates the racial, cultural and religious prejudices embedded in the Act and considered "natural" by those who enforced it. An illustration of the negative feelings towards foreign born beneficiaries of mothers' allowance can be found in Charlotte Whitton's recommendations to the Manitoba Legislature.

Citizenship restrictions ... should not be lifted further than at present, in view of the heavy immigration movement from foreign countries to Manitoba. Even present regulations are imposing a very heavy and increasing burden, from comparatively recent citizens, upon citizens of Manitoba who made possible this form of social aid (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1929, p.33).

In Ontario, widows moving from Quebec were considered a special menace being the target of a special investigation in 1922 (OMAC, 1922-23, p.6). General discriminatory arguments were commonly found among mothers' allowances advocates, as this speech of the Chair of the Toronto Local Board illustrates:

Commendably, Ontario is inviting strangers to find homes in its beautiful and bountiful area; but is it not a greater need, a closer duty, to maintain a Canadian home already intact, but yesterday flourishing under the protection of its master (Labour Gazette, 1929, p.749).

It is difficult to assess the effect of these biases through quantifiable comparisons between

recipients and the general population because correspondent population data are not available by income. The Annual Reports kept close counts of the nationality of recipients until 1947 (see Table 5, Appendix): Canadians and other British born mothers constituted an average of 89% of beneficiaries, while other naturalized mothers represented an average of 11%. The proportion of naturalized mothers receiving benefits seems to approximate that of the non-British born population reported by the Census, but this data is inconclusive since representations among the poor may vary substantially.

If the text of the Act did not exclude naturalized non-British, French or native mothers, the practices put in place by the Act constituted a major discriminatory instrument. As documented by Little (1991 cited in Struthers, 1994, p.46) some local boards disqualified women because they could not read or write English; or produce the necessary legal documentation. 'Little also notes ... that black and aboriginal women "suffered most. Almost every Black mother who applied had experienced neighbours attempting to besmirch her reputation". Aboriginal mothers often had their claims dismissed because of inadequate documentation by Ottawa of Indian births' (Struthers, 1994, p.301, footnote 74). Requirements that applicants procure the official certificates from the Registrar-General's Department further excluded those not familiar with the country and its language. In addition, the explicit exclusion of baptismal certificates as an acceptable proof of birth excluded Catholics and those who gave birth in predominantly Catholic places (OMAC, 1920-21, p.17). The increased reliance on documentation and the institutionalization of discretionary practices made racist and discriminatory practices even more ingrained in the Act's implementation. Its consistent practice is evidence not only of systemic racism and bigotry but also how those applying the legislation - boards, investigators and

administrators - sanctioned these principles.

Financial circumstances.

A great number of women raising children alone were made ineligible because in the eyes of the Commission they could manage, that is the Commission judged that their real or potential financial circumstances made them not really in need (OMAC, 1920-21, p.10). The regulations of the Act established limits to the value of property and assets, the exclusion of those in receipt of allowance from other funds and the Commission's own judgement determined if the applicants should have been able to support their home through better administration of assets, the help of relatives, their own or their children's earnings. These exclusions were effected through a detailed inquiry into the financial standing of the family coupled with the most harsh examples of the exercise of discretionary power.

It is not the wish of the Commission to cause any weakening of the family's own energy and self reliance and where it is felt that it is or should be self maintaining no allowance is granted. ... [I]t has been found necessary to consider the matter of unemployment as separate to the Mothers' Allowance question, and where the family could be self maintaining without an allowance, were all the members employed, it is not considered eligible (OMAC, 1920-21, p.25).

Financial reasons were the primary grounds to refuse applications. In the first ten years of the Act, financial reasons accounted for between 56% to 35% (an average of 42%) of all the reasons given by the Commission for declaring an applicant ineligible. During the depression, the Commission admitted that the lack of employment made it harder to declare families self supporting (OMPW, 1935-36, p.14) and financial reasons dropped to only one fifth of the reasons for ineligibility. Gradually, however, ineligibility due to financial reasons grew to about one quarter of the applications by the 1960s (Table 1, Appendix).

Mothers were subjected not only to tests of destitution of assets and property but also to

the requirement of demonstrating their stamina in attempting to provide on their own. Deserving subjects were portrayed in the Annual Reports through images of high destitution but with a determination to fight it:

a look of hope and contentment (OMAC, 1921-22, p.24).
the ability to manage.... shows wonderful thrift on the part of most of the beneficiaries and their pride in their efforts and in their independence of local relief has very beneficial effect on the children and their plans for a self-supporting future (OMAC, 1921-22, p.28).

The Commission was, however, torn between the dilemma of rewarding the thrifty who carried insurance but, at the same time, excluding those with assets.

Are the thrifty to be penalized for their thrift, and the indolent rewarded for their indolence? The Act does not permit the granting of an allowance if an applicant has more than \$500.00 in liquid assets, but if a man carried insurance, his widow would probably have such assets (OMAC, 1929-30, p.5).

In 1925, using the rhetoric of prevention, and rewarding providence, the Commission urged 'heads of families to protect their dependents by some form of insurance' (OMAC, 1925-27, p.5).

In 1929-30 to encourage insurance, the administration devised a scheme to fix the negotiable assets in an annuity to be retired at a later period allowing the widow to have a small income in addition to the allowance. Insurance also counted with the support of judges, official guardians and insurance companies (OMPW, 1939-40) and the government appreciated the reduction in amounts it occasioned (OMPW, 1949-50, p.16).

Increased investigation on the family's ability to work and strong encouragement of self sufficiency constituted the primary instrument of exclusion used in the postwar (e.g., OMPW, 1949-50, p.15). This period, of 'increasing prosperity in the Province', saw a marked growth in rejections of applications due to the administrative judgement that 'the family concerned being considered at the time capable of self-support' (OMPW, 1952-53, p.11). Rejections for financial reasons jumped from 10% in 1951 to 21% in 1952-53 and represented a quarter or more of all

rejections of applications from 1955-56 onwards (see Table 1, Appendix).

Morally unfit.

In addition to all these exclusionary regulations and practices, the requirement that the mother be regarded by the Local Boards and by the investigators as a fit and proper person to have the care and custody of her children occasioned further rejections. The mothers' standard of home maintenance was assessed with very harsh criteria and disqualification occurred on 'a record of immorality, neglect of her children, or of feeble mindedness, with its consequent shiftlessness, inefficiency and dirt' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.27). Little (1994b) has documented extensively how the investigators report and that of the Local Board, reflecting their class, race, cultural and religious affiliations, used stern moral requirements to inform the Commission on the mother 'fitness for the position' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.60) of providing proper care to her children. Struthers (1994) adds that 'this strict insistence on the moral probity and deservedness of the mothers receiving help was a necessary corollary to the sanctification of motherhood itself upon which the campaign for mothers' pension had been constructed' (p.34; see Mitchinson, 1987 and Valverde, 1991 for the religious and class roots of early women's movements).

If disqualified the mothers were referred to Children's Aid Society (OMAC, 1920-21, p.11) 'in order that they would be under the supervision of an appropriate organization' (OMPW, 1941-42, p.17). In the first year alone the unfitness of the mother was the cause of 2.7% of the ineligible applications (see Table 1, Appendix). To 'charges of unsympathetic administration ... especially in dealing with cases of women deemed "unfit and improper persons"', the chair of the Commission answered that 'not lack of sympathy, but a necessarily high sense of responsibility to the taxpayers, as well as towards the widows and their children must call for conscientious

discrimination and judgement in enforcement' (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1927, p.30). "Not a fit and proper person" reached 8% of the reasons for ineligibility in 1925-26. It remained below this level for about three decades until 1957-58 when it represented 19.6% of the reasons for ineligibility (see Table 1, Appendix). Significantly this year coincides with the year applications from unwed mothers began to soar representing an increase of 14% over the applications of the previous year (calculated from data from OMPW, 1956-57, p.54 and OMPW, 1957-58, p.60). A judgement of mothers' character by the regional administrator continued to formally incorporate the general conditions for the allowance until the family benefits allowance of 1967 (Department of National Health and Welfare, 1960, p.51).

Exclusion/inclusion.

In summary, the question of who was eligible shows a variety of interesting aspects for the understanding of who is the subject of mothers' allowance and the conditions of this subjectivation. The allowance represents a very specific recognition of motherhood. The Act itself was described, in its first assented version in 1920 as '[a]n Act to provide for the payment of allowances *in certain cases* to the mothers of Dependent Children' (my emphasis). And in fact, conditions through which poor mothers were judged deserving of public support eliminated from the benefits of the Act the majority of poor mothers in need of support. Eligibility criteria enforced by the Local Boards or by municipal clerks who received the applications, certainly prevented many other poor mothers from submitting an application.

Those who managed to submit an application but were rejected, from 30% to 50% of all applications depending on the year (Table 6, Appendix), constitute just a symbolic representation of the excluded. Table 1, in the Appendix, shows the reasons for ineligibility of applications given

by the allowance administrators in an aggregate form. Compiled to provide an indication of the process of exclusion through investigation, Table 1 relied on data provided by the reports which from 1937-38 onwards appeared already in aggregate form, hence the large number of cases in the category *other*. The records show that, in the first decade, the large majority of exclusions were on the grounds of financial circumstances. As we have seen this form of means testing included not only actual means but also potential means to provide for the family according to the administrators' opinion. Around the Depression and War years, medical reasons, a scientific form of defining the fathers' total and permanent incapacitation, became a major reason for rejecting applications. The postwar consolidated financial circumstances followed by issues associated with marital status and *not fit and proper* as the main justifications for rendering applications ineligible (see Table 1, Appendix).

Through these mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, eligibility is taken out of the realm of politics and into that of administration. The eligibility process institutionalized civil servants as judges not only of good and normal motherhood, but also of which families society should invest to reform. The specific cases granted an allowance became something other than the particular cases entitled to public support: they emerged as the definition of good motherhood and deservedness. This does not mean, however, that these families were integrated among the 'normal' husband-and-wife families. In fact they are granted a special status of being recognized as "other" families but expected to function within the parameters of normality with help and supervision. Those excluded from the Act were not only denied the financial benefits but also tacitly deemed unworthy morally or financially. Invisible, casted outside the boundary of the "other" family the excluded mothers underwent specific transformations to become eligible under

the Act. For those the Act represented a definite intervention in, and possibly the split, of their families. Hence by separating poor mothers into two groups the Act and its implementation specified the meaning of both the included and the excluded. In addition, this process, by defining the terms under which those outside of normality could enter a special group, i.e., by defining *the other*, helped to map the boundaries of normality itself and to bring all motherhood and family relations under scrutiny.

To those included, despite the supervision and the meagre allocation, the allowance granted a special category which reinforced the meaning of its beneficiaries as a select and worthy group: an exclusive category by comparison to the majority of poor mothers. As in the US, the primary image relied upon by administrators was that of the widow with children: 'a category more mythical than empirical, which served to obfuscate rather than educate, and symbolized passivity, self sacrifice and victimization' (Gordon, 1994, p.59). The beneficiaries, however, were constantly reconstituted through the progressive addition of new groups of mothers as a result of the struggles of the excluded and those that spoke for them. The discourses and circumstances through which these re-significations occur profoundly marked the entitlements of mothers and the rationalities and practices of the program. Of particular significance is the pressure exerted by women advocates through the municipalities on the grounds of social justice and fiscal stability. The inclusion of new eligible groups, however, did not come as a recognition of the cause of their poverty as deserving public support. Increasingly women became eligible for mothers' allowance on the grounds of the needs of children and the coherence of administration, despite their marital status. Although the cause of poverty gradually assumed a secondary role, the distinctive character of mothers' allowance vis à vis general unemployment relief was maintained through

means and moral eligibility. As a result mothers, despite their eligible status, were treated with increased suspicion and intrusive investigation. These stringent criteria and their discretionary application strip the beneficiaries from any actual feeling of security and stability based in the support of the allowance.

This section has presented the evolution of mothers' allowance eligibility criteria as one of the five processes I proposed in building an understanding of how the governmentalization of the single mothers's complex produced very specific forms of rule and a ruled subject, the dependent mothers. Both the development of an administrative structure - the form of government - and the evolution of the eligibility criteria - the naming of subjects - have illustrated how the actual practices of government have a creative and formative potential. But it is also important to notice that the rationalities which originated the initiative are also dynamic and in constant change. The next section focuses on the transformations in the rationalities that sustain the mothers' allowance initiative in interaction with the practices of implementation. It addresses the issues of what, in the eyes of the administration of the initiative, is the justification for the program.

What is Governed: Programmatic Justifications

Throughout its trajectory from 1920 to 1967, the Ontario Mothers' Allowance Act was presented in the policy discourses as primarily directed towards the wellbeing of children. But this interest in children was qualified, expressed and emphasized differently across time. As a textually mediated account of ruling, the Annual Reports offer the ideal opportunity to examine these changes in the meanings of the expressed justifications. The transformations in the justifications for the initiative occur in a variety of different aspects, each modifying or pulling in a

specific direction one particular feature of the governing program and its subject. Overall the trajectory of these justifications describes a movement from a support to mother work and its effects on children to a support for a program of transformation of certain poor families into self-supporting units.

In its original formulation, as the Commission stated in its early days, 'the Act was framed in the interests of the children' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.11). The Commissioners expressed two central meanings to this primary aim. The first focused on the material possibilities financial support offered. Through it children would be 'given an opportunity for health, education, home life and happiness that without the Act would for them have been impossible' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.11). The second meaning was based on the argument that mothers supervision was essential for the child's healthy development (OMAC, 1921-22, p.35). It focused on the mother's conduct through an emphasis on keeping her at home as much as possible. These meanings were consolidated and re-affirmed in later reports confirming their centrality:

The majority of the mothers appreciate the assistance that is being given to them by the Government to maintain homes for their children and to make possible for their children to attend school (OMPW, 1937-38, p.13).

This welfare measure recognizes the vital importance of maintaining the family as the social unit best qualified to care for the children (OMPW, 1946-47, p.17).

Assistance in recognition of childhood needs within the family (OMPW, 1957-58, p.4).

A variety of nuances and appended discussions were, however, attached to these meanings. These statements of aim acknowledge the work of the mother through the establishment of a causal link between this work and the wellbeing of children. Nevertheless, both mother-work and the wellbeing of children were situated within an understanding of the family and its contributions to the nation (see Gölz, 1993 re: discourses of family and nation).

Anyone who has observed the working of the Mothers' Allowance Act can have no doubts as to its value as a constructive piece of social legislation. If, as frequently stated, "the home is the heart of the

nation", an Act that has done so much to improve conditions in the home should be given the credit it deserves (OMAC, 1923-24, p.17).

The Province must eventually feel in its social and economic life the effects of the thousands of children enjoying the blessings of home and mother care made possible through the administration of this Act (OMPW, 1930-31, p.10).

The keeping together of families through the medium of Mothers' Allowances will be of immeasurable value in our social and economic fabric (OMPW, 1938-39, p.5).

The allowance, then, was justified by its value as a public service, its social and economic contribution to the nation through the production of good citizens. This focus on the family and its importance for the social and economic organization of the nation carried with it an innovative approach. Its innovation was based on a clear contrast to charity with its 'limitations of amounts, its demoralizing effects and its destruction of self respect among our people' (OMAC, 1923-24, p.16). As well, the administrators stated, the Act established 'a reward for service not a form of public relief' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.22). It proposed non-intrusive, dignified and uplifting investigation practices (OMAC, 1920-21, p.18) and the provision of regular financial help which would allow the mother to plan, 'giving [her] a sense of stability ... [so] ... that she is inspired to maintain a higher level of conduct and efficiency as a mother' (OMAC, 1923-24, p.16). The 'impersonal payment of the allowance by cheque through the mail' was described as eliminating the 'humiliating feeling of charity' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.23).

Immediately after a family comes under the influence of the Mothers' Allowances Act, the mother knows that she is to receive a cheque each month, she knows the cheque is not a mere gift to her, neither is it a form of charity, it is paid to her by the Government for a distinct purpose, and she must fulfil that purpose or the monthly cheque may be withdrawn (OMAC, 1925-27, p.20).

There is, then, an emphasis on the effects the allowance generated in the mothers which became one of the central justification of the legislation. During the depression commentators often remarked on mothers' allowance being regarded in Canada and the US 'as a specialized form of family welfare services' separate and distinct from relief (Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare, 1933, p.15; see also Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare, 1934, p.31).

The Commission attempted, through a variety of means such as public speeches, to advance an image of mothers' allowance as selective and different from measures addressing the general, improvident and undeserving masses (Cross, 1939, p.3). This ingrained recognition of mothers' allowances as an active program of change vis à vis general relief measures was an important element in setting a hierarchy of income support programs within a welfare system and in claiming for the categorical subject of this policy higher levels of benefits.

The specific character of the scheme was also marked by its objective to support only certain deserving groups of the fatherless family whose character and ability to be changed could be developed. 'The allowance brings relief and hope to the home of the better type' (OMAC, 1924-25, p.15) mused the Commission. The allowance was not exclusively a financial support but a form of individual intervention in the form of a character treatment. It was:

just enough to give encouragement to the mother, so that with careful management on her part and by doing a little work to supplement the allowance she is able to keep her self and her family comfortable in every respect. Were the allowance made to cover the full maintenance it would create wastefulness and probably laziness. Without any assistance the mother would become discouraged and lose all interest in herself and her family. The encouragement thus given to the mother to be industrious and endeavour to get along has a good deal to do in making her family likewise (OMAC, 1923-24, p.17).

Despite the veiled recognition of the importance of the work of the mother, the aim at building the character of beneficiaries, at making beneficiaries self sufficient, in fact transfer to the mothers' individual sacrifices the responsibility to support a family with an allowance below adequacy. And rather than exalting the value of the work of raising a child, the simplistic causal association with child wellbeing down played the unrealistic expectations of administrators and assumed an environment conducive to the healthy development of future citizens in which the mother-work was a given.

A general thread of emphasis on self-support can be traced to the early days of the

allowance. During the depression the Commission admitted that families had, as well, to be 'given the least opportunity' in order for them to 'become self-supporting and the children [to] become good citizens' (OMPW, 1937-38, p.13). During the War and postwar employment boom, the Commission boasted about the numbers of families becoming self-supporting (OMPW, 1941-42, p.23; OMPW, 1942-43, p.6; OMPW, 1954-5, p.3) and considered special situations in which the mother would not be able to work (OMPW, 1943-44, p.6). By the 1960s, however, the emphasis on self-support becomes one of the main values of the program, in sync with the aim of producing self supporting citizens within a sophisticated system of welfare:

It is not enough merely to maintain persons on public assistance. Increasing efforts must be directed towards re-establishing individuals and families on a self supporting status within their communities, wherever this is remotely possible. ... Prevention of dependency and the re-establishment of persons are of greater importance, at this time, than any other step which might be advanced in favour of those receiving public assistance (OMPW, 1961-62, p.3).

While these aspects of mothers' allowance were distinct, they were also interactive and received different emphasis throughout the implementation. Mothers' allowance aimed at supporting the destitute mother to keep her children and provide a home for them as a necessary service in society. But in doing so it intended to be markedly distinct from charity and relief, among other things, in the sense that the allowance brought with it different mechanisms of delivery and screening of subjects and, as well, provided a road to self-support. Within the complex formulation of the importance of children for the nation, the work of the mother raising children alone initially specified in the reports, becomes gradually taken for grant and the importance of preventing dependency assumes central stage.

The mothers' allowance scheme occupied a special status in relation to relief programs distinguishing its beneficiaries from other poor groups by virtue of its screening and diagnosing

practices, as well as its character building measures which amounted to transferring to beneficiaries the responsibility for leaving poverty. This emphasis on self sufficiency restated and reinforced the social expectations of the family as a self-supporting unit and formulates the mothers receiving the allowance as those with good prognosis for rehabilitation, that is, approximating a normal family unit. These expectations of normalization, however, implied in themselves that the beneficiaries of mothers' allowances became a special kind of mothers, performing another form of motherhood from that of the two parents family. This *other* motherhood implied a subjection to the requirement of her transformation and the articulation of the provider role into that of motherhood itself. It is the function of the initiative in promoting this transformation into self sufficiency that becomes its central justification and rationale.

In this sense when mothers' allowance is transformed into family benefits, the justification for the program does not lie in its capacity to support poor mothers or mother work but rather on its mechanisms for distinguishing the 'better type' and promoting in them the necessary changes to a self-supporting life. It is the program of government proposed that is the main justification for the initiative. And this program is based on its subject acceptance of failure, immediate endorsement of incompetence and willingness to change rather than on a subject who is empowered and confident in her ability to assume her role as head of household.

Administration, Eligibility and Justifications

This chapter has introduced the first three processes I isolated to illustrate the gradual, repetitive and intricate production of the dependent mother and her way of life. These are referred to as *broad* in the sense that they configure the outlook and parameters of the mothers'

allowance initiative. They comprise the lengthy and experimental development of the apparatuses of program delivery, program recording and accounting; the slow enlargement and transformation of the eligibility criteria; and the subtle and constant metamorphosing of the justifications and emphases of the program. These aspects of the implementation of mothers' allowances show, in a variety of angles, the governmentalization of the single mother complex, that is, the translations of ideas, rationalities and feelings about women raising children alone into a network of activities and actions directed at governing or ruling these women's lives. A particular important effect of this governmentalized complex is the creation of the dependent mother, a subject who rather than the cause or impetus to this program of action is in fact its very outcome.

When Family Benefits assumed the place of mothers' allowance in 1967, it consolidated a multiplicity of changes and transformations in one piece of legislation. It was for this reason chosen as the marker or point of emergence of the dependent mother. In fact the transformations were a long process arriving at Family Benefits and continued incessantly after that date. The administrative structure embedded in Family Benefits was derived from a labour intensive and centralized structure of volunteer decision making and, as well, a specific information gathering and recording technique. From this original structure a tradition of intense face-to-face contact, discretionary decisions and judgement of mothers based on particular assumptions about motherhood was inscribed in the practices of government of the allowance. The subject of the practices of Family Benefits was an administrable subject, captured in files through standardized indicators which addressed very specific aspects of the lives of the families. These aspects, to be explored in the next chapter, became the parameters through which motherhood would be judged.

The criteria for eligibility define who can become a subject of mothers' allowance. They

are, above all, a mechanism of exclusion since through them the majority of poor mothers in need were made ineligible. These criteria were, hence, the plotting device in the continuum from good and bad motherhood. They created a categorical subject. The initiative originally addressed primarily widows, but the proportion of mothers in this category gradually declined as a multiplicity of other poor women raising children alone joined the ranks of beneficiaries under specific categories. This was, however, far from an evolution of progressive enlargements in the admission criteria. The discussion here has shown that each new category of subject has introduced different approaches to the way the program conceptualized the government of subjected women and their families. These different approaches were manifested in the various investigative procedures, in the justification for the program and in the emphasis assigned to its aims and components. Categorical subjects represent distinct groups managed through different procedures.

The changes in emphasis in the rationalities used to justify the mothers' allowances are a further important process in the study of the governmentalization of the single mother complex. The initiative was originally justified, or found its rationale for existence, in the need to help poor mothers raise children and in the importance of these children for the nation. However, this aim was quickly qualified by the value of the initiative itself. It was not just a question of helping these women in their mother work but of helping them in a particular fashion. While the early characterizations of the program were linked to its distinction from charity work, it was its gradual consolidation of a program of transformations to be effected in the women it aimed to help that became its main *raison d'être*. It was, thus, its own governmental capacities, its power to act upon a group of poor eligible mothers, that justified the initiative itself. This government

was aimed at a domain of mothers as the *other* mothers, subjected to eligibility criteria, reconstructed through administrative mechanisms and targeted for transformation towards self sufficiency. These were malleable and transformable subjects.

In the next chapter, I discuss the interactions of these broad processes with the specific and detailed technologies used in the mothers' allowance initiative to act upon women raising children alone; as well as the integration of this initiative into a national welfare system. These last two processes will complete the first case study exploring the nature and meaning of single mothers as well as the social welfare policies addressing this complex and entangled concept.

Chapter 5

THE GOVERNMENTALIZATION OF THE SINGLE MOTHER COMPLEX: TECHNOLOGIES, CONSOLIDATION AND EFFECTS

Bruno Latour's reflections on power are suggestive here. Rather than considering power as the explanation of the success of authorities in composing a network of forces, Latour proposes a view of power as an effect of such a composition. A powerful actor, agent or institution is one that, in the particular circumstances obtaining at a given moment, is able to successfully enrol and mobilise persons, procedures and artifacts in the pursuit of its goals. Powers are stabilised in lasting networks only to the extent that the mechanisms of enrolment are materialised in various more or less persistent forms (Rose & Miller, 1992, p.183-184).

Introduction

The study of mothers' allowance undertaken here has as one of its central focuses the exploration of practices of social programs. Practices and their creative potential have routinely been relegated to a secondary plane by social policy traditions. These have demonstrated a much larger interest in the rationalities of social justice and distribution of wealth than in the exploration of practices which implemented those ideals. These practices are believed to be a special domain driven by compassion and empathy but subordinated to the rationalities. Practices of social programs and initiatives, within this set of beliefs, represent the self-expression of individual workers and their individual training or capacity but also practices are understood as encapsulated by the rationalities of the programs being implemented. By focusing on practices, this study is locating the actual activities and actions implied in social programs among the processes which produce the *effect of power*, mentioned in the above quote, generated by social programs. In this

sense the practices of a program are part of the network of force mobilized towards a will to govern.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the mothers' allowance initiative is a particular important site to focus the study of practices. As one of the first public welfare programs in Canada, it chartered new territory and influenced the whole welfare system in Canada (Struthers, 1994) when it defined a population and developed the strategies, techniques and procedures to govern the lives of certain groups of people. Among those activities the previous chapter has followed the development of administrative structure, eligibility criteria and justifications of the mothers' allowance initiative. Using the opening quote, we can understand these as power relations in that these processes are successful in mobilizing different groups of people, a variety of procedures and an extensive apparatus of administration towards the management of women raising children alone. They created the dependent mother as the subject of Family Benefits, a subject that, as an effect of these processes, is administrable, categorical and transformable. These constituted three of the five processes I delineate in the beginning of Chapter 4 to characterize the governmentalization of the single mother complex.

As in the previous chapter the primary source used here are the Annual Reports compiled by the administration to account to the legislature and to the public in general for the mothers' allowances initiative. The Reports, as the official voice of the initiative gate-keepers, provided their view of the main elements of the program and their functioning. Hence, rather than an *objective* account of what happened, here I am analysing a specific production of truth coherently organized to portray the program as a desirable product. The Annual Reports provide a description of the activities of the initiative in a variety of formats. At the onset of the initiative,

these descriptions were quite detailed, with examples of conversations or excerpts of letters. As the initiative develops and its administration and management mature these descriptions become more numerical and the details of the activities taken for granted. In this sense the style of the reports itself becomes an aspect of the analysis as well as the textual expression of the accounts.

The present chapter discusses the remaining two processes of mothers' allowances. In "How Government is Exercised" I detail the gradual development of the components of the intervention: financial support, in-kind and tagged benefits; supervision; and social services. Then in the next section "Emergence of the Dependent Mother: A National System of Welfare", I identify the final process studied, that is, the integration of the initiative into a new national welfare system. The chapter will, then, conclude with a characterization of the dependent mother and her particular mode of life enshrined in the Family Benefits Act.

How Government is Exercised: The Technologies of Government

Technologies of government constitute the ways to render the program operable (Rose & Miller, 1992, p.183). They refer to strategies, mechanisms and techniques. I grouped those around four distinct components of the initiative which, each with its specific mechanisms, utilize a variety of technologies of government or rule: the provision of financial support; in-kind and tagged benefits; supervision; and personal social services. Each of these represents a particular angle through which mothers' allowances acted upon individuals and each has its own and particular ways of operating. They occupy a central place in the project of this thesis: how certain women and their families were isolated from the populations and their management was made possible and generative of a singular subject. They illustrate the role of ritualized repetition and

performativity as constitutive of subjects (Butler, 1993, see discussion in chapter 3).

Financial Support.

To those mothers lucky enough to be granted an allowance, the Mothers' Allowance Act guaranteed a monthly amount based on each family's needs as interpreted by administrators. Nevertheless, in defining the amount of the allowance, the Province did not spare its beneficiaries the humiliation and stigma of charity by providing them with an adequate amount based on the actual costs of living. Instead, based on the expense of caring for children within Ontario institutions, and the monthly average of mothers' allowance in Manitoba, governmental officials proposed a figure approximately half that already used in Ontario by the Patriotic Fund (Struthers, 1994, p.32). In the first year of operation the Commission established a temporary maximum ceiling calculated with the provincially allocated budget in mind.

It was early realized that there would be a very large number of applications, many more than first anticipated and it was decided to strike a flat rate of payment until the probable number of beneficiaries could be determined, and the probable cost to the Province. It was agreed to pay a maximum of \$55 monthly in the city and \$45 monthly in towns, villages and rural districts (OMAC, 1920-21, p.11).

By the second year of operation this initial ceiling was already consolidated as 'the city and country rate' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.10) which included a monthly sum of \$5.00 per child up to the number of five. Ten years later, in 1930, the scale of payment was still the same: \$30.00 per month for a mother with two children in a rural district, \$35.00 in a town of larger than 5,000 people or separated district, and \$40 in a city with an extra \$5 for each additional child under 16 years of age (OMPW, 1930-31, p.3). The average allowance varied substantially in the first year, from \$43.31 to \$25.65, but stayed around \$36.00 for the remainder of the decade and, then, progressively reached \$40.00 by the War years (see Table 4, Appendix for the available average

family allocation per month).

Hence, a central characteristic of the allowance, as highlighted by Struthers (1994, p.32), was that 'in another precedent that would echo throughout the building of Ontario's welfare bureaucracy, ... mothers' allowance would have a ceiling but not a floor'. And this ceiling was one of the lowest paid by any mothers' allowances schemes at the time. In 1927, it was pretty well established that '[t]he scale of pensions is not sufficient for full maintenance, especially in the City of Toronto, where living expenses are so high' (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1927, p.31). Rates compiled for the Manitoba Government (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1929, p.30) showed that 'a standard family of mother and three children' would receive \$45.00 in Ontario, \$75.00 in Manitoba, \$60.00 in Alberta, \$57.50 in British Columbia. Only Saskatchewan, at \$30.00, paid a lower allowance than Ontario. When, in 1935, mothers with one child became eligible a chief consideration was the cost of the amendment and in the first year the average rate for these families was \$28.63 per month (OMPW, 1935-36, p.14).

The allowance was a system of maximum ceilings which took into consideration solely the number of children and size of residential location. It did not, however, establish a fixed or certain amount. Deductions on the maximum rate were the practice with wages of children, any source of income, resources and assets being taken into account to determine the amount recommended for each family. In the beginning, the Commission itself admitted that '[f]or the present the allowance paid under the Mothers' Allowance Act is insufficient to maintain the family' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.21) and reflected that 'the ability of the mother to maintain a good standard home on a very small income is nothing short of amazing' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.27). By the Third Annual Report, however, the Commission was already considering supplementation, not

a necessary occurrence but an integral aspect of the program:

The allowance is not in itself sufficient to maintain the family, and where there are no sons or daughters of wage-earning age, the usual means of supplementing it to a sufficient income for the expense of keeping up the home is by the mothers's own earnings (OMAC, 1922-23, p.19).

The supplementary work by mothers was seen then 'as encouraging ambition, thrift and independence' (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1929, p.29). Arrangements made for the care of the children while the mother was away were meticulously scrutinized by the inspectors and night work was discouraged. Part-time work or earnings without leaving the home were preferable in order to allow the mother to spend more time in the home (OMAC, 1920-21, p.21). Mothers' earnings usually came from charwork, general domestic service such as laundry and pressing work at home, and sale of produce. Others supplemented their allowance through sewing, knitting, baking and a diversity of crafts including making artificial flowers, Christmas tree decorations and plasticine work (OMAC, 1921-22, p.29; OMAC, 1922-23, p.19) but these activities required special training. Keeping roomers and boarders, although a common source of supplementary earnings was closely monitored by the inspectors and required spare, adequate space³, an uncommon item among the poor. Supplementation of the allowance was also sought through charity donations or petition for municipal relief, a fact that the administrators recognized but justified as used only in exceptional situations of illness or extra expenditures.

These conditions, however, were deplored by those who came in direct contact with the mothers such as the members of Local Boards:

In many homes we find that supplementary aid is absolutely necessary, and is given by individuals, organizations, institutions - the House of Industry being the chief source of supplies from the City. It

³ The Census 1931 concludes a study of lodgers with the following sentence: 'Keeping lodgers is thus more likely to be a source of income to the better class of wage-earners than to the poorer classes and cannot be resorted to as an amelioration for poverty' (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1931 vol 12, p.64)

has always been deplored by our Board that City Relief has been found necessary for any beneficiaries under the Mothers' Allowance Act; for the spirit of independence that a government cheque is calculated to engender, is minimized, if not nullified, by frequent appeals to people charity. We hope that the flat rates will be increased in the near future, and that eventually scientific and consequently more economic systems of budgeting will replace the flat rates (Labour Gazette, 1929, p.745).

Others called for the adjustment and payment of the allowance on the basis of a pension as under the Workmen's Compensation Act (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1927, p.30). The Neighbourhood Workers Association 'would gladly see them [mothers' allowance rates] raised' but, providing an illustration of typical women's organization strategy, it considered that 'before making a proposal of this kind ... there should be some survey as to the probable cost and the willingness of the Province to bear this cost' (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1927, p.31). From municipal authorities, which saw the cost of allowance inadequacy in their relief bill, there were calls for bringing the allowance in line with the costs of full maintenance (Struthers, 1994, p.99). During the depression, however, despite pressure from a variety of fronts, the Province kept the amount of the allowance unchanged. Total costs were maintained under control, despite enlargement of eligibility criteria, through a stringent application of the regulations.

Intense advocacy continued during the War. In the City of Toronto, nutritional and cost of living studies demonstrated how families and children were undernourished and constantly hungry. An increase in the cost of living of 15% between the years of 1939 and 1942 underscored the inadequacy of the allowance. Aid, women working with a variety of organizations demanded, should be transformed from an accounting activity to one based on needs (see Struthers, 1994, ch.3, 4). In 1943, intense municipal pressure and an increase in the Federal Old Age Pension forced the first increase in the allowance rate since 1920. The 20% increase, however, was recognized even by the Province as inadequate (Struthers, 1994, p.122)

and in 1948 the maximum allowance was further increased to \$42 with an additional amount of \$10 per child. By mid 1950s the average monthly amount paid was \$82.56 including basic allowance, special assistance and fuel (OMPW, 1954-55, p.10). In addition, families were granted access to medical care and urged to take part-time employment or contributions from relatives and friends to supplement the allowance. The major supplementation to the allowance, however, came in the form of the federal universal Family Allowance in 1944. It increased the income of a mother with three children receiving mothers' allowance by 40% (Struthers, 1994, p.123).

Substantial changes in the amount of the allowance only occurred in 1957 with the introduction of budgetary calculations. They were introduced in the booming postwar years with the Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowance Act of 1957 which intended to upgrade the allowances to address the needs of families in a more realistic manner (OMPW, 1957-58, p.4). In most part this upgrade responded to pressure from municipalities which, in face of the high postwar inflation, were providing supplemental relief in a massive scale to beneficiaries of the Act. Mothers' allowance rates were at a lower level than those of relief, and even Provincial Field Workers attested to the extreme strains families were under (Struthers, 1994, p.163). Budgetary calculations substituted the former maximum rate for several ceiling amounts provided for food, clothing, shelter, fuel and other household items. Hence, according to the Minister of Public Welfare, mothers' allowance inaugurated 'the principle of allowances based on the budgetary requirements of the family within prescribed limits' (Labour Gazette, 1957, p.602). In fact these were exaggerated claims since the 'total allowance was little more than a selection of flat rates added together' (Williams, 1984, p.79). Also, as discussed by Hurl (1989), these rates, far from representing family actual needs, were aligned with other aid programs and labour market

earnings. Each family's allowance was determined by deducting their estimated income from their expenses, calculated through the specific rates (see Department of National Health and Welfare, 1960, pp.51-54). The maximum allowance payable became \$120 for mother with one child, increasing gradually to \$180 for seven or more beneficiaries. In addition to the basic amount covering the budgetary needs, mothers could also be considered for supplementary aid for sundries, medically required special food, life insurance premiums and special fuel allowance. They continued to receive free medical and dental services and hospital care insurance. Foster mothers, however, were maintained on the original flat rate.

The regulations to the 1957 Act also provided, for the first time, a formal incentive to encourage mothers to work part-time: women working up to half a week were allowed to keep 25% of their earnings without deduction in the allowance. This regulation substituted the individual assessment of each family's deduction and necessary income previously in place for a numeric across the board deduction. It had enormous consequences for the beneficiaries of the Act. First it made impossible for any mother receiving the allowance to improve her financial situation through work since the individual assessment was substituted by a numerical cap on earnings. Secondly, as remarked by Struthers (1994, p.163), budgetary calculations initiate an era in which the calculations become increasingly complex and beneficiaries lost track of its meaning. And thirdly, it turn out to be the first strict direction regarding the number of hours an eligible mother could be employed for actual income gains, i.e., no more than 24 hours each week (Labour Gazette, 1957, p.1501).

These unprecedented work regulations mark a definite transformation in the allowances: from requirement to supplement the allowance and hence improve the family's situation to a

restriction on how much the allowance could be supplemented and how well off the family could be. These transformations can be traced to the profoundly contradictory nature of the Act, i.e.; the recognition of the importance of mother-work but the unwillingness to adequately value this work. But it is the administrative requirement to centrally calculate the allowance and to standardized the procedures for the initiative that brought about the across the board calculation procedures introducing into the practices of the allowance, to use current policy analysis language, clear formal disincentives to work. These new practices institutionalize the latent contradictions of the mothers' allowance initiative and fix women raising children alone in permanent required poverty.

Since the number of beneficiaries had remained relatively small since the war, the new calculations represented an increase of only 21.7% in the total provincial expenditures with mothers' allowances (see Department of Health and Welfare, 1961, p.87). It produced an average increase of 17% in the monthly payment per family who were faced, from 1951 to 1958, with an increase in the cost of living of 60%. The recession between 1958-1962 made supplementation through part-time work even harder and although half of the beneficiaries supplemented their income through work they also had to seek help from Red Cross, the churches and others for food. Significantly, female family heads were increasingly over represented in the low income population accounting in 1961 for 13.2% of all low income heads while only 7.8% of all families were headed by women (Ross, 1975, p.14). Shelter costs, particularly in Toronto, were very high and families were spending most of their allowance on rent. In line with the municipal shelter allowance which were frozen since 1951, Provincial shelter rates were flagrantly inadequate, the Toronto Social Planning Council campaigned (see Struthers, 1994, p.192).

In 1961 and 1963 new regulations made further changes to the calculations of income, hours of employment and exemptions from gifts. They provided pre-added budget calculations for food, clothing and household maintenance according to family size, and separated calculations for shelter and utilities. The maximum ceiling was increased to \$300 per month. As shelter costs continued high, specially in Toronto, and the ceiling limited the allowances, supplementary aid became, primarily, a way to supplement rental costs (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1977, p.25). The budgetary calculation made substantial improvements to the amounts of the allowances although they remained far below the costs of raising a family. According to the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto while in 1961 and 1962 the allowance was sufficient to cover 57% of the needs of a mother with one child, as measured by the basket of goods method pioneered by the Council during the war and widely used by activists since then. In 1965 this adequacy indicator reached its highest point during the decade at 69% dropping to 60% by 1969 (see Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1977, p.56). These figures point to an inadequacy of 31% at the highest point.

In summary, the determination and allocation of financial support constitute a central technology through which poor mothers were made into dependent subjects. Throughout the history of the mothers' allowance scheme, the calculation of allowance amounts, despite the rhetoric of being geared to the cost of living, was in fact never sufficient to raise a family even by the most modest standards. The very meagre amounts placed women in the conflicting position of fulfilling the Commission's expectations of normal family life with the pragmatic need of allowance supplementation through work, a requirement that was never demanded of mothers receiving, for example, military allowance and most definitely condemned, during the first part of

the century, for the two parent heterosexual family. This dissociation between the amounts of the allowance and the expectations of the program is deeply ingrained in the subjects of the allowance and virtually set the mothers to failure.

The allowances provided no minimum but a maximum amount discounted of real or potential earnings. The calculations of amounts reflect an individual attention to the size and circumstances of each family but, at the same time, a subjection of their needs to the discretionary power of administrators. Innovations such as the budgetary calculations never produced increases based on the cost of living hence did never eliminate the actuarial cornerstone of the allowance. They made calculations complex and a domain of professionals and introduced formal amounts to be deducted from employment earnings. Through its regulatory frenzy and efficiency drive the administration introduced with the new calculation methods a limitation which would, decades later, be one of the main characteristics of women receiving aid under family benefits: the program control of the conditions of their participation in the labour force as an eligibility criterion. Among its effects was a condemnation of these families to permanent poverty.

In-kind and tagged benefits.

Inadequate as they were, increases in the allowance rate were also accompanied by medical services, in-kind and tagged benefits. A primary characteristic of these benefits is their discretionary nature. Winter fuel, an in-kind benefit, constitutes an interesting example. From the inception of mothers' allowance, an informal but much used form of supplementation was to petition charities for fuel. During the recession provision of fuel was part of municipal direct relief costs covered by Federal contributions. Later, when the Province assumed full cost of the program, these expenditures were submitted to the Province for refund. In 1941 the practice of

providing winter fuel was institutionalized based on the cost of coke and the number of rooms to be heated. Provision of fuel, however, was contingent on investigator recommendation and approval by the director as well as granted to a maximum of six months. In 1953, fuel assistance became a maximum amount of \$24 per winter month where the Director considered necessary (Labour Gazette, 1953, p.1816) and was incorporated as an item of the allowance in 1956 with the budgetary calculations.

Tagged benefits are a variation of in-kind benefits since they are granted for a specific need. They were first introduced, in an attempt to diminish the extreme inadequacy of the 1942 rate increase. In 1943-44, the Provincial government approved a resolution giving the Commission authority to increase the allowance above the ceiling in cases of extreme necessity at the discretion of commissioners (OMPW, 1943-44, p.16). The next year, this bonus was formalized with the granting of a \$10 to a mother with an unusual expenditure, such as dental treatment or winter outfitting of a large family, upon recommendation of the investigator and subject to the Commission's approval (OMPW, 1944-45, p.5). These supplementations were incorporated into the allowances at a time when the caseloads were small, War and postwar, and the administration believed that only a minority of hard core needy families would continue as beneficiaries. Among them, the Commission reasoned (OMPW, 1943-44, p.6), only those families in which the mother was prevented from working to supplement the allowance due to the large number of small children or to health conditions would qualify. However, by 1953-54 supplementary assistance was allocated to 36% of beneficiaries. A further supplementation of the amounts came in the form of free drugs and medical services with the physician of choice, as of 1942, through a per capita Provincial grant to the Ontario Medical Association. In 1957-58 a

dental plan similar to the medical scheme was negotiated with the Royal College of Dental Surgeons for the children under mothers' allowances and in 1964 this plan was extended to the mothers. The basic rate comprised 79% of the Provincial expenditure with families, special assistance 12% and fuel assistance 9% in 1954-55.

Medical services, in-kind and tagged benefits were incorporated into the allowance as a result of advocacy efforts and, in a way, as a recognition of the inadequacy of benefit levels. These practices recognized medical needs and extreme or unusual expenditures, hence acknowledging the individualized needs of each family. At the same time, however, additional benefits, e.g; fuel, supplementary aid and medical services, never incorporated the allowances in a form that allowed beneficiaries autonomy and control over them and their granting inevitably required a fair amount of intrusion. They subjected families' needs to the discretionary will of the administrators through special request forms, judgements and carefully monitoring instead of an un-tagged monetary increase in the allowance. Fraser (1989) considers that these benefits are one of the main differences between male and female welfare in the US. Indeed, in Canada as well, in-kind, tagged and service benefits do increase the value of the allowance but they do so not by recognizing a right to benefits but by subjecting beneficiaries to discretion. Although the discretionary practices allow the scheme flexibility, they subjected women who raised children alone to the tutelary judgement of allowance administrators.

Supervision.

In exchange for the monthly cheque, the mothers' allowance scheme required that the beneficiaries be subjected to supervision. Despite the edifying principles of trust in motherhood and the stringent eligibility and calculation procedures, the Commission still had a profound

mistrust of poor families' abilities to handle their own affairs. From the onset, officials under the Mothers' Allowance Act, described the beneficiaries with extreme suspicion and portrayed them as in need of guidance as to the wise expenditure of the allowance, as for example:

The house was always untidy and the children neglected, left in the care of an aged relative while the mother gossiped at the neighbours (OMAC, 1920-21, p.25).

The Annual Reports portrayed these women as careless (OMPW, 1931-32, p.13), listless, discouraged and untidy (OMAC, 1921-22, p.26; OMAC, 1923-24, p.16) and their homes in need of 'the splendid work in rehabilitation' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.11) performed by the investigators. Supervision, then, embodies the idea that these women could only be trusted to define their priorities, manage their own families and the expenditure of their allowance with the help of the professional investigators. What has been documented as intensive and intrusive supervision (Little, 1994b, Struthers, 1994), was justified as having the multiple purpose of guiding family life, overseeing the expenditure of their monthly cheque and, also, continually evaluating their maintenance in the allowance rolls. It reinforced the distinction from charity and relief.

The mother, as an employee of the Government, must not only satisfy the Commission of her fitness to receive an allowance at the time of her application, but she must satisfy them that she is fulfilling the trust which is being placed in her (OMAC, 1920-21, p.60).

The mothers' allowance initiative severs these mothers from all others to perform, not a "natural" mothering role, but a job for the state which had to be carefully monitored and supervised. The practice of supervision was seen by the Commission as a complex intervention which was not to cause 'any weakening of the beneficiary's feeling of independence or taking away of the family's own initiative' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.18). It was not a contact of 'short duration occasioned by distress but extended over many years' (OMPW, 1932-33, p.14) hence its potential for lasting transformative work. The assumption that the mothers need transformation

and improvement is above all an expectation of the program which has supervision as an essential part of its delivery model. It was a tool of surveillance and accountability but, as well, supervision incorporated into practice the notion that each family had specific circumstances, a typical characteristic of social welfare initiatives undertaken by women and for women (see Gordon, 1994a).

Supervision included several types of activities to oversee the mother's responsibility and to account for the allowance to the community. These activities, to this day, continue to represent the essence of supervision. The first step was the development of an *individual plan for the family* addressing the aspects of family life judged essential by the investigator. This detailed path to a future of happiness and self-sufficiency, becomes the central element through which the transformation of the home is accomplished and the taxpayers interests guarded (e.g., OMAC,, 1921-22, p.22). This merger of interests transforms the *private* goals of the family into *public* goals implying that they coincide. From then on, most of the supervisory activities consisted of periodic inspections of how the plan was being accomplished and the provision of 'counsel and guidance where it is needed' (OMPW, 1930-31, p.10). The investigators performed also what today would be termed *advocacy activities*, that is, securing 'resources in the community that may be used to assist beneficiaries to maintain their standard of living' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.19; OMPW, 1937-38, p.17). Each of these activities assumed more or less prominence at different times, i.e., during the recession advocacy was particularly prominent, during the War and the postwar boom the investigatory duties surpassed the counselling and advising.

Supervisory activities focused on some specific aspects of family life and will be treated here in order: first *health conditions*, followed by *children's upbringing*, *satisfactory home*

environment, budgeting and family management; and finally *mother's moral fitness*. Happier and healthier childhood (OMAC, 1922-23, p.6; OMAC, 1923-24, p.5) was one of the themes of mothers' allowances and child's health dominated the activities of the nurses and health workers employed as investigators. Mothers were instructed on 'proper feeding and clothing of children' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.18); on 'watching the physical development of her children' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.20); and they were encouraged to take medical advice and treatment (OMAC, 1927-28, p.15). Also among the duties of the investigators was 'advice in regard to food value, health habits, the persuading and encouraging children to drink milk and eat lots of vegetables' (1931-32, p.12) despite the meagre amounts of the allowance.

Physically, I find that there is an improvement in most of our families. I believe that the children are better nourished, as the mother seem to be using better judgement in the selection of foods, as milk, cereals, vegetables, etc (OMAC, 1924-25, p.12).

The investigators also concerned themselves with the health of the mother and understood with insight the consequences of fatigue. Their reports recorded these conditions:

... the tired and worried look ... pinched and thin faces ... the exhaustion that came from working all day and every day away from home and then at home, working late into the night doing the family washing, mending and cooking ... The haunting fear of sickness that would prevent the mother from keeping the home together (OMAC, 1920-21, p.19).

... many homes where there are mothers who had never before had a steady regular income, and through overwork and worry there is a history of ill health and discouragement and delicate children who have never been properly nourished (OMAC, 1921-22, p.24).

... where before was nothing but poverty and distress, the mother untidy and discouraged, the eyes seeming to have no expression but one of weariness and despondency (OMAC, 1923-24, p.16).

These insights, however, were inserted in a tutelary and moralistic style of reform in which the mothers were expected to follow the healthy advice of the investigators without adequate financial support. The supervisory function and counsel to the mothers were described as successful and the reports abound in accounts of well nourished children (OMAC, 1921-22, p.23), wholesome meals being prepared (OMAC, 1920-21, p.20; OMAC, 1922-23, p.6; OMAC, 1925-

27, p.23) of 'healthfully but very plainly fed' children (OMAC, 1924-25, p.13). As for the mothers they are described as having changed their outlook on life exhibiting 'a look of hope and contentment' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.24) 'new courage and hope' (OMAC, 1922-23, p.6) 'a foothold to face the problems that confront her' (OMAC, 1923-24, p.16); improved health and stronger mothers (OMPW, 1937-38, p.12).

Concern with *children's upbringing*, another focus of supervision, was centred on schooling. The school, since the nineteenth century (see Curtis, 1988), represented one of the principal vehicles of socialization and dissemination of middle class values. School attendance was a central requirement of the Act and mothers were encouraged to 'secure the fullest possible educational advantage for their children' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.18, see also OMPW, 1930-31, p.4; OMPW, 1937-38, p.13). Arrangements for boarding children with relatives and friends (OMAC, 1924-25, p.14), scholarships from philanthropic organizations (OMAC, 1920-21, p.19), family relocation (OMAC, 1921-22, p.22) and cooperation of school authorities and juvenile court (OMAC, 1921-22, p.23) were sought to allow children in families receiving mothers' allowance a 'more intelligent choice of occupation' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.19). School authorities were fully integrated in the supervisory activities, initially with informal consultations (OMAC, 1920-21, p.19) and later formally certifying attendance (OMAC, 1925-27, p.20; OMAC, 1927-28, p.6; OMPW, 1937-38, p.13). This expanded web of surveillance over women who raise children alone and their children had a profound effect, as well, on the educational system itself, establishing new norms of social behaviours:

In the northern district the investigator has spoken of the decided improvement in the school attendance of not only children of our beneficiaries but among other families since the passing of the Act. The requests to truant officers that they enforce the attendance of children benefiting under The Mothers' Allowance Act has stimulated many of these officers by reminding them of what is expected

of them. Many of the teachers in this district have marked the improvement in the work of our beneficiaries' children and that, through a spirit of emulation, this has had a beneficial effect throughout the school (OMAC, 1921-22, p.23).

Concern with the wellbeing and education of children had a marked intent to control problem children (OMAC, 1923-24, p.16) and prevent delinquency (OMAC, 1921-22, p.26; OMAC, 1923-24, p.17). Among the accomplishments of the Act is, the commissioners remarked, 'saving our boys from penitentiaries and our girls from houses of ill fame' (OMAC, 1925-27, p.19). And the police reported having 'little or no trouble with children of beneficiaries' (Canadian Council of Child and Family Welfare, 1930a, p.40). The school requirements of mothers' allowance were motivated, as well, by the expectation that an educated child had a better earning capacity (OMAC, 1924-25, p.14). Children constituted the major hope for family self-support and in school, a report stated, they 'learn to take a pride in their home and their own work ability' (OMAC, 1921-22, p.26). The critical reason cited by the Public Welfare Department to re-instate the investigators in 1937 was the important work of providing children with vocational guidance and advice regarding employment opportunities (OMPW, 1936-37, p.6). These statements illustrate the strong discursive associations between poverty, delinquency and unemployment reinforced through the allowance and used to legitimize its work. Their effect is not only the construction of beneficiaries roles, behaviours and desires but also those of their children. It suggests that only through the work of the allowance could poor children escape the world of delinquency and unemployment.

A further focus of supervision strived to provide a satisfactory *home environment* on the belief that 'the best protection for any child is a comfortable and attractive home' (OMAC, 1925-27, p.21). A much better district or a healthier neighbourhood (OMAC, 1921-22, p.26, p.30),

judged according to contemporary causal associations between space and personality, were a basic requirement for the beneficiaries. Family relocation was a constant requirement (OMAC, 1927-28, p.14) since location and conditions of the home could, in the view of the Commission, be a cause of deprivation and deviant life (see Delaney, 1991; Mackenzie, 1988; Valverde, 1991, ch.6). Home ownership was encouraged, pride in possessions and possibility to plant own garden was praised (OMAC, 1920-21, p.24) showing a lack of sensitivity to these families meagre resources. Number of rooms, segregation of adult and children, covered floors, furniture and furnishings (OMAC, 1921-22, p.24; OMAC, 1922-23, p.6; OMAC, 1925-27, p.22) constituted, for the administrators of the Act, indicators of satisfactory home environment forming concrete associations with good motherhood (see Donzelot, 1964 for discussion of regulation of the family and home spaces in France eighteenth century.).

One home in particular, the visitor found had to be visited with great frequency to keep the mother up to the mark, but after many months of encouragement and insistence she became thoroughly interested. She herself papered the house throughout, has provided herself with good bedding, has put clean curtains on all her windows, the front one having two or three flowering plants, and the place now looks very homelike, while the improvement in the health, appearance and manners of the mother and children is extremely gratifying (OMAC, 1921-22, p.27).

Advice regarding house keeping and developing housewifely instincts (OMAC, 1920-21, p.26) involved conventions strictly pertaining to appearance such as curtains, bed covers/quilts, furnishings or floor coverings. These indicators were associated with neatness (OMAC, 1920-21, p.23) and home atmosphere (OMAC, 1920-21, p.24-25; OMAC, 1921-22, p.24) and came to define the meaning of 'cleaner, more healthy and wholesome homes' (OMAC, 1920-21, p.26; OMAC, 1921-22, p.30; OMAC, 1922-23, p.6; OMAC, 1923-24, p.5). Curtains, in particular, speaking to the middle class notion of privacy of the home, were a constant theme:

Fresh clean curtains on the window and a well washed and mended rug on the floor has made the place homelike and attractive (OMAC, 1920-21, p.25).

...and the mother, of her own initiative had neatly curtained the well-washed windows (OMAC, 1921-22, p.27).

On the occasion of my visit to this family in 1921, there was not a curtain on the windows or a quilt on the beds. ... On my last visit both she and the home were the acme of neatness and cleanliness, nice curtains covered the windows and the house was nicely arranged and the children were neat and clean. (OMAC, 1924-25, p.12-13).

Upon investigator's last visit this family was housed in a warm, tidy and bright home, the woman had nice bright curtains on the windows, and she had beds, bedding, and some other needed furniture (OMAC, 1925-27, p.22).

In a clear example of constructed meaning, the reports evolved from detailing *the indicators of a clean home*, as illustrated in the above quotes, into just remarking on 'insistence on cleanliness of the home' (OMPW, 1931-32, p.12; OMPW, 1935-36, p.15) as a reminder of the meaning of cleanliness developed through the indicators of the earlier years.

Supervision also focused on *budgeting and family management*. Mothers' ability to expend the allowance wisely and thrifty (OMAC, 1920-21, p.18, OMAC, 1921-22, p.27); to buy economically and sew own clothes (OMAC, 1922-23, p.6); to be independent from local relief (OMAC, 1921-22, p.28); to develop a strategy for a self supporting future (OMAC, 1920-21, p.23; OMAC, 1921-22, p.29); to show responsibility towards debt (OMAC, 1925-27, p.22) were all signs that the allowance was given to worthy families. Since the allowance is admittedly less than enough to support a family, the mothers are being judged on their ability to barely scrape by. Ability to manage the home finances was closely associated with the proficient running of the household and rearing of children, since the amount of mothers outside work dictated the time she would have for her children and household duties (OMAC, 1921-22, p.26; OMPW, 1935-36, p.14). Precursors of today's parenting and family management skills can be found in the 'instructions as to cleanliness, language and the home education of children' (OMAC, 1924-25, p.12, see also OMAC, 1923-24, p.16).

Last but not least, *mothers' moral fitness* was a constant preoccupation of supervision as

of all aspects of mothers' allowances. Both Struthers (1994) and Little (1994a, 1994b, 1995) have explored this aspect of supervision and here it suffices to refer the reader to their work. In the first year alone mothers classified as *not fit and proper person* to continue as a beneficiary under the Act constituted 13.8% of all cancellations (OMAC, 1920-21, p.27) and added to those mothers whose home conditions were considered unsatisfactory they represented 17.2% of allowance cancellations. These two causes of cancellation together constituted as high as 12.8% of the cancellations in 1935-36 but only 3.6% in 1955 (see Table 7, Appendix).

With all these intrusive practices supervision proved to be a difficult procedure for the mothers to accept. The Annual Reports document the continued existence of resistance and nonconformism. 'Approximately 4% [of the mothers], create perplexing situations for the supervisors and the Commission. They need constant supervision', clamoured the Commission (OMAC, 1921-22, p.11).

The problem case is and always will be present where we have a live social service organization. The Commission has been careful to weed out the cases that were in danger of bringing the Act into disrepute, and also where beneficiaries were unwilling to co-operate with the Commission in its endeavour to properly administer the Act (OMAC, 1927-28, p.13).

Several techniques were used to convince the mothers to submit to the advice of investigators. Extensively documented is the insistence of the investigators (OMAC, 1921-22, p.27; OMAC, 1927-28, p.14), their more frequent visits (OMAC, 1921-22, p.27; OMAC, 1925-27, p.19), having the allowance administered by a third party (1931-32, p.12) and extra supervision by volunteers (OMAC, 1923-24, p.5).

One woman member of a Local Board visits a home once and often twice, a week, helping the mother in the spending of her allowance and in the care of her home (OMAC, 1921-22, p.31).

Dealing with problem cases and failures also involved having the family referred to Children's Aid Societies, or the Juvenile Court in cases of truancy, and probationary periods (OMAC, 1920-21,

p.27; OMAC, 1921-22, p.23). Cancelling the allowance was the last resource (OMAC, 1927-28, p.14). It was, however, a necessity for a Commission concerned with the constant increase in expenditure of the tax-payers' money. Supervision was a direct mechanism to control total expenditure and the Commission took advantage of it:

It is only with the utmost care that the increase in the number of beneficiaries is kept so low (OMPW, 1932-33, p.15).

... 47% of the discontinued allowances were due to staff or Board efforts (OMPW, 1931-32, p.12).

... of the total numbers cancelled and suspended ... 1027 [51%] were directly due to careful supervision and efficient work of the investigators (OMPW, 1938-39, p.13).

With a caseload of 300 families in 1929-30 (OMAC, 1928-29, p.5) and the difficulties of travel in remote districts (OMAC, 1920-21, p.16; OMAC, 1924-25, p.11) the investigators had a hard task. In Manitoba, by comparison, a mothers' allowance caseload of 150 was criticized by Charlotte Whitton as extremely large (Canadian Council on Child Welfare, 1929, p.29). In 1943-44 the Ontario Commission reports that each beneficiary, except those in outlying areas had at least 4 supervisory visits per year (OMPW, 1943-44, p.6). Help in maintaining a watchful eye over the beneficiaries was enlisted from the local boards and the mothers, although not formally supervised, were also constantly being observed, measured, and judged by educational and health workers or authorities as well as by the service clubs and social services organizations (OMAC, 1920-21, p.20; OMAC, 1921-22, p.10; OMPW, 1930-31, p.10; OMPW, 1944-45, p.16). The Annual Reports in several occasions record the gratitude of the mothers (e.g., OMAC 1920-21, p.20; OMAC, 1923-24, p.18) and probably these were in fact the feeling of many of them. This, however, does not change the nature of the supervisory activity. The resistance encountered is an indication not that aid was not wanted, but rather, of the wish that the much needed aid would come in another form.

In summary, supervision constituted a very sophisticated multipurpose technology developed through the early women's interventions with families. It incorporated an understanding of individual circumstances of the family but imposed on them a grid of priorities and issues selected by program values and objectives. In doing so private family goals became public accounting tools. Supervision offered standardized advice and guidance focused on healthy habits, children's upbringing, satisfactory home environment, budgeting and management, as well as moral fitness. Supervision developed and defined the indicators of good motherhood through intensive contact with the family and a series of associations developed through the pragmatic need to render operational the principles of the allowance. It embodied the class, race, religion and gender of investigators, administrators and current scientific and professional thought. It is, in this sense, a product of its time but it marked and constructed in particular ways its subject as distinct from subjects of other contemporary social programs such as old age pension or workers compensation. Through supervision women raising children alone are acted upon by a practice that is extremely sensitive to incorporating their the individual circumstances and needs but that is, at the same time, bound within a system of tutelary, standardized and poorly financed solutions and expectations. Mothers were constantly and continuously subjected to discretion and advices aiming at transforming their parenting style, house appearance, budget and expenditure practices, and their moral conduct. Repetition, modelling, and guidance focusing on specific aspects of the family's life constitute the main tools of supervision.

Personal social services.

As part of the benefits of the allowance, beneficiaries were also referred to social services. From the inception of the scheme, mothers' allowance investigators were able to 'secure

treatment for the patient by co-operation with medical officers, private physicians, public health nurses and hospital clinics' (OMAC, 1922-23, p.17; see also OMAC, 1921-22, p.10). They negotiated legal aid, job market and employment opportunities (OMAC, 1920-21, p.19, p.21; OMAC, 1921-22, p.23, p.29; OMAC, 1924-25, p.14), summer outings and holidays, and child care for the mothers (OMAC, 1921-22, p.29) using their extensive network and their authority as government representatives. The Annual Reports throughout the history of mothers' allowance expressed their appreciation for the help given by many service organizations, service clubs, mental and medical clinics and members of the local boards (e.g., OMAC, 1921-22, p.10; OMAC, 1922-23, p.5; OMAC, 1923-24, p.5; OMPW, 1949-50, p.16; OMPW, 1950-51, p.14) highlighting their close connection. In the US, Gordon argues (1994a, p.60), the mothers' aid program was so enmeshed with the private charitable organizations that the effect was the expansion of this sector with public funds rather than the development of public social services. A somewhat similar but not identical process may be mapped in Ontario.

From the inception of the scheme in the Province, the recognition that deserving poor mothers needed to be helped with the tax payers' money was accompanied by a feeling that they were, at the same time, responsible for their situation. They were, hence, in need of the moral reform which, within the liberal division of public and private realms, was left to the private charitable agencies (see discussion in Valverde, 1995, p.40). Commentators of the time seem to corroborate this observation:

[t]he public agency has the natural responsibility for the type of distress which arises from a public or community economic ill, over which the individual family has no control, while the private family agency has a more natural responsibility for relief needs which arise directly from family maladjustments (King, 1930, p.71).

King remarks that, in practice, both public and private agencies developed a division of functions

adapted to local circumstances with private agencies usually undertaking the lead in casework (p.72). Discussions regarding the work of private agencies throughout the 1930s illustrate how these agencies used a public program, at a stage in their casework approach, when the family was in the process of stabilizing (e.g., Landry, 1932, p.7-8). That is, although the distinction between public programs dealing with community ills and private programs with family maladjustments was recognized, in practice there was a great deal of interconnection between the two. On the public side, the Annual Reports of the Commission, while recounting many instances of practical advice-giving and listening (e.g., OMAC, 1921-22, p.29; OMAC, 1924-25, p.11), do not report counselling with a depth and diagnostic complexity characteristic of casework. Clearly distinguishing the duties of the investigators, the Commission states:

[S]he must be prepared to advise the Mothers' Allowances beneficiaries in all matters pertaining to the home and to suggest to her the resources available which would be of benefit to the children. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the value of the resources available which offer assistance in child guidance (OMPW, 1942-43, p.20).

As pointed out before, investigators or field workers in the mothers' allowance program, unlike the workers in some municipal relief departments such as Toronto and Ottawa, were not required to be trained social workers, a characteristic that has been maintained to today. Early advocates of professional social work such as Charlotte Whitton staged a persistent campaign for the need to have professionally trained social workers within the public service. Social workers, however, remained throughout the 1930s and 1940s primarily associated with private agencies (see Struthers, 1987a). Casework was, then, carried out by social workers in private agencies while field workers within the public scheme of mothers' allowance developed the techniques used for eligibility, investigation, referral and evaluation processes.

Striving to define themselves as a profession (see Struthers, 1987a) social workers, at first

in the US, developed social or differential casework as a scientific validation of their approach.

Gordon (1994a, ch.6) explains the feminine analysis of poverty embedded in casework:

The social work advocates ... tried to integrate a social psychological dimension into an economic theory of poverty. Influenced by the experience of social workers combatting drinking and domestic violence, and particularly by their clients, they believed that the injuries of class were experienced through problems like alcoholism, defeatism, and violence as well as through inadequate food and shelter. They considered the social insurance definition of poverty partial, reductive and naive. Despite the social distance between them and the object of their concern, they identified with the women and children who were hurt by intrafamilial abuse perhaps even more than those hurt by societal abuse. But they did not, in this period, suppose that economic independence might be a precondition for the self-esteem and self-development they sought to give poor women (p.181).

Social casework demanded in-depth diagnostic investigation which highlighted the character and individual circumstances of clients (See discussion of casework in Leonard, 1996). It drew attention to the psychological and cultural damages of poverty.

The goal of all social casework is the developing of the client's capacity to make his [sic] own adjustments. This means knowledge and sympathetic understanding of the client, not for the purpose of accumulating mere facts about him, but because the worker realizes the responsibility of giving advice when life is difficult, muddled and baffling ... The problem confronting several persons may be the same in name - family desertion. But how different when viewed in the light of past experience, present attitudes, and family relationships (Held, 1933, pp.30-31).

The client was, hence, a complex subject in need not only of 'the supplying of material wants' from mothers' allowance but also 'the building up of those intangible qualities that make the individual more capable of handling his [sic] own problems' provided by private charitable agencies caseworkers (Held, 1933, p.32).

It is important that our methods in giving services to families whose function is threatened should keep pace with our increasing understanding of the importance of the emotional as well as physical needs of the family and its members (Rich, 1938, p.76).

Individual emotional and economic strains, representing the private and public realms of the liberal approach to poverty, were treated separately but in synchrony.

The treatment will include the whole range of services necessary to the comfort or succour of a human being in need: material need, if that be found necessary, most of all, close personal understanding, counsel, advice, stimulation, encouragement, and character strengthening (Canadian Welfare Council, 1940, p.21).

In the postwar, with the increased employment opportunities and the dissemination of psychological language and theories in the field of child and family (see Riley, 1983; Rose, 1989, Part 3, re: this process in England), these realms, although maintaining their distinct public and private locations, were clearly articulated. 'In Ontario', the government argued, 'proportionately fewer persons need *aid for economic reasons* today than at any other time in our history' (OMPW, 1955-56, p.3, my emphasis). 'Personal services', it recognized, 'represent non-economic requirements of individuals and families' (OMPW, 1956-57, p.1). Therapeutical rehabilitation or social regeneration of beneficiaries, assumes then an explicit importance within the Department of Public Welfare which continued to view this component as a domain of private agencies.

It is of equal importance that greater emphasis be given to the re-establishment of public assistance recipients through training or retraining, counselling and other measures which may lead to ultimate independence. Concentrated casework services must also be extended by the strategic placement of such specialists throughout the Province as well as be the greater use of the facilities of certain private agencies which operate within Ontario. It may be that a fee-for-service arrangement might be designed to give advanced attention to certain cases who might benefit through such treatment (OMPW, 1961-62, p.22).

Although the 'equal importance' mentioned in the above quote was never followed up with equal amounts of financial resources, its effects are definitely a stronger association between poor mothers and personal failures or problems than in earlier reports where the focus was the material poverty. This association consolidates a picture of a complex subject of mothers' allowance who needed help not only with her economic needs but also support and casework for the personal and social effects of a life of destitution. Complexity is expressed by an emphasis on the variety of effects of poverty but it is not followed by a renewed integration of the program. Consequently, as the public component becomes more centralised and focused on administrative decisions, it detaches itself from the personal aspects which were addressed by separate,

independent agencies. By drawing attention to the individual circumstances within its marked division between public and private functions, the program developed an interventionist approach which, although not giving the mothers sufficient allowance and curtailing their employment possibilities, relied on an underfunded casework to turn the situation around with personal social services.

In summary, the technologies of government developed by the mothers' allowances scheme have a broad scope. Under the provisions of the Mothers' Allowance Act, women raising children alone were endowed with a small inadequate allowance supplemented by medical services, in-kind and tagged discretionary benefits. These came accompanied by supervision and referrals for casework which completed the social vision of these women's needs. These provisions were characterized by an individualized approach as well as by a mistrust and tutelary perception of poor mothers. The meagre amounts and the increasing necessity for employment supplementation led to the contradictory situation in which supplementation itself had to be capped and regulated condemning poor mothers and their children to a life of poverty. The dependent mother is, through these procedures, set for failure, subjected to intrusion, discretion, tutelary judgement and constraint in her capacity to earn a living.

Supervision defined individual expectations and comprehensive indicators of good motherhood used to assess, oversee and evaluate the beneficiaries' lives. These indicators focused on five aspects of family life: health, children's upbringing, satisfactory home environment, budgeting and family management, and mother's moral fitness. Through repetitive advice, modelling and guidance referring to these aspects, supervision shaped and defined the dependent mother. In parallel, an extensive set of casework services developed in private

charitable agencies calling attention to complex and diverse effects of poverty as well as the different individual resources and capacities to deal with those. As this private approach evolved into a complementary and adapted role to the public scheme, its practice became increasingly detached from social and economic aspects and focused on strengthening individuals and their capacity to self-sufficiency even though lacking the financial resources to do so.

The range of technologies of mothers' allowance, discussed in this section, rather than following a rational course or vision, emerged from the actual implementation and functioning of the program developing and incorporating a variety of nuances and components which when jointly articulated produce unexpected and new effects such as the marked division between the economic and personal needs of the poor mothers raising children alone. These women, rather than simply the beneficiaries of the program, assume then a complex and intricate identity reflecting the arrangements of these ideas and practices. The ritualized and repetitive functioning of these technologies of eligibility, assessment, diagnosis, treatment and evaluation separate them from other families as well as other beneficiaries of social welfare. It made poor women raising children alone subject to a life of dependency and a field of professional expertise.

These components of the program offer a clear illustration of the functioning of practices in their multiple points and constant definition of the subjects's subjectivity, attitudes, behaviour and general conduct of life. They are, nonetheless, inserted in the context and framework set by the other processes of the initiative which were presented previously: the administrative structure, the definition of eligibility criteria, the transformations in the justifications of the program. A further process, that of consolidation of the changes in the program throughout its 46 years of existence, is also important in understanding the contributions of practices in defining the subject

dependent mother. The next section discusses this last process. It will show that effects for the formation of the subject and her way of life were produced, not only from the process of consolidation itself, but also from the form in which consolidation was pursued: an integration into the mechanisms of providing funds for a newly developing national welfare system.

Emergence of the Dependent Mother: A National System of Welfare

This section discusses the transformation from mothers' allowances into Family Benefits. It uses, in addition to the Annual Reports, a variety of secondary sources, cited throughout the discussion, which reconstitute the events around this transformation. It describes the changes in the understanding of mother-work, insert these changes in the social and political events of the time and, then, concludes with a characterization of the main elements of the insertion of mothers' allowances in the Canada Assistance Plan framework inaugurating the Family Benefits.

Issues regarding funds have traditionally been controversial for social welfare programs. Mothers' allowances, despite its comparatively high popular support, was no exception. Funds to cover the costs of the allowances were split between the Province and the local government of the recipient's residence from the onset of the scheme in 1920 until 1937. This system, Ontario reported (e.g., OMAC, 1921-22, p.9; OMAC, 1927-28, p.5), received complete cooperation from the municipalities at a time when the program expenditures were relatively small. The depression, however, brought much havoc to the municipal coffers and Ontario assumed the full cost of the mothers' allowance scheme in 1937. Nonetheless the Province assumed the program as a temporary measure and not as its permanent responsibility. It saw the magnitude of the phenomenon of mothers raising children alone as an exceptional War circumstance. In its

budgetary forecasting, it implied that their occurrence was bound to dwindle in light of educational, industrial, public health and safety measures. With the caseloads soaring in the depression, the reports became obsessed with the idea of achieving a peak load (OMPW, 1935-36, p.14; OMPW, 1938-39, p.12), of a year when the numbers would 'recede to the previous normal' level (OMPW, 1936-37, p.5). In addition, private organizations and municipalities were constantly reminded of their traditional role in providing for needy families (OMPW, 1936-37, pp.5, 14).

Undoubtedly where governments assume responsibility for social welfare, the inevitable concomitants are an increasing willingness on the part of the recipients to become increasingly dependent, and for those formerly active in benevolence to abandon their humanitarian interests and assume that the care of the improvident or needy is the business of Government.

Those conditions both indicate a definite loss of morale. (OMPW, 1935-36, p.5).

The Second World War brought high levels of employment and reduced caseloads within mothers' allowance and the program assumed a low profile relative to the major issue dominating the social welfare discussion: the care of the unemployed. In the previous recessionary decade unemployment relief had crippled provincial and municipal finances and had forced the, then, Dominion government to participate in social welfare issues as a major partner with the provinces and municipalities. The reports of both the 1938 National Employment Commission and the 1940 Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations (Rowel-Sirois Report) focused on the questions of funding and responsibility for social services among the different government levels. Unemployment relief, they recommended, should be a federal function. However, the terms of the discussion had become significantly broadened: the Dominion government was willing to assume responsibility for 'relief or aid for unemployed employable as distinct from unemployables' leaving to the Province 'the residual responsibility for social welfare functions'

including indigence or poor relief, widows' pensions, mothers' allowances and child welfare (Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations cited in Labour Gazette, 1940, p.545).

The 1941 Unemployment Insurance scheme launched by Ottawa was a restricted legislation that covered less than half of the Canadian civilian labour force (Struthers, 1994, p.166) and negotiations regarding the care of the unemployed continued to completely monopolize the social policy arena. When, in 1958, Ontario came under the terms of the 1956 federal Unemployment Assistance Act (see Struthers, 1994, ch.4, 5; and 1987b) a few arrangements were defined although unemployment issues continued to be debated.

The debates around unemployment had a profound effect on mothers' allowances which, at the end of the war, was a program surrounded by uncertainties. Despite the low caseload, its levels of benefits was far below adequacy and there were municipal pressures to determine benefits based on actual need, particularly in the case of large families and incapacitated fathers (see previous section). But the introduction of the federal family allowances (see Kitchen, 1987), with its uncertain effects on mothers' allowance, as well as the intense discussion and hopes for a national system of social security maintained the program in a suspended state. Leonard Marsh's vision for social security in Canada, the Canadian Welfare Council documented (1944, p.13), saw contributory or social insurance programs as the backbone of the system taking care of most people with a relatively minor role for tax funded social assistance. Charlotte Whitton, on the other hand, envisaged that the great bulk of social need would have to be met by social assistance using means-tested methods and supplemented by an enlarged social utilities sector (Canadian Welfare Council, 1944, p.13). The Council itself, criticizing the 1945 Federal Proposals for Reconstruction, suggested a comprehensive system which included an assistance program,

operated by provincial and local agencies with substantial support of Federal grants, and 'benefits as a matter of right for persons chronically unable to take employment and for widows with dependent children' (Canadian Welfare Council, 1946b, p.37). Cassidy, addressing the Canadian Conference on Social Work in 1948, suggests:

If our social insurance system is built up further and if good plans of general assistance are developed, the need for special categoric measures for the aged, the blind, and mothers with dependent children should decrease materially, and there is much to be said for the merging of these programmes with general assistance (Cassidy, 1948, p.49; see also Guest, 1985, ch.4 re: war reconstruction).

Although the mothers' allowances program remained in the periphery of the discussion about a national unified social security system, the effects of this discussion on the program was decisive. At the core of these effects is the recasting of the terms under which welfare was formulated. The centrality of the employable/unemployable discussion as well as the formulations regarding one unified system of welfare redefine the meaning of social provision. This situation was summarized by Hum (1987a), who, significantly, overlooks the mothers' allowance program:

By early fifties, the employable-unemployable dichotomy had become entrenched in Canadian policy thinking. The employable were to be protected by minimum wage legislation to ensure income adequacy. Fiscal and monetary policies would maintain full employment, and unemployment insurance would give protection against the risk of unemployment. On the other hand, the unemployables - the aged, the blind, and the disabled - would receive support through federally cost-shared provincial programmes. Aid for the residual "unemployed but employable" group, which did not qualify for unemployment insurance, continued as a joint responsibility of municipalities and provinces (p.120).

All social welfare programs began to be understood within the dichotomy employed/ unemployed and mothers' allowance was not an exception. Beneficiaries of the initiative started to be defined primarily in relation to their participation in the labour market. Their motherhood duties were re-interpreted as an obstruction to entering the labour force rather than a necessary job as previously articulated. This was an important point in the transformation of the meaning of mother-work within the welfare system. A transformation which is finally crystallized through the postwar

attempts to integrate the program within a national welfare system and its financing. Although, in earlier periods, the mothers' allowance beneficiary was prompted to work to supplement the allowance, in the postwar, she becomes a category of the unemployable due to her family responsibilities. Her unemployability is rigidly defined in the regulation of the Act by a limit in the amount of hours she is permitted to work (see previous discussion under calculation of amount).

[P]ersons qualifying for aid are those virtually removed from the labour market. They are persons who are accepted for care as a government responsibility (OMPW, 1954-55, p.3).
 ...the provincial government alone is collecting taxes to meet the costs of welfare for those who are unable to take advantage of our prosperous times (OMPW, 1955-56, p.2).

In this sense mothers' allowances ceases to be primarily a reward for a *capacity* to do the work of child raising with employment supplementation and supervision, to become essentially a provision attending to a *deficiency* to be fully employed. This at a time when wives and mothers were urged to stay at home and reminded of their duties as mothers not only by dominant discourses but also through a series of measures: day care closures, married women barred from working in the federal government, tax disincentive for working married women, and lay offs from well paid jobs (see Brandt, 1982; Pierson, 1990; Porter 1993). As a result of these measures, Porter (1993) reports, 'women's labour force participation dropped from 1944 high of 33.5 per cent to 25.3 per cent in 1946 and remained between 23 per cent to 24 percent for the next nine years before increasing once again' (p.115). Despite these documented disincentives to mothers holding a job, women raising children alone - *the other mothers* - began to be understood and characterized primarily in relation to the labour market.

On the other hand, as the 1950s progressed, married women gradually began to enter the labour force and, although standards and expectations of motherhood were not challenged, the

necessary domesticity implied by those expectations were transformed. The difference, of course, is that within the two parent family the mother work is a complementary salary. The married woman can afford to work for the low wages offered to women because her wages are a complement to her husband's. Within the families of women raising children alone work earnings are the sole source of support and when supplementary to the allowance these earnings are controlled and deducted from the allowance. Not surprisingly, hence, the representation of female family heads among the poor grew disproportionately to their increased representation in the population as a whole in the 1960s (Ross, 1975, p.14).

While disputes over the responsibility for the unemployed dominated Federal-Provincial relations in the 1950s, Ontario pursued fiscal autonomy fiercely. Within the mothers' allowance program, the Province resorted to administrative reforms as well as training and rehabilitation of beneficiaries to contain the program budget (e.g., OMPW, 1955-56, p.44; see previous discussions). The Province also aimed at extending the financial open-endedness and flexibility of the Unemployment Assistance Act to other categorical programs. On the federal side, Ottawa was unhappy with the loose arrangements of this Act, which contained a vague definition of the target population, and had spiralling costs completely controlled by Ontario. This generalized interest in developing a new approach to public assistance (Department of National Health and Welfare, 1960, p.2) led to some discussion groups and finally, in 1963, to the formation of the Federal-Provincial Working Group on Welfare Programs. The 1966 Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) is a result of these discussions (see details of process in Bella, 1979; Dyck, 1995; Hum, 1983; Struthers, 1994, ch.7, 8). Making use of the federal cost sharing advantages of CAP, Ontario introduced the Family Benefits Assistance Act (FBA) in 1967 providing financial

assistance to those with long term income support needs. FBA replaced the Mothers' Allowance Act, the Old Age Assistance Act, the Disabled Persons' Allowance Act, the Blind Persons' Allowance Act, and the section of the General Welfare Assistance Act governing allowance to dependent fathers and needy widows and unmarried women. Through it the mothers' allowance scheme was integrated within a national framework of a social welfare system: controlled and administered by the Province but receiving a 50% federal contribution towards its cost. Women raising children alone constituted 33% of FBA caseload in 1969 (Social Assistance Review Committee, 1988).

CAP introduced in the Province not only a source of funds but also a set of social welfare discourses popular in the national capital. Certain themes of these discourses were fundamental to the consolidation of the transformations within mothers' allowance. The language of rights to public assistance is one of them. The 1956 Unemployment Assistance Act provided the unemployed in need with a right to public assistance and CAP extended the right to benefits to other categories of the poor in need. The Canadian anti-poverty movement of the 1960s, primarily inspired by the War on Poverty in the US (Hum, 1987b, p.30; Struthers, 1994, ch.7) made ample use of the rhetoric of rights demanding 'the right for a person to live decently, just because he [*sic*] is a human being and a fellow man [*sic*]' (Ontario Federation of Labour, 1964 cited in Struthers, 1994, p.214).

At the federal level the poverty rhetoric of the 1960s reflected, in addition to the American influence, the commitment to the United Nations Charter of Human Rights and the humanitarian values of social work held by federal bureaucrats (Hepworth et al., 1987, p.37; Splane, 1987, p.224). Within the Department of National Health and Welfare there was a growing body of

opinion in favour of extending uniformity of treatment and adequacy to recipients across the national territory as well as modernizing the provincial welfare administrations (Hepworth et al., 1987, p.28). CAP was intended to generate a system based on the right to benefits, a higher level of assistance and broader coverage. The generic language of rights of the unemployable as human beings, did not carry political commitment from Ontario and, although integrated in the system of welfare, mothers' allowance continued to rely on its discretionary basis.

In addition FBA fell short of guaranteeing beneficiaries rights. CAP required the establishment of an independent Board of Appeal to hear complaints, and review decisions upon applicants' requests. The Board only was created after three years of demands by welfare rights organizations (Struthers, 1994, p.246) and, as Hum (1983, p.40) points out, it is an extension of the administration of welfare. In addition, information available to beneficiaries regarding their rights is limited, assistance level is below adequacy and regulations are punitive.

A second central theme of CAP was *need*. This was part of a growing trend among some provinces - British Columbia and Newfoundland - to treat aid to needy mothers as part of the larger program of residual aid meeting the *fact* not the *cause* of need (Department of National Health and Welfare, 1960, p.2). Ontario, as some of the other provinces, consolidated its categorical programs but it did not ignore the cause of need (Hum, 1983, p.40; Struthers, 1994, p.237). It maintained a distinction between GWA for the able body unemployed and FBA for the old, the blind, the disabled, and mothers with dependent children. Benefits under FBA, which were administered by the Province, were higher than under the municipally administered GWA. This distinction maintained the categorical separation between women raising children alone from the able body unemployed as an inheritance from the mothers' allowances scheme. Under FBA,

however, consolidating the postwar transformations, the entitlement to benefits of poor women raising children alone is defined primarily by their temporary absence from the labour market.

This means that rather than eliminating the cause of need as a criteria for entitlement, FBA simply reformulated the cause of need and assigned to it new meanings. These new meanings were further reinforced by the changing patterns of employment within the normalized two parents families. Women raising children alone under FBA, despite their categorical eligibility have their entitlement to benefits primarily based on a commitment to a generic rights of the unemployable. Anchoring this transformation on the formation of the postwar welfare system as well as the changed reality of married women's lives, is fundamental to understand the gradual erosion of the social value of child raising work which dominate the single mother policy discussions of the 1980s and 1990s.

Furthermore, the concept of need brought little adequacy to the amounts of the allowance. To meet the fact of need CAP provided only very general guidelines. It required that the provinces determined eligibility taking into account the basic necessities of life: food, shelter, clothing and other essentials for normal living and the preservation of family life. The provinces, however, had autonomy to define both the basic requirements and their budget determining, thus, the meaning of need. In addition, the plan also called for one method to calculate the allowance: the budgetary method of comparing needs and income already in place in Ontario since 1956 (Department of National Health and Welfare, 1969, p.28-29) and the allowances continued to fall short of actual need (Struthers, 1994, p.235). As illustrated by the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto (1977, p.56), through their traditional basket of goods method, in 1967, the income of a mother with one child receiving FBA and the federal family allowance would

cover 65% of the family's budgetary needs, a reduction of 4% from 1965. Likewise, Hurl (1989, p.28) remarks that 'in 1961 a family on mothers' allowance received approximately 35.5% of the average family income in Ontario'... while in '1971 it received only 28.9%'.

Attached to the themes of rights and needs CAP also insisted on measures geared towards *employability* and its objectives specifically included 'the lessening, removal or *prevention* of the causes and effects of poverty, child neglect or dependence on public assistance' (cited in Armitage, 1988, p.198, my emphasis). Federal authorities, influenced by the American President Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty (see Bella, 1979, p.442; and Struthers, 1994, p.232), contended that problem families receiving public aid should be linked with efforts focused on returning people to the labour force. In agreement, CAP called for a concentration 'on programs to achieve the full utilization of the nation's human resources and elimination of poverty' (CAP Annual Report, 1967/68, p.7). These objectives seemed contradictory in Ontario where, in 1964, unemployment was at a low 3% (Struthers, 1994, p.211). Expenditure with social welfare in the province, however, was growing with caseloads consisting, primarily, of people unable to work because of age, poor health or family (Struthers, 1994, p.217), that is, the unemployables. The employability measures, however, were in sync with programs of training and rehabilitation already in place in the Province and the federal emphasis was full heartedly supported.

Contributions were extended also to persons who were likely to become in need if they did not receive such services. This, Bella (1979, p.446-7) argues was a result of the Alberta push to include its planned preventive welfare services: marriage counselling, family planning, day care centres and personal, recreational and community services to the cost sharing arrangements. In line with the measures of the War on Poverty, prevention was seen by the bureaucrats involved in

the CAP negotiations as the primary way to address the causes of poverty (Hepworth et al., 1987, p.40). Social activists concurred, as Struthers (1994, p.215) documents using excerpts from the Ontario Federation of Labour 1967 study:

Their children [marginalized population] were trapped within a self-perpetuating culture of poverty, "most likely to be poor themselves because their parents are usually unable to give them the needed education, health, or in many cases, incentive to improve their lot." Passive victims of progress, the poor could "not pull themselves up by their own bootstraps simply because their environment has done little to prepare them to cope with the realities of today. So if and when the opportunity for improvement presents itself, they are not equipped to grasp it.

Consequently CAP extended federal-provincial cost sharing to a wide range of social services and programs. These were loosely defined as intending to lessen or remove the causes and effects of poverty and included: rehabilitation services, casework, counselling and assessment, adoption services, homemaker and day care services, and community development (CAP Annual Report of 1967/68). In Ontario, welfare services cost-shared by CAP were delivered through approved agencies which are funded directly by the Province. This arrangement not only encouraged the development of social services but had a marked bearing on their development (see also Hum, 1983; and Irving, 1987b). The insertion of personal social services sector in a needs-test initiative intended as a prevention of poverty has associated this sector and the services it provides with the poor, as opposed to a universal need such that embedded in medical care. The focus of these social services has developed according to the assumptions of CAP.

Incorporating the separation between personal and economic needs already in place in mothers' allowance, a range of non-profit, private social services developed with special attention to increasing an individual's human capital through, for example, rehabilitation and training or support and counselling to remove personal problems (Hum, 1983, p.72). Although there have been, since 1966, unsuccessful attempts to review the role of social services in Canada (see Hum,

1987b, p.36-37; Kelly, 1977), it remains unchanged. A variety of services including child welfare and family skills became essential elements of the anti-poverty strategy and their diverse programs and agencies, their autonomy and broad scope has created a very large network of auxiliary services to FBA. These private, non-profit services became, in practice, detached from the public financial component with significant consequences for the popularization of beliefs and feelings regarding the personal responsibility of the mothers for their own poverty.

In summary, Family Benefits consolidated many transformations to mothers' allowance which were introduced in the postwar period. Funds, far from a peripheral issue, had a tremendous bearing on the nature of the program and its subject. The Province consistently denied responsibility for the wellbeing of families with a female head, constantly reminding both private charitable organizations and the municipalities of their moral and statutory duties regarding these poor. The program was, hence, residual, partial and only reluctantly maintained by the Province with both municipalities and private agencies having an undefined but significant role as advocates and providers of complementary services.

The war and the reconstruction debate brought discussions regarding a national social welfare system around the axis of the employment / unemployment debate. Mothers' allowance, a relatively small program supporting a reduced category of poor women, figured marginally in these discussions. The discussions, however transformed mothers' allowance and, finally, integration into a national system of welfare consolidated a series of mutations which gradually reformulated the terms under which mothers were maintained. Mothers were no longer supported in name of their work of raising a future citizen - with supervision and subjected to transformation - but, rather, they were compensated for their temporary absence from the workforce because of

their children rearing duties. Their eligibility was under the rationality that their mother-work constituted an obstacle to their participation in the labour force. Rather than being defined as performing the valuable child raising work, they became primarily unemployable individuals for family reasons. In fact, many were 'unemployable' not only because of motherhood obligations but well beyond when their children grew up because of the lack of work experience, limited skills and the cumulative effect of living in poverty for years.

Further, the creation of CAP and its incorporation of mothers' allowance gave women who raise children alone the right to benefits. A right that carried only a rhetoric weight. The program, on the other hand, maintained its categorical definition of needs based on the traditions of the mothers' allowance program: budgetary calculations of amounts, supervision and rehabilitation. Under CAP employability and preventive services also received federal cost sharing and the social services sector expanded enormously although maintaining the separation between financial and personal needs of mothers. The mechanisms of delivery, primarily by private, non-profit independent agencies, made integration and coordination of these services further difficult and their personal nature has remained dissociated from general poverty measures.

The Dependent Mother: A Subject of Family Benefits

Family Benefits can be understood as a definite marker in the transformations occurring in the single mother complex and its articulations with governmental practices. This first case study has mapped out how a concern with mothers raising children without a male partner emerged as an object of government early in the century, and traced the forms, means and processes through which the dependent mother was created in Ontario. This process of creation was anchored in the

implementation of the Mothers' Allowance Act which in 1920 recognized mother-work in the name of the child. This recognition, however, reflected the views of women's groups of the early twentieth century, the national concerns with children as future citizens and the moral crusades of urban reformers. As a practical solution mothers' allowance developed around a financial contribution towards the support of certain families with a female head as well as a variety of interventions. These interventions attempted both to contain the numbers of these families - through stringent eligibility and supervision practices and through the provision of amounts below adequacy - and to bring them to a normalized way of life and to a self-supporting status. The case study considered five processes generated by mothers' allowances: the development of an administrative structure, the formation of criteria for eligibility, the transformations in justification for the initiative, the consolidation of program components, and the integration of the program into a national system of welfare. Through these it reconstructed the practices of government and the constitution of the subject dependent mother.

The process of development of an administrative structure was gradual and delicate and it involved a myriad of agents and factors. Mothers' allowance maintained the structure of central-local delivery but shed the original volunteer participation while incorporating its effects in a complex set of regulations, face-to-face contacts, discretionary practices and cost-cutting priorities. It produced a subject administered centrally, compartmentalized through file reconstructions, contained and investigated according to budgetary demands. The widow was the symbol of the program, yet eligibility was broadened to other groups of mothers without partners. Broadening brought into the initiative a variety of technologies of investigation and monitoring through which mothers were defined and judged. Articulation of these groups of mothers as

deserving of support was initially based on their role in the care of children and their value for the nation. However, this justification was gradually enmeshed with support for the program itself and its rehabilitation potential. With Family Benefits, poor mothers without a partner were inserted into a general program for the unemployable and their motherhood understood as a temporary obstacle.

Complementing these broad processes, the case study has also examined the detailed technologies of subjection involved in the consolidation of program components. The amount of the allowance, calculated through increasingly complicated processes, maintained its constant low levels and supplementation through work. Employment as supplementation, however, was transformed from an encouraged practice into one that was limited and regulated. The dependent mother is, therefore, locked in permanent poverty, subjected to controls in her participation in the labour force, and above all, she is set for failure since there is strong dissociation between the amounts and the expectations of the allowance. Supervision brings intrusion, tutelary judgement and discretion to a constant and continuous presence in the lives of these women. It also transforms private family goals into public accounting tools. The repetitious work of supervision makes mother work a function of five aspects of family life: health, child upbringing, satisfactory home environment, budgeting and family management, and mothers' moral fitness. Personal social services and counselling which emerged from the feminine understanding of the complex effects of poverty evolved into a separate, underfunded intervention addressing the personal capacity of those in poverty to overcome their problems. They create a complex subject who has her monetary and material needs dissociated from personal counselling needs.

Under CAP, the transformation from an *allowance* - 'limited quantity or sum', or 'to

supply in limited quantities' - to a *benefit* - that is 'allowance to which person is entitled' (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 1976) - was a representative change of words. It emphasized a system in which the central pieces were the concepts of rights and needs but, at the same time the word *benefit* signalled the maintenance of the allowance roots. Family Benefits inaugurated a new model of management of women who raise children alone. They continue to represent a category but, under this approach, the differentiation between families without a male breadwinner and other needy subjects is subtle.

Eliminating the cause of poverty as the reason for support means that women who raise children alone are no longer deserted, widowed, wives of incapacitated men, unwed mothers and others, performing the valuable mother-work under recognisably difficult circumstances. Under Family Benefits, they are a generic unemployable subject understood as such due to their family duties. This inclusive definition of subject, however, downplays the very aspects that originally made the beneficiaries of mothers' allowance more deserving in the public's eye and allowed them the privilege of financial support and rehabilitative interventions denied to other poor persons. The dependent mother has a right to benefits yet right has but a rhetorical value since the Board of Appeal was only established after much protest and never really operated independently. Rights, on the other hand, were guaranteed by the same legislations, regulations and practices derived from the discretionary practices of mothers' allowances.

Despite these transformations, the dependent mother is also in direct continuity with the mothers' allowances. The technologies of Family Benefits are based on the same containment and transformation interventions with roots in the liberal assumption of poverty as caused by personal deficiencies and hence the contradictory tendencies of support and discouragement of these

families. The individualized methods of investigation, planning and supervision of the program themselves represent a recognition that poverty had differential effects on families. However, within a central tutelary structure and tight control of the budget, this recognition alone failed to incorporate individualized responses to the needs of the family. The investigative and supervisory requirements, both for budgetary and standardization reasons, transformed life stories into indicators, institutionalized discretion and established set aspects of family life to judge and account for good motherhood. These defined the dependent mother's internal and external house arrangements, attitudes, behaviour and personal appearance. The racial and class assumptions imbedded in the education and supervisory activities, as well as judgements regarding morality and respectability of the recipients, were incorporated into these practices.

Perhaps the most striking continuity between the two programs is the complete dissociation between the expectations levied and the means provided by the interventions. The paltry amounts of the allowance and the regulation, not only of home life but also of the type and hours of work, maintained women's marginal status in society. Furthermore, the mothers' impossibility to adequately care for their children was underscored by the postwar increase in standards of living and consumption of goods as well as, following Callahan's observation (1991), the enlargement of standards and requirements for child care. These processes almost defined the personal needs of mothers receiving FBA - low self-esteem, anxiety, guilt and family management under increasingly demanding child care requirements - which under CAP were provided by the personal social services as an independent and complementary structure.

The case study reported in chapters 4 and 5 has followed how a certain approach to the wellbeing of populations, focusing on a vision of supporting certain families out of normality,

unfolded into a broad collective program of government of the dependent mother. The next two chapters will discuss the second case study: the experiment of public housing in Ontario. They will explore how the shelter needs of women who raise children alone were conceptualized and acted upon through a set of practices in which poor mothers were rendered invisible within an abstract concept of housing need as the cause of poverty.

Chapter 6

THE SPACE OF MARGINAL POPULATIONS: THE EXPERIMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING

On one hand, I do not think that there is anything that is functionally - by its very nature - absolutely liberating. Liberty is a practice. So there may, in fact, always be a certain number of projects whose aim is to modify some constraints, to loosen, or even to break them, but none of these projects can, simply by its nature, assure that people will have liberty automatically, that it will be established by the project itself. The liberty of men is never assured by the institutions and laws that are intended to guarantee them. This is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around. Not because they are ambiguous, but simply because "liberty" is what must be exercised (Interview with Michel Foucault, Rabinow, 1984, p.245)

Introduction

The two previous chapters examined the particular ways in which providing for the income needs of women raising children alone through mothers' allowance generated a mode of government and its subject. They looked at a collection of rationalities and their translation into a variety of articulated governmental processes of development of an administrative structure, construction of eligibility criteria, transformation of justifications for intervention, building of program components and consolidation into Family Benefits. These processes work through intensive contact, supervision of family life, control of economic activities, intrusion and tutelary advice among other technologies which were repeated and reproduced through the several activities of the program. The effect of this governmentalization of the single mother complex was the construction of a particular way of life for women raising children alone and, more generally, a contribution towards the normalisation of family life even in its "other" manifestations. The dependent mother is a being whose existence, including her subjectivity and

materiality as well as her children, is profoundly enmeshed with this mode of ruling and its activities.

In chapters 6 and 7, I will show that the single mother complex was not confined to governmental interactions with a specific income security program of welfare and that its governmentalization is multifaceted. These chapters will discuss the second case study, which uses the example of the development of a public housing program in Canada to show a different set of processes from those of mothers allowance. Through these processes the complex was further governmentalized and the dependent mother transformed. Engaging this governmentalized complex in a variety of situations validates certain aspects of its subject positions and interpretations of ways of life, taking the dependent mother from the privacy of casework and policy documents to a public and visible arena. Moreover, in this trajectory the complex and its governmental practices are taken into new domains and generate effects not only for the dependent mother but for urban life as a whole. In this case study, then, I will illustrate how the practices and interactions of the single mother complex incorporate shelter as a means of government by examining the public housing program and how this program developed a relationship with dependent mothers. I will also show how, through this process, these women and other groups resignify both the program and their relationship with it.

The study of these projects of government is undertaken here in an attempt to unravel the functioning of social welfare projects and practices, and in particular their relationship with the subject. In most cases, and public housing is a good example, these social welfare projects are proposed and pursued, to use the expression suggested in the opening quote, with liberating aims, among others, in the mind of several actors. If indeed liberty is a *practice* it is the practices of

these programs that should be examined in order to understand where and how their effects seem to point away from liberty. In this sense this second case study is exploring the very nature of social interventions, their practices and effects focusing on their relationship with subjects. Public housing has figured prominently in many emancipatory proposals throughout the Western world. In Canada, after decades of lobbying and agitation, it was one of the main components of the war on poverty of the 1960s just to be, a few years later, condemned as a generator of poverty and deprivation.

In itself the relationship between the two social constructs - single mother and public housing - is intriguing. Shelter has a long lasting association with motherhood. Throughout the formation of the dependent mother, described in previous chapters, poor mothers' chances to settle their family in a modest but comfortable home have played a fundamental role in the family's future plight. The home and its suitability not only determined how mothers were judged and represented socially but these were also the deciding factors in their capacity to keep their family together. The cost of shelter, if we follow the early observers and recorders of the plight of these mothers in Ontario, has been a substantial enough item to determine the viability of these women as family heads. For example, the administrators of mothers' allowance themselves, early in the implementation of the Act, acknowledged the importance of the cost of shelter:

In the rural districts and small towns where rents are lower the allowance is more nearly adequate than in the large cities, and files show that the country mothers can manage with very little outside employment, in a very few cases with none (AR, 1922-23, p.19, my emphasis).

In the pre-depression days, not only the Mothers' Allowance Commission but the profession of social work in general was concerned with the problem of high shelter costs and its suitability for family living:

This rapid growth has brought with it many problems, one of the most serious for the social worker is that of high rent (Wark, 1928, p.64).

Yet the provision of shelter remained conspicuously peripheral to the allowance: it was not an issue the Commission recorded or discussed in its Annual Reports. The home and its physical appearance were present but measures to address the lack of appropriate (or socially sanctioned) shelters were not part of the Commission's repertoire of interventions. Shelter cost was invisible in the allowance once rent was computed in the privacy of each mother's needs assessment. Shelter was also obscured in the concerns of activists during the 1930s and 1940s, whose lobbying efforts focused on the nutritional adequacy yielded by the allowance (see Struthers, 1994, p.101-116). It is only in 1957 with the introduction of budgetary calculations (see Chapter 5) that shelter cost is made explicit with its own separate ceiling. Grossly inadequate as it was, the new method of allowance calculation exposed how the cost of shelter was taking over the amounts allocated for food and clothing. By the 1960s shelter costs assumed centre stage in the campaigns to eradicate a newly found poverty amidst the wealth of the postwar period (Struthers, 1994, p.191-4). The response implemented by the Federal government came in the form of amendments to the NHA in 1964, initiating the large scale construction of subsidized rental housing in Canada.

This response did not, however, claim an association with women raising children alone or with recipients of public assistance or even with welfare but rather it addressed a generic low income population. These women were absent in the proposals and policies of public housing. By the 1980s, when the public housing program was widely recognized as a failure and abandoned, one of its most ardent supporters, activist and professor Albert Rose, attributed to single mothers part of the blame:

Public housing for families was out of favour not merely because of the problems involved in its construction and administration but because two new, important groups of persons with housing needs had come to the fore: senior citizens and sole support mothers with dependent children (Rose, 1980, p.96).

Since the late 1970s, a flourishing feminist literature worldwide dedicated much attention to the interactions between women and housing (see bibliography by Novac, 1986). In Canada Wekerle's pioneering work (e.g., 1980; 1984; 1991; 1993) has discussed the different quality and types of spaces both required and generated by women. Klodawsky and her associates (e.g., 1983; 1984; 1985; 1987) have compiled an assortment of reports and assessments addressing the challenges faced by single mothers regarding shelter suitability and affordability: these women spend a higher than average proportion of income on housing; they have higher than average probabilities of living in accommodation needing major repairs and lacking basic amenities; and they generally depend on public transportation as well as require facilities for children and access to services. This literature has also yielded many specific studies about single mothers and public housing. Canadian explorations, similar to their international counterparts, have produced evidence of the large number of single mothers in public housing projects (e.g., Jordan, 1981; McClain & Doyle, 1984, p.51; McMillan, 1987, p.26; Rose, 1980, p.174), specific design alternatives (e.g., MacLeod, 1983; M. Soper, 1980; Yasmeen, 1988) and preference or need surveys (e.g., Wiesenthal, Wiezmann & Mockler, 1991).

This scholarship records and describes the large numbers of single mothers living in public housing projects but does not explore how that happened or what the formative elements of this association would be. That is, it naturalizes, or assumes as a matter of fact the association between single mothers and public housing. It is, perhaps, a common sense assumption to attribute the association between single mothers and public housing to the feminization of

poverty: public housing was intended for poor households and single mothers constituted a substantial proportion of them (e.g., McClain & Doyle, 1984). This assumption by itself invites further questions about the terms and form that this association took: what are the processes that formed the link between public housing and women raising children alone and how have they affected both these women and the program?

Spain (1995) has recently described public housing in the US as a 'distinctly gendered urban problem' (p.256) which provides a space 'that holds "surplus" women in abeyance until socially sanctioned roles are created for them' (p.256). This argument, however, although drawing attention to the meaning of an occurrence that had been until then taken for granted, is formulated within an understanding of patriarchy as an abstract and totalizing force which controls and defines reality. Thus there is an embedded functional determinism through which spaces are created rather than a contested and gradual formation of meaning that involves also the formation of the space and the women themselves in multiple interactions with other processes. Although endorsing the characterization of public housing as a gendered space, I reject the reduction of this relationship to the terms of a single function and the representation of women who raise children alone as passive, acted-upon beings waiting to fulfil the roles created for them.

In this context, the second case study sets out to make explicit the mechanisms and trajectories through which public housing, as a program independent from mothers' allowance, has discovered, summoned and interacted with a governmentalized single mother complex and its subject. It will show how the dependent mother, as an established subject within a particular program of welfare, does not have an automatic and natural group identity. The formation of this group's identity involved transformations and processes which expand and create different

dimensions of these women's identity as well as a very public image of them, which came to characterize the space of public housing itself with a particular form of marginalization.

Consistent with the conceptual framework discussed earlier (Chapter 3) the focus here is on practices rather than the numerical outcome of the program or analysis of its achievements. The practices of public housing will be examined through a very specific form of text of rule: the correspondence of the Minister responsible for Ontario Housing Corporation for the period of public housing expansion in Ontario, 1964-1973. In contrast with the previous case study, which used the Annual Reports as a *public* reconstruction of the program from the administrators' perspective, here the reconstruction of the program used is a *private* one. That is, I reviewed the documents, letters, internal memorandums, reports, newspaper articles, and so on, which the different Ministers responsible for public housing chose to keep in their record of the program. Although they form a selective array of materials, hence portraying a reconstruction of the program, these sources do not have the same organized intentionality of the Annual Reports. These materials are stored in Ontario Archives in boxes corresponding to the different drawers of the Ministers' file cabinets and are cited according to identification of these boxes. They contained a more detailed and intimate look at the day-to-day activities of the program, the problems encountered and how they were solved. It is particularly significant that most of these records pertain to construction activities and comparatively very little pertain to the actual procedures related to tenants. Unlike the Annual Reports, however, these text recordings of practices of ruling offer accounts of practices from tenants's own voices through their letters and submissions to the Ontario Housing Corporation.

As in the previous chapters these texts were contextualized through published texts

addressing public housing. Although public housing has been extensively studied in Canada, this has been done through a focus on the federal level and on the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (e.g., Bacher, 1993; Bourne & Ley, 1993; Fallis & Murray, 1990; Miron, 1993). Very few studies have explored the functioning of the Ontario Housing Corporation with the exception, primarily, of the extensive documentation provided by the published works of activist and professor Albert Rose, who participated in and documented the housing process in Canada since the postwar. There are also, in this vein, certain evaluative reports such as the one produced by Dennis & Fish in 1972 which has become a classical public housing manual. The secondary sources assume central importance in the initial sections of chapter 6 where a reconstruction of the rationalities around public housing is undertaken. There is, however, limited documentation of the processes of implementation as they relate to tenants or prospective tenants and no published work to date has examined these processes as they relate to women raising children alone.

The public housing case study starts with a review of the conceptualization of the housing problem and its solutions in relation to the emergence of welfare. This is followed, in the next three sections, by a detailed discussion of the formulation of an apparatus of implementation which constituted the public housing program in Ontario in the 1960s. In "Why this Form of Government", I address the transformations in discourses and arguments in favour of public housing which created a justification for the program. Following, in "How Government is Exercised", I examine the central concept of need and how it was made into an issue of practical assessment of adequacy; decisions around type of dwelling, and calculations of affordability. Finally in "What Government Practices Seek to Govern", I discuss the processes of production

and delivery of the program. A brief summary of the apparatus of implementation of public housing closes this chapter highlighting the effects of this apparatus for women raising children alone. Chapter 7 continues this case study with a discussion about the discovery of tenants and the effects of this discovery.

Conceptualizing the Housing Problem: A Better Way of Life for Canadian Families

This section outlines the broad elements that led to the formation of shelter as a problem and the actions this problem generated in Canada. Although exhibiting specific aspects, Canadian approaches have definite roots in and derive stimulation from other Western nations, especially Britain and the US. Canada has, nevertheless, to this day, maintained a relatively original path in its housing policies and programs while keeping events abroad at close scrutiny. Reflecting this proximity, this section discusses the formation of housing as a problematic issue in Canada and the influence of other Western nations on the rationalities and practices of shelter provision in this country.

In European nations, provision and adequacy of shelter came to be seen as a problem requiring a social solution in the context of the formation of the working class and the modern family (see Donzelot, 1979; Rabinow, 1989; Wright, 1981, p.262-284). In Britain the greatly overcrowded cities of the nineteenth century, with their overflowing sewer systems and dense polluted air, were the focus of many reformers (e.g. Engels, 1958). There, arguments for sanitary improvements aimed at ameliorating the mode of life of the poor used the same rationale of differentiation embedded in the 1834 reform of the Poor Laws. In the sanitary interventions, however, the separation between workers and paupers was achieved in a different fashion from

that of relief measures:

In the former [the poor laws], the problem was the reorganization of relief so that the labouring classes would not be unduly tempted away from selling their labour for subsistence. In the latter [sanitary improvements], intervention would involve the removal of those conditions which led the labouring population into pauperism. In the one the problem was to make the condition of the pauper signify less-eligibility; in the other, to make the condition of the labourer really more eligible. The notion of pauperism could be used, then, not simply to institute relief practices which constituted the poor as wage labourers or their dependents, but as a grid by which certain modes and conditions of life among the propertyless could be established and fostered (Dean, 1991, p.208).

These interventions contributed to the creation of the worker through two different paths: first by discouraging him to choose relief which was to be defined as less than the workers' wage; second by providing conditions which would make the worker's mode of life more attractive than the pauper's. Among the latter, not only the house but the whole urban realm became the space of construction of the form of life of the worker and his family. Sanitary solutions to the urban, slum or housing problem were varied and involved a range of groups attempting to derive social and scientific norms for peaceful class coexistence in the cities. The European solutions to the urban problem envisaged medical and regulatory public interventions and counted on the expertise of the private sector to provide houses (Emms, 1990; Lundqvist, 1992): in 1889, the first housing law passed in Belgium granting tax advantages for builders and creating saving banks and local housing committees; in 1892 a housing law was passed in Austro-Hungary; in France a housing law similar to that in Belgium was in place in 1894 and in 1902 public health laws allowed interventions to combat hygienic abuses (Rabinow, 1989, p.181, p.252); and in 1890 the Housing of the Working Class Act in England gave local governments authority in matters of slum clearance as well as rebuilding and management of units as rentals (Daly, 1989, p.400).

On the other side of the Atlantic, the American cities, despite their newness, depicted conditions comparable to their European counterparts. In the larger cities in the US, reformers,

journalists and medical officials had been actively documenting these conditions since the 1870s: immigrant and other poor families lived in crowded, filthy unsanitary and squalid buildings and environments (see Gutman, 1976; Lubove, 1962; and Ward, 1989). In Canada, Doucet & Weaver (1991, p.241) conclude, the concern with shelter lagged behind the US. The British North America Act assigned to the provinces all matters of health and welfare as well as property and civil rights. On the other hand, as the Municipal Act of 1849 had given Ontario municipalities the power to pass bylaws, licencing methods and building bylaws became municipal ordinances subject to provincial scrutiny (Sayegh, 1987, p.77). The actual building or provision of housing was however, considered a private matter and around the turn of the century there was much documentation of poor housing and urban decay in Canada. Among them the most well known are Herbert B. Ames' survey of Montreal conditions in 1897; the later reports of the Toronto Bureau of Municipal Research in 1914 (see Rose, 1958, p.36) and Woodsworth's "Strangers Within Our Gates" in 1908 and "My Neighbor" (*sic*) in 1911 discussing the conditions in Winnipeg.

Primarily due to the high cost of land and construction rather than control by powerful land holding aristocracy as in Europe (Adams, 1974/1934, p.47) most residents in the New World rented. Home ownership was very difficult due to the high sum required for a down payment and the lack of employment stability that would allow mortgage payment (Doucet & Weaver, 1991, p.75). In Toronto at the turn of the century three out of four urban salaried and wage earning workers lived in rented houses (Jones, 1978, p.2). Rent was, however, an expensive proposition. Jones' (1978, p.3) study of rents and wages shows that in Toronto between 1900 and 1913 rents increased by 100% while wages of skilled workers increased by 80% and those of unskilled

workers by 30%. A wealth of literature has described the conditions of living of the poorer dwellers in urban Canada: rapid increase in urban population around turn of the century; low income of the new urban dwellers; inflation and speculation in the real estate and building industries; deplorable tenements and rooming conditions (see Copp, 1974; Darroch, 1983; Piva, 1979; Rutherford, 1974; Wade, 1994, chap.1). The few parks in Canadian cities were gifts from philanthropic landowners (Doucet & Weaver, 1991, p.75) and urban services such as water, sewer facilities, side-walks and paved streets were provided after the fact and implied extra assessment levies. Only in 1901, for example, Montreal made enclosed sewers obligatory. Although by early twentieth century public health regulations and municipal codes were passed in every province, enforcement was difficult and varied widely, as documented by the Federal Commission of Conservation, created in 1909 to investigate issues regarding housing, urban and town planning (Jones, 1978, p.2).

The slum was, as of the 1890s, a source of concern for a variety of religious leaders, health inspectors, and social welfare activists in Canada who saw it not only as an economic and health problem but also as a moral threat (see Rutherford, 1974; Valverde, 1991, ch.6). Dr C.J.

Hastings, Toronto Medical Officer of Health, remarked in 1911:

It must be apparent that we are confronted with the existence of congested districts of insanitary, overcrowded dwellings, which are a menace to public health, affording hotbeds for germination and dissemination of disease, vice and crime (Hastings, 1918, p.67).

These associations were not specific to Canada and throughout the Western World, reformers established a series of discursive links between the physical and moral or the public and personal consequences of slum housing noting widespread 'intemperance, sickness and death, pauperism, crime, corruption of children and adolescents, weakening of marriage and family ties, loss of self

respect among wage earners' (Birch & Gardner, 1981, p.404).

This construction of the urban and housing problem influenced the range and form of solutions discussed. The recognition of public responsibility implied in measures such as regulatory legislation, rehabilitation and suburban resettlement would render them highly unlikely as solutions of a problem seen as moral in its roots. In contrast interventions proposed by the urban reformers, such as slum clearance and improved housing, had a marked moral component and were undertaken by individuals and private organizations. Valverde (1991, p.102), comments that the strict division between private and public within liberalism places moral issues to the private sector. In Britain, for example, philanthropic solutions to slum housing had been in place since the mid nineteenth century with a number of associations of charitable donors building houses and using rent proceeds to build additional projects (Tarn, 1973). By the 1860s Britain had several limited dividend companies which combined philanthropic housing building with small profits of up to 5% (Birch & Gardner, 1981). Among those was Octavia Hill who began her housing work in 1864 with the purchase of properties in London aiming at improving the housing conditions of the poor classes while returning a limited dividend to investors. She instituted a new system of housing management in these properties which ensured tenants' moral and material improvement through rigorous monitoring of behaviour and actions; intensive volunteer visiting and guidance; and subjecting repairs and continued residency to tenant's compliance. She established what Dale & Foster (1986, p.30-32) described as a women's solution to the housing problem as well as a woman's profession of rent collectors and managers.

A combination of business and philanthropic housing was also in place in the US in the 1870s and in certain cities these philanthropic companies produced a substantial amount of low

cost housing until World War I (see Birch & Gardner, 1981). As in Britain, women played a large role in American philanthropic housing as investors, board members, and workers. On the one hand, the proponents of limited dividend companies saw the problem of slum housing as caused by the inadequate supply of decent dwellings and exploitative slum landlords, and they assumed that new construction would free better houses for those in worse housing conditions, the so-called trickle down principle. On the other hand, they viewed the slum as a contagious source of crime and vice from which the worker and his family should be protected. Their solutions combined the construction of dwellings using new financial arrangements and architectural forms as well as management and tenant selection schemes based on supervised environments and moral guidance (Birch & Gardner, 1981). Enshrining these interventions as intended for the healthy male worker, the tenant selection practices excluded indigent, aged, feeble and sick persons. In addition, only regularly employed artisans and workers were able to afford the rents. Philanthropic housing, hence, unlike mothers' allowance, did not claim exception from the capitalist rules for a specific group of people unable to follow them but rather it was a critique of the excesses of greed of the urban landlords and proposed a solution for the masses of poor workers. As in the European context, housing in the New World was conceived as problematic for the norm, for the way of life of the average worker, rather than a residual issue for a specific group of people.

In Toronto, business-philanthropy housing was extensively discussed in early twentieth century. Despite intensive agitation by the several local groups, however, a private charity company, the Toronto Housing Company created in 1913, never managed to raise the necessary amount of money (see Hurl, 1984; and Purdy, 1993). Hence, unlike experiments elsewhere, in

Toronto, the municipal government was pressured by business leaders to participate in the enterprise, initially through enabling legislation, and later through financial guarantees to the semi-private venture which required provincial legislation. Through this legislation Ontario became the first province to accept constitutional responsibility for housing (Sayegh, 1989, p.77). This also initiated a long lasting link between the local government and low income housing in Ontario. Shelter issues in the early 1910s, therefore, assumed the form of a 'function of the state to safeguard family life' (Beer Papers, cited in Hurl 1984, p.38) but this role was one of enabling private charitable enterprise rather than of providing housing (p.40). Contemporary to the discussion about Mothers' Allowances in Ontario, the Toronto Housing Company was also proposed as a differentiation from charity. The former, however, stamped its divergence from charity through its methods (see Chapter 5) and the latter did so through its profit-yielding in the form of a limited dividend. This experience was short lived. In all it housed a modest number of people, and it was marked by opposition and controversy (Purdy, 1993).

In Britain, the search for stability after World War I brought the issue of veteran's housing to the political forefront, giving responsibility to local councils for construction and management of rental housing with central government funds (Daly, 1989, p.400). Prior to that public provision in the form of council housing has been, since 1890, allowed rather than mandated. In the period following World-War I, the fears of a communist revolution, the hardship of the war and the conditions of veterans provided the incentive for a consensus around state responsibility for relieving shortages, controlling rents and setting shelter standards for the working class. Several subsidy programs produced a high level of housing construction, e.g., Addison (1920-1923), Chamberlain (1924-1934) but it is the Wheatley subsidy introduced in 1924 which insisted

on the construction of rental housing. The Greenwood Act of 1930 initiated slum clearance in the interest of public health relegating issues of rent to a secondary plan (Best, 1996).

Similarly, in Canada, a veteran housing initiative took place after the World War I and it involved the Dominion government under the provisions of the War Measures Act. The Better Housing Scheme was associated with agrarian radicalism, labour unrest, fears of a communist revolution, and the lack of prospects for returning soldiers; all these added to widespread concerns about the low quality and overall shortage of dwellings (Guest, 1985, p.34-35; Jones, 1978, p.4-6). This scheme inaugurated several features that shaped both the housing problem and its solution in Canada. First, the scheme required the participation of all three levels of government, each with very specific roles: indirect financing, guidelines and standards were under the Dominion's control; the provinces, which passed enabling legislation, had the responsibility of management and coordination of the scheme within their territory; and the local municipalities had direct provision and administrative responsibilities. As the scheme quickly wound down by 1923-24, the municipality was left with a series of unwanted costs and responsibilities (Wade, 1994, p.32). Second, the terms of the solution to the housing problem were changed from provision of low income rental housing, characteristic of philanthropy, to provision of mortgages towards ownership of a private family home. Furthermore, as shown by Delaney (1991) even the design of this private family home was approved federally and determined by assumptions about how a normal family should work and live. Lastly, the scheme consolidated the trickle down principle as an approach to the provision of low income housing since the houses built were not inexpensive and only middle class buyers could afford them (Delaney, 1991).

While the Dominion government in Canada maintained its distance from housing issues

throughout the 1920s, in Britain local authorities carried on substantial public rental housing building in the interwar (Ball, Harloe & Martens, 1988; Daly, 1989, p.403). These experiences profoundly influenced American housing reformers who followed closely the British architectural, garden city and planning solutions. But it was only in the depression with Roosevelt's New Deal programs that the US saw its first public housing programs implemented by the Federal government (see Wright, 1981, chap.12). In clear contrast to both Britain and the US, the Canadian government, despite the dismal shelter situation aggravated by the penurious conditions of the depression, continued to reject direct provision of rental housing. A series of municipal housing surveys in the early 1930s, among them Toronto's Bruce Report of 1934, documented unhealthy conditions and proposed a program of subsidized rental housing (Bacher, 1986, p.7; 1988a, p.6; Guest, 1985, p.101; Rose, 1958, p.37-41). These recommendations were echoed by municipal officials and private business organizations such as the National Construction Council which argued that construction of housing and public works were a better solution to unemployment than relief (Hulchanski, 1986, p.22; Wade, 1994, p.63). In this period, hence, housing construction interests coincided with that of low income housing activists but this relationship has not been uniform throughout the development of the housing issue.

In 1935, as part of Bennett's "New Deal", the Federal government finally stepped into the housing arena with the Dominion Housing Act (DHA) (Bacher, 1988; Hulchanski, 1986). Its strategy was to encourage private construction of housing for those who could afford it, and in this way encourage the releasing of older dwellings to the lower income brackets, in other words, the trickle down principle. The Act provided mortgage assistance to owners and builders, reinforcing the central position of Canadian financial institutions in the housing scene. As

Hulchanski (1986, p.21) proposed, it put forward a view of housing as a stimulant to business recovery rather than a social need. Workers' housing was to be a private provision with the government intervening to facilitate this process. Overall, however, the Act had minimal impact on the employment situation and quantity of housing constructed. In addition it benefited primarily white collar workers (Hulchanski, 1986; Wade, 1994, p.67).

The DHA was maintained in the new Mackenzie King administration which, under considerable pressure by housing activists, in 1937 started the Home Improvement Program providing aid for repairs, rehabilitation and housing conversion as an employment measure and in 1938 passed the National Housing Act (NHA). The new Act extended the previous DHA to the building of small dwellings and established a national housing administration within the Finance Department. Wade (1994, p.79-8) suggests that this Act was strongly influenced by contemporary intellectual and political lobbying activities of a *government generation* of well-educated, middle to upper class Anglophone males, who lobbied from within the Liberal party or through government appointments (Owram, 1986) rather than through 'the voluntarist and philanthropic methods of previous reformers' (Wade, 1994, p.81). This group, although separate, was influenced by activities of the League for Social Reconstruction, the United Church and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Within these national organizations, the prominent roles of spokespersons were occupied by intellectual men, such as academics Harry Cassidy and Leonard Marsh or professional Humphrey Carver. This group devised the agenda for the housing movements (Wade, 1994, p.79). Carver, for example, wrote the chapter on the national shelter problem in the 1935 *Social Planning for Canada* published by the League for Social Reconstruction.

These men saw the housing problem as essentially a lack of low income rental units and thus they aimed their lobbying efforts primarily at the Federal government which they judged the only level capable of mobilizing the amount of resources necessary for housing construction. The solutions proposed were large scale and comprehensive, involving massive commitment of resources. They were preoccupied with macro financial aspects assigning to a secondary level the pragmatic issues of specific needs or processes of getting people into dwellings. This activism, carried at the national level, differed substantially from that of the mothers' allowances movement two decades before which contemplated piecemeal, small and tentative strategies (see Gordon's, 1994a analysis of male and female conceptualizations of welfare in the US New Deal). In this scenario women, in their professional or other groups, performed the active but largely unrecorded work of lobbying local politicians and bureaucrats as well as working within organizations such as the League for Social Reconstruction and political parties (see Wade, 1994, p.84-92 for work done by women in Vancouver during the depression and Rose, 1958, ch.5 for women's activities in Toronto). By the end of the depression housing groups had acquired strengths and organization. But before the innovations of the NHA of 1938 could be put into practice, the outbreak of World War II suspended all initiatives.

During the war an alternative way of tackling the housing problem emerged. The war added scarcity of materials and labour, and intense urbanization to the already insufficient and deteriorating housing stock of Canadian cities. In 1941 the Federal government embarked on a program to house munitions workers and their families and after 1944 to accommodate service men's dependents and veteran's families (see Wade, 1986). Created under the War Measures Act, Wartime Housing Limited (WHL) marked a shift from the Dominion government's indirect

intervention in the housing problem to the direct construction and management of rental units. Both its structure and functioning departed from the previous model. Its operation was decentralized with each branch (51 in 1945) working like an independent builder under the coordination of a committee of prominent local men who enlisted assistance from community organizations in project development and problem solving (Wade, 1986, p.48-49). Location decisions followed a survey of needs of war industry areas, and construction of housing employed local architects and builders working under the Company's specifications. Inspired by industrial towns and workers' community experiments of early twentieth century, WHL developed considerable expertise in tenant relations and community building providing its housing projects with social services and leisure amenities (see Bacher, 1988b; Scott, 1943, 1944; Wade, 1986). Altogether WHL added substantially to the housing stock with the construction of 26,000 units. It was, however, opposed by other government departments, the Property Owners Association and the Building Contractors Association. In addition, as Wade (1986, p.52) documents, among the opposition to WHL was the voice of the Canadian public housing lobby, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, who deplored WHL's autonomy from parliament; the threats its pragmatic approach posed to a planned and comprehensive national housing program; and the cost and quality of the houses it produced. Wade (1994) proposes that these divisions in the housing movement had significant consequences since the 'differing goals among the protest groups allowed the Federal government to diffuse agitation without ever resolving the long-term housing problem' (Wade, 1986, p.55).

A national solution for the housing problem was proposed in 1944 by the federally sponsored Sub-committee on Housing and Community Planning of the Advisory Committee on

Reconstruction which proposed a quantified dimension to housing need. The Curtis Report divided the Canadian population into income groups and discussed specific housing solutions for each of the three groups according to their affordability potential: 'those who can afford to build their own homes without assistance'; those 'who are able to pay an economic [market] rental'; and those 'who cannot afford to pay rents prevalent for satisfactory housing' (Subcommittee on Housing and Community Planning, 1944, p.11). The last group, the report proposed, was in 1941 about one third of the population, composed primarily of large urban families with an income of \$1,200 per year, and paying rent of more than the 20% of their monthly income (p.153). For them, the Curtis Report recommended public housing managed through the municipalities with federal subsidies to pay the difference between the economic rental and the tenant's ability to pay. The Report recommended the use of housing as an anti-cyclical economic stabilization tool (p.150) and concurred with the Federal government that the private market was the primary supplier of homes for the majority of the population. It argued for a public housing program for those outside the parameters of self-sufficiency defining it as a shelter solution for the specific group of those who could not access housing through the "normal" way, that is the private market. This residual group was defined by a deficiency: their inability to perform as others. This definition provides a sharp contrast to the characterization of, for example, the subject of mothers' allowance whose contribution or important function in society was highlighted.

The federal response to the Curtis Report was the NHA of 1944 which streamlined federal housing policy in the directions defined by the 1935 DHA: promotion of home ownership for every Canadian family and housing construction as a stimulant of industry and as a job generation strategy (Bacher, 1986, p.10). The main tools of the Act, consolidated and expanded in its

subsequent amendments and re-writings, were the government's indirect intervention as assistance to the market in the form of manipulation of interest rates; the provision of mortgage moneys at lower rates than those prevailing in the money market, reduced down payments and extended periods of amortization; and the promotion of the house construction industry and its main product, the single family detached house on a newly serviced lot (Carroll, 1989; Rose, 1980, p.35; Sayegh, 1987, p.123-153).

In addition the Federal government created a further instrument to help the average Canadian family to afford home ownership: family allowances (Porter, 1965, p.427). As Bacher (1986, p.10) reported, much of the support for family allowance was due to the Deputy Minister of Finances's argument in 1944 referring to low rental housing projects that 'with children's allowance on anything like an adequate scale, it should be possible to avoid such a program'. The Federal government also created in 1945 the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation (CMHC) to administer the NHA. It consolidated under its authority most of WHL programs.

Under the NHA, joint loans for home ownership accounted for two-thirds of all federal housing activity from 1945 through to 1970 (Canadian Council of Social Development, 1977, p.91). The house building industry became, in the postwar, a major employer as well as the focus of a substantial capital investment and hence an important sector of the country's economy (Clayton Research Associates Ltd, 1990). The federal government commitment to a private solution to the housing problem for the middle income worker and his family through mortgage subsidies made the construction industry viable and strong.

For the families of war workers, service men and veterans, housing was no longer a problem by the 1950s (Wade, 1986, p.93). A complete transformation of the nation's living

patterns and individual's modes of life was in effect. Population growth occurred in the fringes of existing towns and cities while the city centres declined (North America see Berry, 1973; Binford, 1985; Fishman, 1987; Hall, 1987; Jacobs, 1961; Sennett, 1970; Canada, in particular, see Bellan, 1971; Chorney, 1990; Sewell, 1993). Ownership of a new home in the suburbs became the dominant shelter solution for the postwar Canadian family (Clark, 1966; Rose & Wexler, 1993; Fowler, 1992; Mackenzie, 1988; Strong-Boag, 1991) and promotion of rental housing became associated with eroding the foundations of the nation.

Home ownership has in recent years assumed the proportions of a national fetish. Along with this pride has come the notion in some communities that rental housing belongs in some other municipality and that tenant families constitute somewhat inferior citizens (Rose, 1958, p.18).

Home ownership was a costly project for individual Canadian families, as Rose documented in the early 1950s:

The great majority of Canadians have not found the search for housing easy: they have scraped and sacrificed to build, buy or rent continuously better accommodation; they have substantial mortgages to repay each month; they are paying increasingly high municipal taxes to provide the services which they and their neighbours desire and require; they are forced to budget strictly to meet their shelter costs and to provide a reasonably satisfactory standard of living as well (Rose, 1954, p.80).

This particular solution to the housing problem was not only onerous for individual families but also changed their way of life by compelling, for example, two income families (Moore, 1989; Rose, 1958, p.13); and the reliance on cars as mode of transportation (Berry, 1973; Jacobs, 1961).

A mirror image of these developments and created through the same policy trends, the decaying inner cities became the location of those excluded from normality. For low income groups, housing shortages and inadequate living conditions persisted well beyond the 1950s. The shortage of moderately priced rental accommodation was aggravated by the CMHC sale of WHL. In 1951 it was estimated that between 23% and 48% of Ontario families did not earn enough to

buy a home and, hence, needed rental housing at a price which was 'a reasonable proportion of their incomes' (Rose, 1958, p.13). Throughout the 1950s, activists urged and campaigned for a variety of housing issues: improvement of the residential conditions, evictions freeze, creation of emergency shelters, continuation of war time rent control measures, creation of local housing authorities and a public low rental program (Wade, 1994, p.115-136). The housing problem was at the centre stage.

In summary, this first section has provided an overview of the rationalities and practices up to 1945 that constituted the housing problem in Canada. The shape of the housing problem and its solutions in this country were profoundly influenced by both developments and discussions in the US and Western Europe, particularly Britain, which fuelled debates around shelter with ideas and examples of a variety of practices. Shelter was earlier conceptualized within the traditions of promoting a more attractive mode of life for the worker rather than that of the poor, who can only survive with the help of relief. It was to be the main marker between those dependent on a wage and those dependent on social help. In Canada, unlike other Western nations and despite a variety of initiatives in rental housing - e.g., philanthropic housing and WHL - providing shelter for the masses of workers followed primarily one path: the privately built and owned family home. Implementation of this model required intense and indirect government intervention in the form of a supply of cheap mortgage money; implementation of family benefits; consolidation of the trickle down process (*filtering* in contemporary terms); and promotion of a specific (suburban) mode of life. It forged strong links between the construction and development industry and the federal government.

Many events and trends contributed to the establishment of this model and made Canadian

housing policy a unique development: involvement of all three levels of government, each with a very specific role; a particular advocacy pattern marked by gender divisions of function and social access; the constitution of those who could not afford home ownership as an incapable and residual group; the conflicting agendas of advocacy groups; and the commitment to private provision by administrators and politicians. As of the Curtis Report the Canadian housing rationality and practices were determined around the axis of affordability. Home ownership for those that could afford it with the help of heavily subsidized mortgages became the path encouraged and followed by those within the “normal” parameters. For the “others” who could not afford a mortgage the trickle down principle was the solution available.

Despite this predominant trend, the movement around a national subsidized rental program gathered a certain momentum and in the 1960s a substantial public housing program was in place. The next section describes what discussions and arguments animated this experiment and the type of public housing program that emerged. It will discuss the formation of a justification for a distinctive program of public housing in Canada which, unlike the British experience, was not a shelter solution for the working class but for those struggling to be affiliated with that status.

Why This Form of Government: Defining Canadian Public Housing

This section discusses the particular circumstances which prompted the formation of grounds to justify the implementation of a specific form of public housing in Canada. This process involved discussions at the federal level, practical experimentations at the municipal level, development of administrations expertise at the provincial level and enormous advocacy efforts at the grass roots level. While the “normal” way of life was governed through mortgaged home

ownership and the suburban detached housing form, the shelter needs of families and individuals excluded from this normality were not the object of large scale governmental activities. Low income housing was primarily shelter in bad conditions or of difficult maintenance.

The NHA of 1944 together with the amendments of 1945 allowed two possibilities for the creation of low income housing. The first was through slum clearance grants closely tied to the construction of low rent housing in the lands cleared (Sayegh, 1987, p.129). These provisions were relaxed in the 1954 NHA which required only that those displaced by slum clearance be rehoused within the municipality. The second possibility was through loans to limited dividend housing companies for the purpose of providing low-rental housing:

Service clubs, charitable foundations, church groups or business leaders, for example, may form such companies to look after the needs of pensioners or others of limited income (CMHC brochure, cited in Rose 1958, p.27).

Municipal housing projects were built for the aged under this section in Owen Sound, Windsor and York Township and in Burlington for some families dependent on Mothers' Allowance and other forms of public assistance (Rose, 1958, p.27).

While the limited dividend approach appeared similar to strategies in Britain and the US, housing activists argued that the numbers of those in search of moderately priced rental housing, the administrative complexities of its provision, and the financial requirements were all far too large to be tackled by individual citizens or voluntary associations. The problem, activists insisted, had assumed a nation-wide scope and the national government should assume substantial responsibility for it (Rose, 1958, p.25). Some labour groups argued that housing was a citizenship right and that a large proportion of wage earner families, between 40% and 57%, required subsidies to have decent housing:

[I]t is essential that it be made clear to the government and the nation as a whole that the provision of good housing to every Canadian family is a *basic need of the nation* and that it *is not* a charitable gift demanded for the poor by well meaning but impractical humanitarians. ... [N]ational interests (not paternalistic urges) demand the provision of certain basic family standards irrespective of the ability of the family to gain these or its contribution to production as measured in the conventional manner (Wade, 1946, p.102, emphasis on the original).

Other reformers used the issues of the magnitude of the needs of veterans and their families as the catalyst of the demands:

I see the driving justification for the great national housing program under our Federal Government in the terrible plight of our veterans. Two decades of under building and building without regard for social need now falls as a catastrophe upon the veteran and his family. ... It is impossible to leave the public low-rent housing issue aside when dealing with the veterans' housing problem without hitting a blow at those veterans who have the greatest need, and who have the right to expect most from the nation. (Smith, 1946, p.96, 98).

Social work groups had been using for some time (Wade, 1946, p.104) the economic argument that the provision of public rental housing was necessary not only to protect the majority of citizens from the threat of crime and disease bred in the slums but also 'because the costs of slum dwelling had to be inevitably met by expenditures for social services, health services, correction services and the protection of persons and property' (Rose, 1980, p.165).

At the end of the war, thus, the rationalities around a low income housing initiative gathered momentum based on the description of the needs of a group of people and the reasons why these needs should be addressed by government. Three distinct rationalities were articulated at this point: first, using as subjects a large portion of wage earner families in housing need and the rights of citizenship; second, using the magnitude of the needs of veterans and the federal responsibility towards this group; and, third, evoking the threat of crime and disease represented by the slum that hung over the urban population as a whole.

Although distinct these rationalities found a joint expression in a practical experiment carried out by the municipality of Toronto. In 1944, a coalition of groups including the Women's

Electors' Association, the Toronto Welfare Council, the Local Council of Women, the Canadian Legion, the Board of Trade and the Toronto Reconstruction Council (see Rose, 1958, p.46) formed the Citizen's Housing and Planning Association to work for public housing in Toronto. It focused particularly in Regent Park, a blighted area in the core of the city and used arguments based on public health and the social and economic welfare of the city to argue for low rental housing project under the City's responsibility.

It has been widely recognized in this and other countries that no nation can expect a healthy and vigorous population without decent standards of housing for its citizens. The connection between the health of a nation and its housing conditions is indisputable. ... It is clear that juvenile delinquency, crime and vice thrive in an environment of bad housing. In terms of taxes, for the taxpayers this means highly increased police, fire protection and health rates and a high cost for private social services agencies, in relation to better housed areas (Citizens' Housing and Planning Association, 1944 cited in Rose, 1958, p.49).

In 1947 the question of Regent Park redevelopment was submitted to the ratepayers in a referendum amidst strong appeals to the situation of the veterans:

In short, let the people decide whether they want decent housing, or whether they really believe that veterans and other citizens should continue to live in slums (Citizens' Housing Association, 1946 cited in Rose, 1958, p.59).

The referendum result showed substantial support for the project with or without assistance from other government levels (Luffman, 1950, p.126). A Housing Authority was established and entrusted with the construction, control, maintenance, operation and management of the project. Regent Park, as the first subsidized rehousing project built in Canada, was well documented and researched by Professor Rose and his students (see Rose, 1958) and this model experiment was fundamental in setting the terms and form of government constituted by public housing in Canada.

Among its effects was the 1949 amendment to the NHA creating the Federal-Provincial Partnership. The amendment allowed the Federal Government to participate with 75% of the capital and operating costs of housing projects undertaken by the provinces. Public housing had

gained increasing acceptability in Ottawa where the Federal government accepted 'some financial responsibility for public housing in an overall social security program' (CMHC memorandum 1949, cited in Dennis and Fish, 1972, p.132, my emphasis).

Public housing, however, was no longer an ideal discussed just in terms of proposals but a complex issue among others involved in the provision of citizens' wellbeing in a whole system of government of populations. P.R.U. Stratton (1952, p.3), a prominent housing activist based in Vancouver, summarized:

Society has come increasingly to accept the principle, as embodied in social allowances, old age pensions, etc., that every citizen, provided he is willing, where able to work or to care for a family, is entitled to at least a minimum of the essentials for healthful living. Shelter is one of these essentials.

In this statement we can trace some of the central elements in the transformed housing discourse. First, shelter was inserted in the current debate of postwar welfare. It was, following the Curtis report, associated with targeted welfare programs such as social allowances and old age rather than the universal family allowances. Public provision of shelter was definitely not for all but reserved for a group of those unable to afford the product offered by the private market and underwritten with subsidized CMHC mortgages. Second, despite the appeal to citizenship and entitlements, there is a definite association of these entitlements with criteria of worthiness: deservedness is attached to ability to work or raise a family. Finally, also present is the assertion of less eligibility, that is, entitlements referred only to minimal and essential needs. Satisfaction of *all* needs was reserved for those who were able to afford housing provided by the private market.

While the insertion of shelter into postwar welfare seemed to be a settled issue, a debate remained about the conditions and quantities in which public housing should be provided. The matter of subsidy encapsulated this debate from the government perspective. As Stratton (1952,

p.5) argued, subsidy was a political issue. While the provision of large quantities of non-subsidized public rental housing would free older housing at cheaper rates to shelter most low income groups, it would also compete with private construction interests as well as affect the real estate interests of developers and of the ordinary property owner (for current debate and an international comparative perspective see Kemeny, 1995). The Government was faced with the social pressure of shortages added to the dilapidated conditions of the rental housing stock and the lack of cooperative and public utility housing associations which in Europe supplemented the rental market. Federal authorities began, then, to accept the possibility of a subsidized public housing program contained in scope and aimed at a reduced group.

Acceptance of the idea of some sort of public housing program yielded, at the Federal level, support for a reluctant and limited program (Bacher, 1993). The Federal-Provincial Partnership was a contained and cumbersome initiative. The level of participation required of the provinces was deliberately set high (Canadian Council of Social Development, 1977, pp.2-3; Miron, 1988, p.251) in order to buffer Ottawa from municipal pressure (see Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.176). On the other hand, the provinces placed a large portion of the cost on municipalities (Bacher, 1986, p.15). In 1954, Rose offered an assessment of the Partnership results in Canada:

What have we accomplished? We have one municipally-owned public housing project, the Regent Park (North) Project in Toronto with 745 tenants accommodated to date and a further 544 to be accommodated in safe, sanitary and decent housing accommodation. There are at present 5,000 applicants for the 544 apartments. We have nine federal-provincial combined land assembly and rental housing projects, all in Ontario, five of which will offer subsidized rentals eventually in 195 of the 384 rental units; we have sixteen subsidized federal-provincial rental housing projects in six provinces offering eventually 1,407 units; and we have eight federal-provincial full recovery rental housing projects, that is rentals will not be subsidized, in three provinces offering eventually 1,091 units. ... Surely any examiner of these accomplishments would have to conclude that while we have not failed, we have not achieved a great deal (Rose, 1954, p.80).

The Federal-Provincial partnership constituted, then, the first attempt of the Federal

Program to provide low cost rental housing. Nevertheless, the small size of its outputs, its complicated administrative arrangements, and its financial taxing of the weakest level of government - the municipality - made this initiative rather than a practical tool for addressing the housing problem, a political instrument for managing critics. Housing activists continued to emphasize the social implications of this situation. Bad housing was believed to have serious consequences for the welfare of families: a 1951 study by the Children's Aid found that housing caused or contributed to child neglect in 23% of their current 366 cases (Children's Aid and Infant Homes of Toronto, 1952).

How can parents provide affection and sympathy while their own needs are inadequately met? Can a marriage flourish without the privacy to permit the husband and wife to plan together, or even to be together alone? The man who works all day at a monotonous and fatiguing job derives little satisfaction from family life if he returns home to a single room with two to six noisy, active children and a harassed, frustrated woman waiting (p.1).

The depression that set in at the end of the 1950s brought the highest levels of unemployment since the war and exposed the poverty of large sectors of the population. The rediscovery of poverty amidst the wealth of the postwar highlighted the failure of the income security programs to protect a large sector of the population from hunger and grinding poverty. Among the most costly items in the minimal requirements of living, shelter had a prominent role because poor families had to utilize too high a proportion of their income on shelter, often of substandard quality. Housing became the catalyst of an explosive debate over welfare programs and the needs of the poor. Rentals in subsidized housing provided a less costly alternative for them (Watson, 1961, p.16) but it was in short supply (McAllister, 1963). The private rents paid by recipients of relief and mothers' allowance exceeded their shelter allowance which had remained at the same level from 1951 to 1961 while the cost of living had increased by 60% over the same period (Struthers, 1994, p.191).

We find people on relief are just half way through a month and out of food money. They have used that food money to pay rent. ... Money for food, fuel, and clothing is being diverted to keep a roof of sorts over the family's head. The wolf is at the door alright, but he is looking for rent' (Welfare Council, 1961 cited in Struthers, 1994, p.192).

Within the Federal government ranks, from 1955 to 1964, CMHC debated the nature and purpose of public housing (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.133). These debates focused around the purpose and form a possible future public housing program could assume and strongly influenced the specific shape of the low income rental program eventually implemented. In 1955, a proposal from the Corporation to expand the social housing program failed to gain ministerial approval and a further proposal, in 1957, met the same resistance from within CMHC's own board:

My main criticism of the statement is that it seems to assume that public housing is primarily an instrument of social policy to remedy directly the conditions of those of the poor who are living in bad housing ... Public housing at this stage in Canada ... should be regarded primarily as an economic matter and as a part of urban development or redevelopment rather than an instrument of social policy (Letter to the president, 1957 cited in Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.135).

In addition to this marked differentiation between social and economic roles of public housing, an expansion of the restricted Federal-Provincial Partnership into a tangible public housing program involved also a further differentiation: CMHC staff proposed a particular form and role for the program in order to avoid competition with private enterprise.

A clue to a residual position for public housing design and standards may be found in the stock of used housing presently available to lower income families. ... It is not suggested that a residual character for new public housing may be found in building into it a structural obsolescence. There may be, however, merit in creating some measure of functional and social obsolescence; i.e. to incorporate into the concept of public housing design a number of traits making it less socially desirable (CMHC memorandum, 1962 cited in Dennis & Fish, 1972).

Acceptability of public housing, hence, involved the conceptualization of a very specific product to be delivered. It was to fulfil primarily an economic role as part of the urban redevelopment initiatives. It was also an issue of minimal or essential needs and as such it was to be physically differentiated and visible in the urban fabric in order to be clearly distinct from privately built and owned houses. This long trajectory of transformations in the provision of shelter shows how,

unlike the mothers' allowance initiative, concrete or real families in need were gradually substituted for a vague image of low income families, evoking discourses of social differentiation and government of the other, in the ideas that shaped the form and role of housing.

The practical experiment of public housing, however, required also an administrative structure of delivery and management which, following the traditions established in the BNA Act, were the responsibility of the provinces and their municipalities. During the Federal Provincial partnership dealings, Ontario had on many occasions voiced a critical view of CMHC, pointing to its inflexibility of procedures and centralized structure which caused lengthy delays and design problems (correspondence of managing director; AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5, file: OHC-1965). In parallel to these developments regarding the idea of public housing within Federal government circles, the long standing housing lobby in Toronto, with their ranks strengthened by labour and welfare groups, pressured municipal authorities for a solution to the housing problem. There was agitation around the formation of a region-wide housing authority, modelled on the strong role US municipalities had in housing planning and provision, which would negotiate subsidies directly with the federal level (Rose, 1980, p.37). The Province, under considerable pressure for its inaction on the housing field, developed its own plans for a provincial housing body.

In 1964, Ontario Housing Corporation (OHC) was created to assume responsibility for agreements with the government of Canada under the sections addressing urban redevelopment and the Federal-Provincial Partnership (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5, file: OHC-1965). The agency saw as its mandate the production of low-income housing units and its creation marked the beginning of an expanded low income housing program in Ontario. OHC followed closely the conceptualization of public housing developed within CMHC. In September 1964 during the

OHC inaugural meeting the important economic role of housing was highlighted.

Success in Ontario can make a significant contribution to the National economy as a whole (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5, file: Minutes of meetings).

In that same year the Federal government amended the NHA introducing for the first time the words *public housing* into the Act and changing the terms of the Federal-Provincial Partnership. With these developments, policy discussions around public housing at the federal level ceased indicating 'that the issues canvassed in the preceding eight years had been settled and it was now a matter of carrying out the solutions adopted' (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.178). Public housing had become a practical matter of implementation.

In summary, the meaning of public housing in Canada, then, was developed over a long period of time before assuming any concrete form. The first program with this name itself came into existence almost five decades later than the first provincial initiative in providing for its citizens: mothers' allowance. Ontario in the 1960s was already an experienced and sophisticated administrator of programs regarding the welfare of populations. The very process that defined the provision of housing for the working population in Canada, placed public housing as a form of provision for those outside the parameters of self-sufficiency, a specific and delimited group unable to perform and live as the "normal" citizen. Public housing was formulated as a responsibility of government by several advocacy groups using arguments about the sheer magnitude of those that could not afford home ownership; and the composition of deserving subgroups such as the veterans. Also important in this argumentation was the postwar widespread rhetoric of citizens' right to certain standards of living; and, ultimately, the economic and social expenditures required by the slum.

Lobbying and pressure aided by the municipal experiment of Regent Park resulted in a

contained program of subsidized rental housing through the Federal-Provincial Partnership. Expansion of this initiative into a national public housing program of substance incorporated two other aspects into the idea of public housing: first, the relevance of housing construction as an economic stimulation policy; and second, the residual character of the design generating a product which, despite its affordability, would limit the size of the program through its undesirability. The product offered was profoundly marked by these developments.

This section has discussed the formation of a body of ideas that justified a very specific kind of public housing as a program of government in Canada. It illustrated completely different dynamics from those of mothers allowances where there was a commitment around the idea of supporting a certain group of people. In the current case, the realm of the programmatic involved the thorough development of the idea of public housing into a Canadian solution, distinct from those of Britain and the US although influenced by them. This process required a detailed configuration of justifications for intervention, insertion of public housing in a residual stream of welfare provision, the development of a general design for its actions, delivery mechanisms, and effects expected. The next section in this chapter will examine the centrality of the definition of housing need for determining how government is exercised and following, in “What Practices Seek to Govern”, I will discuss the components of the public housing program.

How is Government Exercised: Housing as a Noun

It is now twenty six years since Turner’s classical article (1972) exhorting professionals and activists to think of housing as a verb and not just as a noun. He was criticizing the established way of providing housing which had come to dominate most centralized housing

programs. Turner drew attention to dynamic processes involved in dwelling provision in order to achieve liberation and empowerment through housing. As a noun, in contrast, housing had to be understood and framed as a set of static categories. It is this way of understanding public housing that is explored in this section. The particular way of making housing need into a practical issue is central in this process. It will be approached here following the development of three aspects of provision for housing needs: adequacy, type of dwelling and affordability. These aspects define, shape and locate the meanings of need at the centre of the process of governing through the provision of shelter.

Adequacy.

The definition of actual material need was essential to determine the tangible products of a public housing program. The Curtis Report talked about a housing need estimating it through the deficit method, that is, it basically subtracted from the actual housing stock a projection of the number of new households formed. Rose (1955, p.4) attempted to advance this method by arguing that need was not only a question of providing shelter for those who did not have it but also a question of adequacy:

Adequacy implies that each family shall be housed in sufficient space to maintain a happy family life and that this housing shall be of sound construction properly maintained. ... Adequacy thus has both social and physical implications. ... It is, of course, futile to discuss social and physical adequacy if much of the housing which meets acceptable standards is beyond the capacity of a substantial proportion of the population to own or rent' (Rose, 1958, p.3-4, emphasis in the original).

To solve the issue of shelter, then, required a consideration of adequacy which involved attention to the suitability of house for the family, its physical condition, and the family's capacity to pay for it. These three aspects of need formed the basis of Rose's comprehensive survey and, interestingly, they constitute the basis of core housing need analysis currently done by CMHC (CMHC, 1990, p.142). The survey translated each aspect into observable indicators and standard

assessment procedures which were compiled to determine the total need of a municipality.

The fundamental objective of the project was that of exploration and experimentation with the techniques of the housing survey and, if possible, the determination of a method by which housing need could be measured ... The use of three Schedules, when revised in the light of the statistical and analytical conclusions derived in the experiment, would provide the housing analyst (local municipal council, housing authority, or any sponsoring organization) with the great majority of facts required to interpret the housing requirement of the municipality or any area within it (Rose, 1955, p.106).

Unlike the mother's allowance scheme, where need was determined and acted upon in an individual and face to face situation within the fixed budgetary ceilings, housing need assumed a faceless expression. The actual need of each individual family appears only in a series of aggregated indicators giving to housing need an *area* or *spatial* nature. Its outcome became, inevitably, a certain number of dwellings and issues of adequacy became a question of fitting the families into the newly built unit: family rather than shelter adequacy (see complementary discussion about heterogenous housing in Turner, 1976).

Family adequacy involved considerations of size and composition of family vis-à-vis the shelter. As some critics have remarked for a variety of contexts (e.g., Delaney, 1991 for Canada; Donzelot, 1979 for France; Hayden, 1981 for the US), adequacy, as a measure of correspondence between the design of the home and its inhabitants, is an important form of regulating family life. In the early precursor of public housing, Regent Park, adequacy was clearly used to define private family arrangements:

The tenant in public housing is admitted only when available accommodation is adequate for the size and compositions of his family. Children past infant years are not expected to sleep in bedrooms with their parents. Children of opposite sex are not expected to sleep in the same bedroom beyond their earliest years. If an additional child is born and an additional bedroom is required, the family is shifted as soon as appropriate space becomes available. There is neither physical nor social overcrowding. ... [t]here is thought to be a definite relationship between the adequacy and security of public housing accommodation and the birth rate of tenant families (Rose, 1958, p.208-9).

These guidelines were carried into OHC practice where they had significant repercussions on how a family unit was defined and how household arrangements regarding care and domestic work

were organized. Evidence can be found in the letters OHC received from advocates asking for special considerations of some families circumstances. In St. Jamestown in Toronto, for example, the Diocesan Council for Social Service of The Anglican Church of Canada carried on a lively letter exchange with OHC in 1965 pertaining to the relocation arrangements which forced grandparents and unmarried sisters and their children to form independent family units (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5). These household formation practices had, arguably, consequences for women raising children alone and their support and survival techniques.

Type of dwelling.

Need is also used to define the types of units produced, that is their size, location and density. The issue of dwelling size constituted, within CMHC, a central aspect in the formulation of a public housing program and its nature.

It has been stated that public housing should be made available to large families ... Units larger than three-bedrooms ... can hardly be said to be residual, while middle income families with many children can seldom afford more than three bedrooms (CMHC memorandum, 1962 cited in Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.175).

The type of unit is, then, through the technology of need operationalization, transformed into a mechanism to regulate out of normality families: they could not be rewarded with public housing solutions which addressed their actual circumstances. As OHC emphasized the economy of constructing two or three bedrooms units, the large families were, predominantly, excluded from the projects. Size of unit becomes in the provision of public housing a form of controlling what size of family gets admitted to public housing. For example, the Globe & Mail of May 10, 1966 documents the case of two evicted families with five children which could not be accommodated in OHC housing because of the size of units available. Small size of units became a highly debated issue in large urban areas where the cost of land was seen by OHC as necessarily implying

high-rise, high density urban forms.

Apartment buildings afforded housing described as bachelor accommodation and one- and two-bedroom apartments, for the most part. The housing authorities were committed to the prevention of overcrowding and thus could often not meet the needs of families with more than two to four children. In any case, there was the emerging question of the suitability of apartment dwellings for families with children. In the late 1960s there was an increasing volume of literature attributing disturbed family relationships and behavioural problems among children to high-rise apartment living (Rose, 1980, p.10).

Small sized units would, perhaps, induce fewer children in housing projects (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.192). The number of children in the projects, however, was not reduced since smaller units allowed a higher number of units to be built. In an indirect turn of events, I suggest, the small size of the units may have functioned to facilitate the accommodation of women raising children alone vis-à-vis other families since the former had a relatively small number of children. The census of 1961 shows that only 3.4% of the families headed by women had five or more children while 5.9% of those families headed by a male were in that category (Statistics Canada, 1961, table 73, p.13-14). In fact, ignoring the above mentioned literature on the dangers of child raising in a high-rise, during the 1971 Ontario Supply Committee debates covering OHC activities, the Corporation representative declared:

I think I have made the point that if there is usefulness in highrise development - and much has been said on this - this is one area that probably is acceptable for this type of family [single-parent family]. It does provide for baby-sitting in the one hall. It is not always in the capacity of the mother to cut the grass in row housing or the other form of housing. ... the production by virtue of costs, in recent months and years is such that we are producing more units in the one- and two-bedroom category that has tended to look after that kind of family (Legislative Debates, July 13, 1971, p. S-2171- S-2172).

In terms of location, a substantial number of the dwellings provided by public housing in Ontario were on the fringes of metropolitan areas, and in large, high density high-rise projects clearly distinct from the norm of single detached family homes. Public housing location was seen by OHC as a question of bringing the worker where the jobs were: the suburbs. As the Honourable J.R. Nicholson - Minister of Citizenship and Immigration - argued in 1965 by

occasion of the 13th Annual Conference of the Ontario Housing Authorities (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1, file: Minister's correspondence), industries were locating in the periphery hence semi-skilled workers should be relocated there. Another argument suggested that location outside the city core allowed proximity to higher status groups which might be a beneficial contact for those in poor housing conditions (Management Systems Branch, Tenant Selection, 1972, p.5. AO RG 44-16, Box 6; see also Sayegh, 1987, p.341. For similar but current arguments in the US see Briggs, 1997). As a consequence of these location decisions, Dennis & Fish (1972, p.182-183) argue, public housing tends to be distant from commercial or shopping services, employment and recreation facilities; close to undesirable land uses such as express ways, railway lines or industrial plants; clustered around other projects or other low income housing; and have poor public transportation services. Location had a profound effect on the quality of life of working women, of which single mothers were a substantial proportion, and on their ability to work since most of their jobs continued to be located in the urban core (see critique in Klodawsky & Mackenzie, 1987). In Thunder Bay, the Lakehead Social Planning Council documented the condition of the La Salle Project in a report dated June 26, 1970.

There are no laundry facilities, there are no stores close by and consequently bus service, even when available, becomes an added expense for these tenants, few of whom have cars. Until a tenants' association presented a brief to the City, there was no bus service on Sunday and inadequate service at certain times of the day (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1, p.4).

While average project size in the country was 77 units in 1972, in Metropolitan Toronto it was 231 units for projects built since 1964 and in other large Ontario cities, such as Hamilton, Ottawa and Windsor, this average was 100 units (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.182). OHC argued that rising costs in major urban centres made large scale, and frequently high-rise projects the only economically sound solution (p.178,182,192; and Rose, 1980, p.10). As early as January 1964, a

representative from Regent Park, in an address to the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto characterized the high-rise building as

not suitable for large families because of the regimentation required, the insufficiency of play space and therefore children tend to congregate in corridors and elevators making it difficult to the mother to supervise the children (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1).

In addition to the isolation and density of the projects, quality of life for tenants was further affected by the CMHC restriction on funding recreation facilities under the NHA of 1964 (Stanley J. Randall, the Provincial Minister responsible for OHC, in a letter to Federal Minister Paul Hellyer, April 23, 1968, AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7). OHC did not include, even in projects destined for families, any provisions for tenants' recreation or any service facilities. At OHC's fifth meeting in March 5, 1965, housing activists in Toronto had already prepared a petition and full report outlining the need for social services and specialized educational and recreational services in public housing developments (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5; see also a brief by the Toronto St. Christopher House of June 1966, AO RG-1-1, Box 4). The Mayor of Ottawa in 12 September, 1967 at the 15th Annual Conference of the Ontario Association of Housing Authorities observed that projects seemed to be populated by women and made a passionate plea for the inclusion of services in the planning of public housing (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 2).

Type of dwelling provided, discussed here in terms of size of units, location, size of projects and services, have important effects for the formation of the composition and form of life of a tenant body. All these unusual features associated with an institutionalized *project name*, gave public housing a distinct and segregated spatial differentiation within the urban fabric as recognized in a letter from Randall to Hellyer in April 23, 1969 (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7, p.5). Many of these effects, highlighted here, produced a selection bias towards women raising children

alone shaping in this way their location in the urban space and also their day to day life and relation with these spaces. They become through these processes and technologies, associated with high density, segregated and poorly serviced spaces.

Affordability.

As an aspect of need, the relationship between housing cost and family income, or what is today understood as affordability, has been discussed from a variety of view points. For some, housing affordability is an issue to be tackled with the provision of income supports rather than houses built and owned by government. In 1969, the Hellyer Report argued that income security programs addressed more adequately the housing problem than public housing since it was an issue of needy groups, that is the residual poor rather than the normal working population:

Public housing is in a sense an "imported" concept in Canada. While it is a widely used approach in many European countries, it runs counter to the general Canadian concept of social welfare and security. In most areas this concept revolves around attempts to provide needy Canadians with sufficient income or assistance, via subsidy or insurance, in order for them to use the same services which exist for the population at large. In the field of housing, however, the approach has not been to assist those in need to compete in one way or another in the private market, but rather to build special projects designated and reserved for their use (Canada, 1969, p.53).

CMHC has successively argued that public housing is not an efficient way to meet shelter needs of low income households since cash transfers can more appropriately satisfy individual preferences, unless, and this is a sizable exception, there is a need for increases in the housing stock or for market supply adjustments (see CMHC 1969, p.5; 1979, p.22). This ambiguous support for public housing is, in a way, a recognition of housing advocates' arguments that home ownership or rental in the private market was at a price which the majority of the population could not afford. At any rate, this recognition of special circumstances did not imply an assumption of permanent responsibility for provision. OHC emphasized that:

[A]t the present time, housing assistance can be found in numerous programs of which public housing is

merely the most obvious. A major form of housing assistance in Ontario is "cost shared" under CAP and consists of the shelter component of payments under the GWA and FBA Acts (Remarks by OHC to the Feb 22, 1973 meeting of the Social Services and Housing Committee of Metropolitan Toronto, p.10, AO RG 44-1-2, Box 11).

Echoing these sentiments and arguments, shelter allowances have become the housing intervention of choice in the late 1990s in mature welfare states (see Kemp, 1997 for an international perspective and Steele, 1995 for a Canadian study). Among the arguments for this shift is the announcement that the large postwar housing shortages have ended and the problem to be tackled is one of income rather than housing (Kemp, 1997, p.7).

A shortage of affordable housing was one of the arguments in the development of Regent Park, and there, affordability was first made into a practical concept in Canada. Carver & Hopwood (1948), in a study of rentals in that project, proposed a standardized way to make rents affordable to poor families. The study set the standard for calculation of rents in public housing through a rent-to-income scale which linked rent to income and the number of dependent children. Two basic definitions were essential in this scale: the rent-paying unit or the concept of family income, and the inclusions and exclusions of income computation (see Rose, 1958, p.94). The scale equated rent paid with the family situation and its changing circumstances rather than to the quality and size of accommodation.

In short, public housing in Regent Park (North) offers a form of security which is extremely rare in our industrial society. Very few families can count upon adjustments in shelter cost following changes in income for whatever cause. In most cases a family in which the father dies or suffers long illness or disablement or unemployment or even lower wages, is forced to move to less adequate accommodation, sooner or later (Rose, 1958, p.208).

Rent was set at a maximum of 20% of the family income plus a contribution for utilities and reduced according to the number of children (OHC, 1970a, appendix A). As indicated by Rose (1958, p.206), the 20% proportion was derived from the survey of family expenditures

which produced the Cost-of-Living Index in 1939 and the creation of the Consumer Price Index in 1949. Despite the inappropriateness of using an average as a guideline (see Rose, 1958, p.207) the 20% proportion of family income was widely used as an indicator of adequate rent. In the original Regent Park rent-to-income scale, the calculation of family income included only a portion of wives' and children's earnings while family allowances paid by the Federal government were excluded. In the opinion of the Regent Park Housing Authority (Rose, 1958, p.96), the inclusion of family allowances would affect the purposes for which the allowance was intended. A revision of the scale in 1958 eliminated rent variations due to the size of the family, included services in the rent, and raised the rental proportion of family income to 30%. It was implemented in 1962 and carried through for the projects built under the 1964 NHA. In 1968 rents were frozen pending the results of a study but internal discussions about the scale continued as this excerpt from a memo from the managing director to the Provincial Minister Stanley Randall, indicates:

Some years ago a similar study [of rental scales] was carried out by CMHC but the findings were never released. The group at that time consisted mainly of sociologists who did not take a very realistic look at the economic responsibilities which families should be asked to assume. In suggesting the format of a study group we will certainly be recommending people who will take a more business like approach to the matter rather than base everything on a "give away" basis (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 8, Jan. 7, 1969).

The rent ceiling was, after much debate, reduced to 25% in a revised rent-to-income scale of 1970 (Memorandum to Randall, April 15, 1970: RG 44-1-2-Box 1). Despite variations in the amount, a certain correspondence between income and rent paid in public housing was maintained and constituted one of the main distinctions between public rental housing and private renting. In 1969, 79% of all Canadian families in the lowest income quintile spent over 20% of their income on shelter and the average ratio of rent to income for families in this quintile was 44% (figures derived from Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.60, 65) while in 1974 it was 43% (CMHC, 1979, p.36).

Affordability, the relationship between rent and income as implemented in public housing, hence, places its tenants in a much better financial position vis-à-vis tenants in the private market. Despite the zealous care CMHC put into defining an unattractive product, public housing was, at a financial level, a very desirable tenure. Rent money could buy better accommodation in public rather than private housing, a fact widely recognized in government reports.

One aspect that should not be overlooked is the fact that Ontario Housing Corporation tenants, including those in receipt of Welfare and Family Benefits are immediately placed in a preferential position once they are housed. Whereas, the segment of the population not so housed are faced with steadily increasing costs in the private sector. To widen that gap by providing even greater subsidization of accommodation and services could result in mounting opposition to the programme (OHC, 1972b, p.5)

The 1970 rent revisions included a further advantage which benefited the employed mothers in one- or two parent-families: exemption of \$900 per annum in the calculation of income to cover child care expenses (OHC, 1970b). OHC supported the exemption for the employed one parent family head: 'This can well represent the difference between the female head of family obtaining gainful employment or subsisting on welfare payments' (OHC, Proposals for review of rent to income scale, p.17, 1970 AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). However they deplored its application to working wives who, in their opinion, should perform their child care duties (Memorandum to Honourable Stanley J. Randall, April 15, 1970: AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). In practice, as an indicator of need, the ratio of income to rent incorporated the costs of day care or nursery in the costs of rent in the case of working one parent family, hence, allowing employed single mothers a substantial advantage in this rating (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 6, OHC letter to Miss C.V., November 1, 1971, p.3). The inclusion of the cost of day care constituted a way in which poor working mothers raising children alone would be additionally encouraged to opt for public housing instead of private rental accommodation.

A particular case in the rent-to-income scale was the calculation of rents for those on

public assistance. If considered just on the basis of family income tenants receiving unemployment relief or mothers' allowance would pay the minimum rent of \$29 per month in the late 1940s . Regent Park Housing Authority, however, negotiated with the Commissioner of Public Welfare a fixed rent of \$40 per month for recipients of assistance. Nevertheless, this fixed rate seemed, with time, insufficient to the Authority and after a series of negotiations, Public Welfare agreed, in 1955, to fix rental rates based upon average current monthly rents, approximately \$61 per month (Rose, 1958, p.123-125). With the introduction of CAP in 1966, shelter allowances for recipients of Family Benefits and General Welfare became variable with family size requiring some communication and administrative manoeuvres between housing authorities and municipal and provincial welfare administrators but maintaining the principle of full coverage of public housing rentals (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 6, OHC letter to Miss C.V., November 1, 1971, p.4). This practice occasioned many problems such as tenants' anger that their rent would increase while their income decreased under public assistance (see for summary account of problems: Report to Chairman and Members of the Board of Directors, 1973: General Manager's Office, AO RG 44-6, appendix B). These issues are represented in the following passage from a brief prepared by Regent Park Community Improvement Association:

If a mother with one dependent receives Mothers Allowance (*sic*) of \$195. per month the rent is \$95.00 or 48.7% of income. However if the mother *earns* \$195. per month the rent would be \$37.00 or 18.9%. A person on disability pension of \$126.00 a month pays \$43.00 rent or 34.1% of his or her income; a person on welfare (no dependents) receiving \$108.00 per month also pays \$43.00 (A New Deal for Ontario Housing Tenants, October 1972. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 15, emphasis in the original).

Despite these difficulties and controversies, the equivalence between shelter allowance and rent meant that recipients were significantly better off living in public housing than in private housing.

The study data [Toronto single mothers in receipt of FBA] demonstrated that there are marked income

inequities between families living in public and in private housing. One-half of the mothers in public housing in the metropolitan area were paying monthly rents in the \$90-\$99 range in contrast to the same proportion of families in private rented housing paying in excess of \$120 monthly (Ministry of Community and Social Services [MCSS], 1973, p.9).

As a report by the Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto in 1972 (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 9) demonstrated, 61% of non-public housing tenants on social assistance paid higher rent than the amount allocated, requiring that the amount budgeted for food, clothing, and so forth, be spent on rent (see also letter from Community Action Resource Centre of Port Colborne of June 20, 1973 AO RG 44-1-2, Box 11; Report from Carleton University School of Social Work, September 1972 AO RG 44-1-2, Box 9). A study of mothers receiving Family Benefit Allowances in Metropolitan Toronto states:

The inequity is substantially heightened by the payment of full rental costs in public housing through the Family Benefits allowance and the effective application of a maximum in the private housing sphere. Families in public housing have more disposal income to spend on food and other commodities, as is demonstrated by the data of the study. Such inequity among family benefits clients is not defensible (MCSS, 1973, p.9-10).

While public housing was a better deal than private rent for all tenants and not only those in receipt of social assistance, rent equivalence constituted a practice which contributed to making public housing highly attractive for the latter. It was much more viable for a recipient of Family Benefits to support her family within public housing projects and have higher disposable income. The MCSS study (1973, p.163) suggest that 91.3% of mothers receiving Family Benefits in public housing had a telephone in comparison to 63.7% of those in the private market. In addition certain housing authorities, as for example the Windsor Housing Authority, would consider reducing the rent charged in circumstances of real hardship if petitioned by the caseworker or agency supervising recipients of assistance (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 2, Memo of July 23, 1970). Consider this example discussed in the Toronto Star of June 14, 1973:

Mrs J.J. who has three children was deserted by her husband three years ago. Unable to work, she gets a maximum of \$360/month in welfare from the provincial government of which she pays \$100/month for a two bedroom apartment to the OHC. Now consider Mrs J.R. whose husband also deserted her and her three children and who gets \$360/month from provincial benefits. Mrs J.R., however, cannot get into public housing so she spends \$120 monthly to rent a privately owned apartment. These two examples illustrate a survey of such mothers which found that in Metro the family in private housing has \$20 per month less on average for food and clothing than the one in public housing (p.6).

Affordability constitutes an important expression of need and its satisfaction. It refers to the translation of an abstract concept of need for shelter into a specific number of families with above average expenditures in housing and to a solution to this problem through the rent-to-income formula. It renders the concept of need operational in a particular way and I indicated here how these ways affected poor women raising children alone. However, there were a variety of complex ways in which the processes of satisfying housing needs of low income families forged a link with women raising children alone. This section has shown that, on the one hand, the predominance of small dwelling units located in high-rise apartment blocks - rooted in the imperatives of economic construction and the residual principles embedded in the program - seemed to favour the accommodation of women raising children alone.

On the other hand, the projects were ingrafted with a series of distinctive features associated primarily with location, density, bareness of services and recreation facilities which made them undesirable housing choices. Public housing was a housing unit to which a family had to adapt in terms of size and format and in many cases the family unit had to be rearranged and the mode of life changed (e.g., transportation and child upbringing). Despite these controlling and heavy conditions imposed on the family, public housing was affordable, that is, it constituted a particularly good financial deal for those few who managed to get into it. It was, in addition, specially beneficial for those on social assistance and seemed to provide extra financial inducements (rental equivalence) and selection privileges (e.g. day-care deductions) for women

raising children alone.

These incentives and arrangements, however, did not seem to be planned or orchestrated within the provision rationality but rather seemed to result from the interaction of several practices of the program. Articulating these practices, the concept of housing need, operationalized through specific understandings of adequacy, type of dwelling and affordability defined the ways through which ruling would take place. Although departing from concrete existing families and housing conditions, need is expressed in the form of an abstract ratio of units per area and adequacy is reinterpreted into a family rather than dwelling characteristic. Type of dwelling, in terms of its size, location and density, rather than considerations about family necessities become a way of regulating and directing the lives of residents. And finally affordability, in itself a central piece in assuring the right to housing, when in interaction with other housing processes such as location or scarcity of units, becomes a mechanism which restricts mobility and choice rather than an instrument of emancipation.

The next section completes the first part of the second case study regarding the interactions of social policy with the single mother complex and its subject through an examination of the experiment of public housing. In this first part, discussing the detailed transformation of the rationalities of public housing into practices and mechanisms of ruling, I have presented, so far, an argument about how shelter was transformed into a problem of housing the working class and how this problem was solved in Canada through the provision of subsidized mortgages. Further, I have introduced the justifications which made a specific form of public housing into a viable and practical solution around the 1960s in Canada and I have also discussed the operationalization of housing need as the central element in this solution. The next section

examines the several processes through which the public housing program was implemented.

What Governmental Practices Seek to Govern: Spaces of Marginality

The construction of low income rental housing was not a completely new experiment in Canada but the creation of OHC and the 1964 National Housing Act introduced a variety of new procedures and funding mechanisms and, from then on, housing was produced and delivered not only under a newly named program but also under new or transformed practices. This section examines three processes comprising these practices: construction, management and allocation of units. The emphasis here is on how these practices affected tenants or prospective tenants rather than the relationships between public housing, OHC and the construction and development industry. The latter is the usual focus in the few studies on OHC, of which Dennis & Fish (1972) constitutes the most exhaustive example. This section will argue that through several practices in these processes the resulting effect was the identification of the spaces created and managed by OHC as particular spaces of marginality, that is spaces outside normality with defined characteristics.

Construction of units.

It is only with creation of OHC in 1964 that Ontario assumed substantial responsibility for public housing. OHC established itself firmly as an intermediary between the Federal and municipal governments developing a centralized style of action both in terms of organization and location. It was created with unusually broad powers to raise its own funds by way of loans or issue and sale of debentures, bills or notes, to be guaranteed by the Ontario government (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5, letter to MPP A.F. Lawrence). The Corporation was governed by a Board of

Directors consisting of 7 to 11 members appointed by the lieutenant-governor-in-council. Unlike all other provinces where housing was the jurisdiction of the Minister responsible for municipal affairs, in Ontario, OHC answered to the Minister of Trade and Development (later Minister of Economics and Development) during its expansion period, from 1964 to 1972 (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4, Minister's files 1970/71). In 1972 it was transferred to the Minister of Revenue, and in 1973 to the newly created Minister of Housing under whose responsibility it presently resides. The Corporation, Sayegh (1987, p.155) argues, 'has often found itself ineffectual in the absence of provincial government policy directions and, subordinate to the federal government whose policy, priorities and programs determine its funding and purposes'. It never developed a conceptual understanding of the role of housing or a long term plan. It concentrated on 'putting housing on the ground' (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.148) and unit starts rather than families housed became the indicator of program success.

Rose (1980, p.102-104) proposes three phases to characterize the work of OHC. During 1965 and 1966 OHC embarked in a program of purchasing existing housing in the form of row housing, maisonettes, garden-court apartments, and multiple dwellings scattered around the metropolitan area. This practice built the corporation stock of dwellings and responded to demands of the municipal administrations but it did not add to the housing stock and was difficult to apply in small and medium sized municipalities. From approximately 1966 to 1968, as the market for rental housing grew tight (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.194), OHC initiated new construction through the proposal call method. In this phase, the Corporation publicly invited development proposals for specific numbers of units to be built usually on land owned or optioned by the developers. In a third phase OHC undertook land assembly and land banking under

encouragement from CMHC programs as well as construction of student housing. At the end of 1972, OHC was responsible for administration and management of 50,000 dwelling units in Ontario, 43.4% of them in Metropolitan Toronto (Dennis & Fish, 1972). All this flurry of construction 'clearly developed a substantial housing industry in Ontario which depended to a great extent upon the activities of OHC' (Rose, 1980, p.104). It made OHC the largest landlord of North America (McMahon, 1990) and imprinted a particular image to public housing in Canada - predominantly high-rise, high density, segregated communities - since the experience of OHC produced a much large volume of housing than any other province.

Most public housing units in Ontario were built in the second phase under the proposal call method. OHC argued it allowed for several construction economies and produced a public housing design similar to other low priced housing. With this method, Dennis & Fish (1972, p.148) claim, the Corporation disregarded municipal priorities, preferences and development plans assuming both the project planning and management roles. Project planning would be initiated through a request from a specific municipal council to which OHC would respond with a brief survey of needs and demands. This survey consulted those on the waiting list for public housing about their current living conditions and preferences. For example, the need and demand survey for the town of Timmins in June 1965 comprised 62 families of which 72% received incomes of less than \$356 per month. Twelve families were *mother-only* and seven of them received mothers allowance (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1) but this did not imply that these families would be housed. These surveys, hence, assume waiting lists as the primary indicator of housing need, narrowing considerably the issue of need (see also Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.190) but on the other hand, their function was limited since units were not built with these particular families in mind. The surveys

helped municipal councils formulate a request for construction of a specific number and type of dwellings for families and/or seniors. Although the initiative is apparently with the municipality, there was considerable political pressure brought to bear upon the municipalities (Skelton, 1996) which the Corporation viewed as obstructionist and against public housing (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.148). From this point until the units were ready to be inhabited all decisions belonged to OHC in negotiations with developers: a call for proposals would be issued and submissions evaluated by the Technical Review and the Development committees of OHC and, subsequently, submitted to the Board, the management Board of the Cabinet, the municipality involved, and CMHC. The successful bidder, typically a large construction firm with an established relationship with OHC, would sell a complete project and site to OHC.

The proposal call method has been critically analysed by Dennis & Fish (1972, p.195-6) who point out that it worked in the absence of guidelines and reinforced the residual location of projects since attractive and desirable sites are reserved by the builders for private projects (see also discussion re: dwelling type in previous section). It also developed an 'extremely close relationship between OHC and the builders with whom OHC deals on a regular basis' (p.195). It allowed subjective valuation as well as potential for abuse and conflict of interest (p.192; Sayegh, 1987, p.161). Unless projects did not meet local zoning regulations, the municipality could not object to project construction. This indifference to municipal politics and local group interests were usually crystallised in land use disputes, i.e., issues of neighbourhood density and image. The heavy handed resolution of these disputes through the provincial authority resulted in stigma and antagonism towards public housing and its inhabitants. Although the process did not by itself cause a social fear and hostility towards the poor, it rendered to these sentiments a spatial

expression and a collective form: it was not an objection to individual families but to their concentration in a particular space.

Management of units.

Project management was handled by OHC through local housing authorities. These were set up under the NHA amendment of 1949 as autonomous bodies from municipal government and thus from the municipal political process. The city of Toronto had created its housing authority in 1947 to handle the Regent Park North re-development project (Rose, 1958). In general local housing authorities constituted, up until 1964, strong pressure groups in the advocacy for assisted moderate income housing (see Ontario Association of Housing Authorities, 1964). Boards of the authorities, after 1964, were composed by 'influential private citizens' (Axworthy, 1972, p.53) appointed by the provincial minister following recommendations from OHC Board. At the end of 1964 OHC dissolved the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority and took over the administration of the 2,500 units in Metro (Rose, 1980, p.102). The other 38 housing authorities continued with managerial roles but answering to the Corporation head offices which determined all rules and regulations.

The program was in fact directly managed from Toronto where activities were departmentalized into tenant selection, project management, and community relations. Local project managers dealt directly with these departments when necessary but on-going management of the project was left very much to individual managers in their different styles. Dennis & Fish (1972, p.203-7) report widespread negative attitudes among managers and administrators. Management decisions made at the provincial level were protracted, cumbersome and comfortably insulated from feedback from local residents, project users, and opposition from municipal

councils and housing activists. Complaints to these distant and powerful administrators, both from individual tenants and project managers, followed a difficult path and often required formal political intervention (Dennis and Fish 1972, p.202). Some of these reached the Board of OHC or the Minister's desk, and illustrate the intense moral regulation which dominated tenant relations:

The tenant at X, a separated wife, has requested permission for a male person to be allowed to move into the unit as divorce proceedings are under way and it is her intention to marry the person in question. ... It was unanimously agreed that permission should not be granted (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5, OHC board meeting of March 5, 1965).

It is very strongly suspected that there has been an unauthorized gentleman friend living in the unit. This is denied by Mrs. W. who claims he is a brother or brother-in-law on a short visit (Memo of Oct 26, 1973 AO RG 44-1-2, Box 14).

Only in 1973, as a result of the recommendations of the Ontario Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy, the Comay Report (see Rose, 1980, p.106-112), OHC initiated a decentralization process with new regional branches in Ottawa, London, Sudbury and Thunder Bay working directly with the housing authorities.

Allocation of units.

Local housing authorities were in charge of tenant selection in accordance with directions by OHC. Tenants were drawn from the waiting list according to their priority status and their fit to available units. The application procedure followed four steps (Report on the housing registry of Metropolitan Toronto, May 1, 1969. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 6). First, an application form was completed and checked for correctness. Then the application was classified according to the bedroom requirements (see also discussion re: adequacy in previous section) and, subsequently, a standard point-rating system designed to establish priority was applied. Finally, the application was granted a priority rating and filed under the bedroom count. A Placement Officer coordinated the application of the point rating system which closely mirrored the procedures first

developed for Regent Park in the late 1940s (See Rose, 1958, p.5):

To provide an objective means of weighting the merits of each person or families' claims as compared with the claims of others on the waiting list, point ratings have been devised. Briefly, "Point Rating" is a formula by which a housing staff member awards a specific number of points to each applicant from various factors, and recommends for housing those with the greatest number of points (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 6, OHC letter to Miss C.V., November 1, 1971, p.2).

The formula contained a few items reporting home visitors' impressions of the physical conditions of the applicant's present dwelling; ratio of income to rent and size of family; and evidence of certain emergency conditions such as notice to vacate or health factors. These were added to a suitability rating to determine a priority ranking. Suitability was a subjective rating indicating the visitor's judgement of how suited to living in public housing a particular family was.

In the present housing category, officials look for housekeeping methods; cleanliness and conditions of the premises. If, in their opinion, the applicant has not made an effort to keep the premises clean and proper he or she will be refused housing.

A senior housing official agreed that if an inspector has a personal dislike for the applicant the points will not be awarded (Windsor Star, November 2, 1973).

According to the Association of the Ontario Housing Authorities, although an applicant would more likely be given a second chance to show improvement, housekeeping standards were the main cause for rejection of prospective tenants (Brief to the Comay Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy, May 1973. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 9). The subjectivity of suitability assessments led to its use, in many instances, as a moral regulation tool. An illustration of the process is seen in documents pertaining to the investigation of the application of a certain Mrs C.H. and her daughters after the press took up her case. In this case, the visitor rated the woman's stability as demonstrated by a number of years in the same address and job, as well as her ability to produce certified documents and receive the visitors when demanded. In addition, paternity and circumstances of her children's birth were scrutinized and recorded in the assessment form (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 5, Minister's files 1971). In another case an internal investigation report

remarked that the woman 'seems to have children of different races' (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 5, Minister's files 1971). Internal guidelines of the Management Systems Branch specified:

At the time of the home visit, if there is an indication of irregularities such as child neglect, bad housekeeping, social problems, vermin, etc., a note to this effect is marked clearly on the home visitors's report. This is not necessarily a disqualifying factor, but if the family is subsequently offered a unit, follow up on these matters for clarification, referral to agencies and assistance, must be arranged before an offer of accommodation can be made (General Principles 1971, p.6. AO RG 44-16, Box 2, file: procedures general).

There was great secrecy regarding selection procedures, which tenant placement committees considered a private matter between them and each individual tenant although information was checked with employers, school officials and against bank account. When inquiries about the point rating system reached OHC, they were discussed in general terms, under the heading sections and applicants were not informed of the exact rating under each item (see letters to OHC director. AO RG 44-1-1). The point rating system, community agencies noticed, seemed to exclude many of the families most in need. For example, the CAS of the County of Norfolk wrote to OHC in February 17, 1967 exposing the difficulties in having 'their families' housed by OHC since they were deemed undesirable (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1). It was only with the tenant's movement of the late 1960s (discussed in the next chapter) that these practices were slowly uncovered by tenants' groups supported by the, then, Toronto Alderman John Sewell. Size of waiting lists and tenant selection practices were then brought to the forefront of a very public discussion (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). Applicants and tenants had many complaints about the point rating system: unfair and unclear assessment; small number of home visitors who could not screen all applicants; insulting treatment by visitors; lack of notice for visits; unclear criteria; and inaccessible management.

It was through this intense activity that it became explicit that as the number of

applications increased only those in an emergency situation were actually visited. This means that to have any access to public housing applicants had to be a special case or a priority. This process, in fact, had transformed bad housing conditions into the *norm* and only those beyond this newly constituted norm were considered for housing. This redefinition can be evidenced in the information distributed by the Tenant Committee of Metro Toronto in a meeting of May 5, 1970 in Regent Park:

If you are just a *normal person* who is living in a place that is not good enough, may be too small, and the rent is more than you can afford, you probably won't be given priority unless you are under notice to vacate. ...

Many people don't get a home visitor (a crucial step in the process) since they are not under the notice to vacate, or they aren't a *special case* (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1, my emphasis).

OHC had, since the early days, received many letters from individuals or their advocates explaining their extreme circumstances. Women raising children alone, their CAS and other family workers, for example, wrote moving letters to OHC's administration claiming and constructing a special case for themselves as did their advocates,.

Mrs H. has been experiencing a great deal of financial hardship recently. She is separated from her husband since he is an alcoholic, and supporting her three children, ages 10, 12 and 14. Three years ago she had an accident on the job which left her with a back disability, and for this reason she had to undergo an operation ... (letter to OHC, Oct 16, 1967, AO RG 44-1-2, Box 10, file: Minister correspondence)

As the waiting lists grew, the need to demonstrate a special case status became somewhat institutionalized. I suggest that this process may have provided an opportunity for women raising children alone and their advocates to use the deserving aspects embedded in the dependent mother identity to represent themselves as a special case. The following excerpt, from a letter of June 19, 1970 included in a petition from the Windsor West Citizen's Associations to OHC on behalf of 29 women on mothers' allowance, illustrates this claim to special case:

Contrary to public opinion most mothers I know would rather be out working but circumstances at present time will not make it possible for some. I'm sure you are aware of the fact that we want the

same privileges for our children as a woman living in the best part of town whose husband is working and making a good wage. But it seems it is just like beating our heads against a brick wall (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 3, file: Minister' Correspondence, 1970).

Grievances recorded in June 12, 1970 (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 2) indicate that a woman in need of accommodation because of 'marital discord' was given a high degree of priority. The amended NHA, 1973 established federal funds for the exploration of housing needs of specific special groups such as senior citizens, natives, immigrants, handicapped, transients and single parent families. Single mothers became one of the items officially incorporated in the point rating system a few years later in 1980 (Fallis, 1980, p.166). In 1987, 'a special priority status' was assigned to 'assaulted women and their children' (Ontario Ministry of Housing, Criteria for Selecting Tenants, brochure, 08/87) and her request for housing was usually accompanied by a letter from the shelter worker describing her particularly extreme conditions. These processes contributed to the association of women raising children alone to public housing projects. This association would occur through the women themselves using their dependent mother subject position to gain access public housing despite the processes of discrimination and control to which tenants were submitted.

In summary, this section has examined the processes which comprise the central practices of the public housing program in Ontario: construction, management and allocation of units. The construction of public housing in Ontario can be condensed within the processes of needs assessment and proposal call, a method widely criticized for its subordination to the building industry and for the dismissive treatment of municipal and local citizens' interests. It generated antagonized and segregated spaces within municipalities by assigning absolute priority to economic processes determined through the market place and the construction industry. At the

delivery level, administration and management of the units were dismissive, distant and antagonistic. Although carried out through local housing authorities, management rules and decisions were established at the central offices of OHC and imprinted a second rate treatment to tenants and to the spaces. The formal procedures of the point rating system, which determined the allocation of units, were intrusive, subjective and marked by moral regulation of individual families. The process of creation of special cases normalized bad housing conditions and transformed single mothers into a distinct group associated with public housing. In face of the importance of housing in the budget of poor families, the practice of special cases functions as an encouragement for women who raise children alone to assume the subject position of dependent mother and to inhabit the spaces created by the public housing program.

Public Housing Apparatus of Implementation

This chapter has discussed the justifications, technologies and processes which produced the spaces occupied by public housing in Ontario as peripheral, badly serviced and meanly managed spaces within the urban fabric and how women raising children alone were indirectly but forcefully encouraged to inhabit them. These two effects, although separate, are intrinsically linked and this chapter traced their emergent correlation. An underlying point is that, these processes can only be understood within the context of an approach to housing in the Western world as part of the formation of the worker. Housing is part of the measures that differentiate the worker from the pauper by rewarding his (as was the gender rule originally) engagement in the labour force by allowing him the means to solve the shelter problems for him and his family. In Canada, unlike solutions developed in Britain and in the US, housing for the masses of postwar urban workers

assumed one single predominant form: home ownership through subsidized mortgages for privately built suburban, detached, single family homes. This solution excluded both rental housing and government involvement in actual ownership or construction of dwellings, practices that were adopted in other countries prior to World War II.

An important process in the implementation of public housing was the creation of an idea of public housing which through a variety of transformative processes could be integrated with the understanding of housing provision for the norm. I discussed here the slow workings of creating a deserving population for low income rental housing, i.e., the veterans, low wage earning workers and the slum dwellers; and the discourses around government involvement, i.e., responsibility for war veterans, rights of citizenship, protection of the majority. I also introduced the articulations of the proposals for public housing with the system of welfare and with the private production of houses for the norm as well as a series of experimentations with delivery, i.e., Regent Park as a municipal experiment and the Federal Provincial partnership as a three-level articulation. The first program with the name public housing was, therefore, a carefully planned and articulated intervention which already carried in its definition a commitment to economic and redevelopment processes, as well as an intention to affect poverty through attending to the housing need of those that could not afford the normal housing provision process.

Public housing in Ontario developed around the operationalization of the concept of need. This means that need for shelter was first made into an administrable and tangible concept at all levels and transformed into a variety of aspects which can be used in relation to need and its satisfaction. These constitute the technologies of public housing. This chapter has discussed the issues of assessment of adequacy and its use in provision of housing; of definition of type of

dwelling and the uses of size, location and density of dwellings in the construction of units; and of a method to guarantee affordability using a rent-to-income formula.

The last section of this chapter has addressed the processes through which public housing was produced and delivered in Ontario: construction, administration and allocation of units. Construction actually started with the needs assessment survey which determined housing as an issue of number and type of units. This was followed by the proposal call method which amounted to entrusting a development company (under bureaucratic review) with all the details of project planning, siting, design and actual building of the public housing projects. The resulting spaces had very little consideration for the future inhabitants and were disdained by municipalities and neighbourhoods. Management of the projects was under a distant and centralized style which generated poor and expensive management practices, alienated and treated tenants as secondary and inferior components. Finally the allocation of units followed discretionary practices of individual assessment and moral regulation which had reduced accountability mechanisms.

Of particular relevance throughout these discussions is the emphasis on the kind of spaces generated and how a relationship with women raising children alone was forged. As these spaces were gradually defined not only as marginal in their location and integration in the urban fabric but also as inhabited by marginal, devalued populations, they were at the same time being increasingly allocated to dependent mothers. This happened through a variety of mechanisms which were not intentionally seeking to address those women. The small size and high density of the units, which attended to the residual character of the product, offered an opportunity to fit the small families of mothers raising children alone. The calculations of the rent-to income formula made public housing the only affordable shelter for these families. The point rating system, through the

development of special case status favoured the dependent mother and her family. These examples show that while these links with the dependent mother were being developed and consolidated, a variety of processes was also in place, constructing meaning and defining the spaces of public housing as marginal spaces.

The next chapter will examine the consolidation of these links and meanings through a focus on the specific population processes of public housing. It will explore how a project conceived as a tool against poverty became the cause of the poverty it was intended to combat and how it came to be blamed for a myriad of urban problems.

Chapter 7

THE SPACE OF MARGINAL POPULATIONS:

THE EMERGENCE OF GHETTOS OF THE POOR

I would suggest that no historical or logical conclusion follows necessarily from this primary complicity with subordination, but that some possibilities tentatively do. That agency is implicated in subordination is not the sign of a fatal self-contradiction at the core of the subject and, hence, further proof of its pernicious or obsolete character. But neither does it restore a pristine notion of the subject, derived from some classical liberal-humanist formulation, whose agency is always and only opposed to power. The first view characterizes politically sanctimonious forms of fatalism; the second, naive forms of political optimism. I hope to steer clear of both these alternatives (Judith Butler, 1997, p.17).

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the gradual discovery of public housing as a space inhabited by people rather than an economic intervention centred on the production of dwelling units of a certain type and density. The context and effects of this discovery were central for the transformation of public housing into a social intervention addressing groups of people with problems. This discovery is unequivocally evident in the examination of the texts of rule underlying this chapter. In early documentation from the 1960s there are very few records giving any attention to the tenants as a specific group or to their lives. The tracing of the roots of this discovery undertaken in this chapter has found that concerns with the population of public housing existed but were placed at a secondary and invisible level. Although this discovery, as I will show in this chapter, is done, in fact, through a series of piecemeal adaptations and changes, a

milestone in this process is the Hellyer Commission and its very public emphasis on and specific rendition of the public housing population.

This process of discovery, however, is not unilateral. While the federal government, through the work of the Commission, was investigating the processes and resulting ways of life in public housing, tenants and other groups, such as women, were also rediscovering themselves and formulating their new identities in a new, postwar, transformed Canada. These identities were not formulated in isolation, deriving impetus from some internal character until then oppressed but, in fact, they were formed in interaction with the very processes of subordination which were defining their marginality. Agency was in *complicity with subordination*, to return to the above quote by Butler, but also, in the act of subjection, there was an opening of possibilities for change in claiming the tenant identity and restaging it as one with rights and demands. That there was in fact an opening up of possibilities rather than a stable and permanent solution to the housing problem will become clear in the discussion about how these transformations affected women raising children alone.

As in the previous chapter, a number of published sources contextualize the use of the ministers' correspondence as texts of rule. These were primarily the works of professor Rose, and housing reports produced by the CMHC or commissioned by the federal or provincial level such as the Denis and Fish Report. These contextualizing texts are particularly important to reconstruct the historical record of events which renders the information and interpretations derived from the texts of rule intelligible. In analysing the texts of rule, the particular issues addressed and the order and emphasis they received in terms of their filing documentation, were particularly important. For example, the ministers' files would reveal the several versions of a

report with internal memorandums highlighting particular aspects, the press release, the reactions from the press, and the bureaucratic reactions, discussions and searches for ways to answer unexpected questions. All of these can be used to demonstrate the importance that certain issues assumed and how they were interpreted over time and by different constituencies. In particular, the texts of rule are used here to illustrate the several voices involved in the formation and claiming of identities through a record of letters and other various documents included in the files.

This chapter will conclude the second case study which intends to illustrate a different process of governmentalization of the single mother complex from that occurring through the satisfaction of income needs. In the present case study, women raising children alone are not the central focus of the public housing program but its effects have definite consequences for governing the lives of these women through addressing their shelter needs. Chapter 6 has examined the discourses and justifications around the program; the transformation of the need for shelter into a practical activity; and the processes of construction, management and allocation of public housing. It showed that these processes and technologies defined and segregated a specific urban space and constituted it as marginal and substandard. These same processes and technologies created at the same time very definite links with the dependent mother and her family.

The first section of this chapter discusses the roots of the opposition to the program, the pressures and the events that led to its rejection by the Hellyer Commission leading to its modification in 1973 and eventual halting. The following section, "Who is Governed", investigates in detail and depth the formation of a population of inhabitants for public housing. It places the roots of this process in the practices of Regent Park and shows how these roots and the

centralized delivery processes of public housing generated a rigid population quota which has been invisible in the discussions of program practices but which had very definite outcomes for the dependent mother. This section also examines how tenants and their public image, women raising children alone, transformed the program and were in turn transformed by it endowing the dependent mother with a group dimension. The conclusion will discuss issues of agency and subject formation and transformation as well as the effects of these developments on the dependent mother. This chapter, in contrast with Chapter 6, will emphasize processes and power relations focusing on interaction and change.

Opposition to Public Housing

While some form of provision of low income housing had been the objective of extensive lobbying efforts since the turn of the century, government intervention in housing also gathered strong opposition throughout these decades. This opposition was somewhat quieted with the discourses articulated around the justifications for the particular experiment of public housing proposed around the early 1960s but support for the program was far from a popular venture. In particular the participation of the federal government and the ties of that level with the private financial sector helped to curtail the public housing experiment and marked its gradual transformation as of 1973. The slow and labourious process of abandoning the program itself involved a variety of changes in meanings and understandings which slowly discredited the achievements of the program, emphasizing certain aspects of the experiment and drawing attention to one element of public housing until then invisible: its population.

Prior to 1964, the actual and potential costs of the Federal Provincial Partnership had been

a constant concern for the government representing an obstacle to an expanded public housing program. In particular, the subsidy-sharing formula was under intense scrutiny despite its low average level of \$300 per unit (see Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.176). The NHA amendments of 1964 introduced a federal loan to OHC covering up to 90% in the costs of public housing projects for a maximum term of 50 years, rather than the joint ownership and sharing of capital costs, and reduced the federal participation of operating subsidies from 75% to 50%. These procedures made the federal government into a banker rather than a partner in ownership of public housing.

In Ontario, the Province was the sole owner of the projects but it recovered part of its share of the operating losses (7.5% of the costs of subsidies) from the municipalities (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5, file: OHC-1965). There was no capital investment on the part of municipalities and, as shown in the previous section, they exercised little influence over project planning and design. Therefore, from the municipalities perspective, they not only had projects imposed on them but they also had to participate in the costs of subsidizing rents in public housing. Considering that an important source of revenue for municipalities is property tax, it is easy to see that public housing would be faced with strong opposition from property owners as well as from politicians whose authority to control land and municipal expenditures was undermined.

In addition, Rose (1980, p.6) argues, a certain portion of the population opposes the involvement of any level of government on subsidies. There is a different public perception between loans and subsidies: capital loans are re-paid, in the long term, and the direct expenditures are relatively small vis-à-vis the total. Subsidies to rent, on the other hand, although not substantial in relation to the total capital expenditures, cause concern since they are not re-paid. As most construction of public housing has been funded through loans to provincial

housing corporations rather than through the Federal Provincial Partnership, this emphasises the banker role of CMHC, borrowing from the Bank of Canada at government rates and lending the same money at almost market rates. The financial stability derived from this practice allowed the agency relative freedom from parliamentary scrutiny (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.130, 131) generating a strong current of public opinion against this practice.

Responding to the Minister of Finance, the primary function of CMHC has been to provide financial resources and set standards for the application of the NHA across Canada. The understanding of housing as a major economic stabilization tool has marked the role, interests and functioning of CMHC (p.130). Through the conditions for approval of insured loans for specific projects, the Corporation determined, as discussed in previous sections, the values and the kind of public housing to be delivered by the program. However CMHC, Dennis and Fish (1972, p.131) argue, failed to facilitate the suggested expanded social housing program announced through the 1964 amendments to the NHA. Its banking role generated a rigid administrative structure preventing CMHC from assuming new functions and roles; or adopting new organization forms and techniques; or even engaging in substantive innovation.

[T]he Corporation was a banker and government sponsored housing was to be kept as a residual program only. This led the corporation into a pattern of *responding* to requests for loans or housing projects rather than *initiating* activities (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.138, emphasis in the original).

It is, perhaps, not particularly useful to dwell on all the possible activities CMHC did not shoulder, although the above quote does highlight what the crown Corporation actually did. By simply responding to requests for loans, the only consideration of CMHC was that the money lent was spent according to the guidelines it developed. It concerned itself with the safety of the loan and measured its performance in terms of unit starts, never quality of life or people housed.

Keeping public housing at a residual level in terms of expenditure was one of the central concerns of its self defined mandate. Thus as the expenditures in public housing increased sharply without a parallel increase in the revenues, the Federal government began to feel uneasy about its participation in the program (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.215). According to CMHC (1979, p.9), \$172 million was committed to housing between 1949 and 1967, while for the two year period between 1968 and 1969 this expenditure rose to \$377 million.

In addition to these concerns with public expenditure, public housing also became a hot political issue by late 1960s. Burns & Silzer (1987, p.69) comment that '[d]uring the 1968 federal election, the major political parties clearly perceived affordable housing as an issue that concerned voters'. The predominantly urban population; the effects of inflation on lower income Canadians and on the prices of housing; and the modest public housing stock figured predominantly in the campaign speeches. The new Trudeau government, elected on a platform of *Just Society*, was swayed by the activities and agitation generated by the war on poverty initiatives (see Struthers, 1994, chap.8). As a result, in 1968, the Trudeau government formed a Task Force on Housing and Urban Development headed by the Minister of Transport, the house builder and land developer Paul Hellyer.

The goal of the Task Force was to determine the federal role in urban issues and in particular the federal government choices in the housing field. After travelling from coast to coast, commissioning studies, receiving briefs and holding hearings in many urban centres, the Task Force issued its report in January 1969 (Canada, 1969). The Report was extremely critical of public housing, citing particularly problems with its large scale development form. It also criticized the permissive attitude taken by governments towards land speculators, attacked urban

renewal projects and recommended a series of measures to facilitate and expand home ownership (see critiques in Burns & Silzer, 1987; Fraser, 1972; Rose, 1980). Despite this strong criticism, the Report gave no guidelines as to the future role of the federal government in public housing. As a document by the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers (OAPSW) explained, the Report did not clarify the purpose of public housing, or recommend the provision of adequate community facilities and services, or even evaluate seriously citizen and tenant participation, although it criticized how all those issues were currently handled (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7, March 5, 1969). In particular the OAPSW was critical of the large, high density projects that came to characterize Ontario public housing and recommended a series of detail controls and standards aiming at the containment of the program.

The recommendations of the Task Force were rejected by the government and Hellyer resigned from cabinet, eventually changing political parties. The Report had, however, lasting effects. Its general framework and directions were quickly implemented in the early 1970s. OHC, responsible for most of the public housing in the country, was hit particularly hard by the criticism of public housing in the Hellyer Report and a period of turbulent relationship with CMHC ensued (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7, file: Federal Task Force on Housing, 1969).

The Task force on Housing and Urban Development has raised many questions about the social implications of the existing types of public housing projects. In addition, many social agencies and knowledgeable individuals have made many suggestions that would serve to improve the quality of these projects, to minimize the stigma attached to those residing in public housing, and to create an environment that achieves human dignity (Andras to Randall July 7, 1969. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7).

The whole idea and practice of public housing construction and management was publicly questioned: physical and social aspects of public housing; type and form of housing; the degree of concentration and density; the need for recreation and/or public day care facilities for children; the desirability of selling public housing units; the possibility of acquiring existing housing for public

housing purposes; the rent-to-income scales (Letter from Andras to Randall, September 12, 1969, RG 44-1-1 Box 7). The Federal government itself became 'concerned with the physical adequacy of the projects and the quality of life within them' (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.178) raising serious questions regarding project size, site planning and design as well as the need for recreation and/or public day care facilities for children (Letter from Minister R. Andras to Randall, September 12, 1969, AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7).

In 1970, CMHC announced that financial assistance for community and recreation services would be provided through a system of grants (CMHC, 1979, p.11). As well, a new Ministry of State for Urban Affairs was created in 1970 and in that same year two studies were commissioned: the Lithwick Report; and the Dennis & Fish Report (see Rose, 1980, p.52). Federal funding was virtually at a stand still with interpretations of new directions being discussed. The experiment of public housing in Ontario was at a crossroads.

This section has described the context in which the public housing experiment became a contested experiment. A marked role of banker assumed by CMHC gave to the federal government large control over the program in terms of its definition, quality and also its duration. It is this role as a banker that brought the magnitude of public expenditures to a central position in the discourse of public housing. In addition the magnitude of shelter needs in relation to the modest accomplishments of the program transformed public housing into a debated issue within the full political spectrum. A direct outcome of these debates, the highly publicized Hellyer Task Force criticized and sought the cancellation of the public housing program and set in motion a process for its transformation.

It is particularly significant that these critiques of the public housing program incorporated

a variety of descriptions and assessments of tenants in their multiple groups and the conditions of life. While the close association between OHC and the construction companies, the lack of controls over location, quality design and density of projects came under intense evaluation, the attention was also turned to the spaces and the population of public housing. In the next section I will argue that the processes of discrediting and reducing public housing, while highlighting a variety of outcomes, turned a spotlight on the populations of public housing and the measures to address their shelter needs. It will focus on the meanings and effects of this new discovery.

Who is Governed: Populating Public Housing

Within the mothers' allowance program, the process of eligibility was at the very centre of program definition. Who the program was to address was part of what the program was. In public housing, on the other hand, those that were to benefit from the program were implicitly or vaguely represented by a beckon towards low income households. Although units were allocated to families, the process of allocation was understood as fitting families to units and the emphasis was on the fit rather than on the processes of selection. In this section, I unveil certain roots of the practices of public housing which demonstrate that despite their hidden and peripheral situation in the program, population definition practices were firmly engrained within public housing. Nevertheless, these population definition practices were not the only practices which brought the dependent mother associations with public housing to a visible and public plane. Also essential in understanding this visibility were the activities and demands of protest groups of the late 1960s and 1970s and their reframing of identities and rights.

Not a 'dumping ground'.

The idea of who were the ideal types of people to become tenants of public housing began to be formed in the Regent Park Project. Managing the Project, the Housing Authority of Toronto refused to offer emergency housing for the poorest and underhoused of the city, despite its founding pledges (see Rose, 1958, p.51).

Members of the authority felt that it was in danger of becoming a "dumping ground" for all the unsolved and knotty problems in the field of housing within the city. Emergency housing was the most serious and complicated of these problems ... Instead of a redevelopment and rehousing project, Regent Park might have become a half-way station for many families with more or less chronic personal, social and economic problems. ... The authority was accused of trying deliberately to select "high-grade" tenants as far as possible (p.80).

In this account, the choice of words - dumping-ground, unsolved and knotty problems, half-way station, chronic personal, social and economic problems, high-grade tenants - convey the general perception that those in need of emergency housing were less than deserving citizens and indeed bearers of problems that exceeded the scope of the public housing solution. On the other hand they also reflect an attempt to make public housing not a housing of last resort. The intention in this model project was to create an ideal community which could demonstrate the effects of good housing on those able to benefit from it. As with the mothers' allowance initiative, it shows an intention to address those among the poor who have the potential to be normalized.

A series of procedures for tenant selection were developed in Regent Park to guarantee a certain composition of residents. They were developed by Mr. Frank Dearlove, seconded from the Department of Welfare of the City of Toronto (Rose, 1958, p.83) and required disclosures and controls unheard of in the private rental sector.

The potential tenant must state his (*sic*) income and that of other members of his family. He must name his employer so that his income may be verified. He must admit a tenant selection officer or "investigator" to his present dwelling and answer a number of questions so that his need for housing and general character ("housekeeping") may be assessed. Once admitted to the project he must submit notice of any change in his income or in that of other working members of the family to the authority.

He must admit a staff member of the authority or investigator to his dwelling from time to time so that his "housekeeping" may be assessed. He must discuss his income with a staff member approximately once a year in a routine check of income and rentals (Rose, 1958, p.172).

The Authority was justified in implementing stringent selection and management practices, some argued (Rose, 1958, p.206-209), because Regent Park housing was a privilege. Its rent-to-income scale and its regard for family and dwelling size offered advantages not found in the private rental sector. These practices, on the other hand, were opposed by others on the grounds of their infringement on personal rights and liberties (e.g., see *Canadian Forum*, editorial, October 1951). As well, they were shown to be a tool for selecting families not hard to house in the private market (see Rose, 1958, chap.14; Rummey, 1951).

Research undertaken by Rose, his students and associates (see Rose, 1958, p.ix) documented that the practices in place in Regent Park involved creating a whole environment where families would thrive through the careful craft of rebuilding communities. As attested by social workers, nurses, doctors, sanitary inspectors, police officers, school teachers and the welfare department (see Rose, 1958, p.108-118, chap.9, 10), Regent Park housing had a beneficial influence on family problems, child welfare and juvenile delinquency. Good housing made better citizens (Rose, 1954, p.82; see also Marsh, 1950). This effect was accomplished, in the first instance, through the provision of adequate and affordable housing which alleviated tensions in the family unit (Children's Aid and Infant Homes of Toronto, 1952). Complementing and consolidating this effect, Regent Park provided also more intensive interventions for those in need.

New surroundings made for change but the role of the housing manager and his staff in assisting these changes must not be neglected. Most people needed a good deal of encouragement and some required a "lift" or "push". They received the encouragement and occasionally, for those in need, a "lift", perhaps in the form of a job on the maintenance staff of the project, or in personal or vocational counselling; a few juveniles convicted of delinquency were placed on probation under the supervision of the housing

manager. All families were visited by the manager or his assistant at frequent intervals after occupying a house or apartment; the use of the various facilities and equipment was explained and the rules and regulations were interpreted. Thereafter the accommodation was inspected once or twice a year and grossly untidy housekeepers were reminded of the standards expected of them. In a few of the most flagrant cases, families were "asked to leave" the project (Rose, 1958, p.121).

These interventions closely resemble the supervision technologies used by caseworkers within the mothers' allowances. They are individualized, use intense face to face contact, repetition of normalizing rules, close monitoring, and the personal influence of the worker to find clients a job. In addition, they used similar strategies of home visiting, role modelling and pedagogical demonstrations reflecting an interaction between the social welfare and the housing initiatives.

Nevertheless, these carefully tailored interventions and influences required a meticulously chosen population through the point rating scale discussed in Chapter 6. Rose strongly deplored 'a public housing project inhabited wholly by the lowest-income group, whether independent or dependent upon public assistance' (Rose, 1958, p.121). As the Project opened residency to the broader city community in 1954, creating 'a relatively normal healthful environment' (p.221) extreme care was required with the mix of families admitted to it. As the population of Regent Park doubled from 1953 to 1957 (p.152), the number of families in receipt of municipal relief increased steadily but remained a mere 2.4% of the total 1289 families in 1956 (derived from Rose, 1958, p.125). In addition 22 women heads of household were in receipt of mothers' allowance in 1957 (p.186) occupying a further 1.7% of the total dwellings. Data on family composition, which would show the number of women raising children alone, are scarce (e.g. note absence in McMillan, 1987; Rose, 1958). A structured sample used in Toews' thesis of 1953 (reported in Rose, 1958) suggests that 19.4% of tenant families were either widows or separated mothers with one to six children in 1953. As a community, Rose (1958, p.189) claimed that Regent Park in 1957 exhibited a larger diversity in age and income than the suburban

neighbourhoods developed at the same time although most families were of moderate means.

A member of the board of the Metro Toronto Housing Authority from 1955 to 1964, Rose (1958, p.222) argued that proper housing management was one of the most important lessons derived from the Regent Park experiment in terms of rebuilding community in the urban core of a metropolis. I suggest that this management combined two types of measures: a careful selection of the families to constitute the tenant population and an intense surveillance of these individual families. In the first type, managers attempted to create a tenant body with representation from a widespread mix of families and diversity in age and income. Using the discretionary powers of the point rating scale, they strived to achieve their own idea of social normality. Secondly, paternalist and authoritarian measures were combined with a personalizing and caring attention to each tenant's situation as in the traditional social welfare interventions to create a 'surge of personal pride and community responsibility' (Wood, 1956, p.424).

The contested space of public housing.

The centrality of tenant selection and management to public housing initiatives was not an understanding shared by CMHC. In 1957 a member of the Board of Directors wrote to the President of the Corporation:

I feel that the construction of any particular public housing project should be based on economic and urban development considerations primarily and that the needs of an individual (and) selection of particular tenants should be secondary (February 12, 1957 cited in Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.174).

This position prevailed in the development of the idea of public housing but later at OHC some activities denote a certain attention to the allocation of units and the tenant body. Perhaps this can be traced to the presence of Professor Rose on the Board of Directors of OHC from 1964 to 1980. In its public declarations, OHC included the intention to create a diverse community to

avoid segregation (see press releases AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1, file: OHC, 1964). An administrative study by Stevenson & Kellogg Ltd. in 1964 (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 4) considers the numeric flow and processing of inquiries, applications filled, investigations completed and finally numbers housed. Early internal assessments also touched the issue of segregation (see Feldman, L. November 25, 1965. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 4). A restricted examination of the Moss Park project looked at the steps involved in the process of housing high priority families from the housing waiting lists (Memorandum from OHC Managing Director, April 22, 1965. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1). Activists and social agencies alike brought to the attention of OHC the pressing problems of housing for emergency purpose and accommodation for multi-problem families (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1, Oct 8, 1965) as well as the need for counselling and child rearing assistance to tenants (Letter from Managing Director of OHC to Minister of Economics and Development. Oct. 8, 1965. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1).

Just before the creation of OHC, references to tenant selection procedures within the Metro Housing Authority appear as informal recommendations. A memorandum from the Manager of Management Systems Branch to Tenant Selection was particularly suggestive:

Re: Tenant families without a male partner

I have noticed in the past few months an increase in the number of applications in the above category forwarded by Tenant Selection in our application bank. It is my feeling that we should put a hold on this type of application for a while, particularly at Scarlettwood. Any community, if it is to remain a balanced one, can only absorb a reasonable number of any one type of family. ... It is my recommendation that a project should not contain more than 10% of any type of family (Dec. 3 1963, AO RG 44-16, Box 1).

This quantification, which amounts to a rigid definition of 'balanced community', is already a shift from the practices in Regent Park. Perhaps due to the centralized administration or to the expanded size of the responsibility, the search for diversity was translated into the explicit containment of certain groups reflecting the administrators' own ideas about families without a

male partner. In the first housing manual produced by OHC in 1965, the recommendation was made into a regulation with rigid quotas and imposed on housing authorities across the province:

Although families in receipt of Public Assistance will probably reflect high priority as to need, the Housing Authority is cautioned that families must be selected from various income groups within the prescribed income range to ensure that the project is representative of a good cross-section. The ratio of welfare families should not be more than 20% of the total families in the project, divided in two categories, 10% municipal welfare and 10% other forms of assistance such as Mothers' Allowance, etc. By the same token, care should be exercised that a project does not become overly populated by female led-families, i.e. widows, deserted wives, etc. Experience has shown that once the 20% ratio of any one particular type of family is passed, the project can rapidly develop into a segregated, rather than the integrated community which is the aim and desire (Management System Branch, p.20. AO RG 44-16, Box 1).

This regulation is not only numerically rigid but it also singles out recipients of public assistance, rather than any other group, as undesirable and requiring containment. Recall that this particular group was being assembled under the CAP umbrella (see chapter 3) and, although internally differentiated, it represented a consolidation of those people receiving non-pension benefits. This assembly gathered all those excluded from the labour force in one group: the social assistance recipients.

Also remarkable in this regulation is the association of 'female-led-families', irrespective of their source of income, with the sentiment of being tolerated in small numbers and being a threat to 'the aim and desire' of those creating an integrated community. Why this specific concern with widows, deserted wives and separated mothers? The dependent mother was already constituted as a problematic and deficient subject, as shown in Chapter 5. The 20% quota became one of the most powerful instruments used by local housing authorities in the formation of the tenant body. The decision on the family's eligibility for public housing living was no longer based on the examination of individual characteristics of each family but on the family's classification according to its composition, independent of habits or need. It subjected the person-to-person contact to an

abstract population formation directive marking a fundamental transformation in the process of definition of a tenant body.

The quota remained, initially, within the realm of regulations internal to local housing authorities that, as seen in Chapter 6 kept tenant selection a private matter between applicants and the authorities. Most of them, eager to make public housing acceptable to municipalities, welcomed regulations regarding tenant selection. The quota was initially contested only through letters addressing individual cases. In a letter of July, 5 1965, for example, the MPP Ralph Knox wrote to the Minister responsible for OHC:

In the Sarnia low-rental project the local authority have (*sic*) a ruling whereby a quota is established with respect to admitting families where the male parent is missing. This ruling was made as a result of experience, of course, and I am not questioning the right of the Authority to make any necessary ruling. However, there seems to me to be discrimination here that may be unwise. At present a divorced woman with three children made verbal inquiry and was told that they were over the quota now, and so she would not be eligible. As far as I am aware, this lady is worthy of consideration for one of the 3-bedroom units being advertised as available, other than there is no male parent. ... Yet I, personally, do not feel completely satisfied that such a ruling would stand a very good chance under the searching eye of the Press should a case come to it for examination (AO RG 44-1-1, Box 5)

To the many inquiries about the 20% quota which reached OHC during the initial years, officials argued that the distribution of applicants' family composition varied from day to day rendering impossible a confirmation of a quota system (see AO RG 44-1-1). During the 15th Annual Conference of Ontario Association of Housing Authorities in 1967, however, the 20% quota was openly debated:

Under the present regulations only 20% of the available homes can be occupied by families receiving welfare benefits. Once this limit has been reached these people already on the verge of disaster, are barred (Proceedings of the 15th Annual Conference of Ontario Association of Housing Authorities, 1967, p.8. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 1).

The Mayor of Ottawa accused OHC of discriminating against 'people in receipt of social assistance; the blind, the maimed, the family where the mother is head of household' which are set ... 'apart from the normal waiting list' (p.8). Gradually letters (e.g., United Steel Workers in

Peterborough, July 10, 1969 [AO RG 44-1-2, Box 2]; and MPP for Windsor West, Oct 24, 1973 [AO RG 44-1-2, Box 14]) and newspapers were no longer inquiring about but challenging the 20% quota:

There are (*sic*) also a quota placed on the number of mother led families allowed in the units - not more than 10% - yet Mrs Evangeline stated that 7 out of 10 applications she receives are from mother-led-families (Sudbury Star, August 1, 1970).

Opposition to the 20% quota focused on its unfairness and discrimination towards certain groups.

Mr. Makarchuk: You said [that] roughly the people that require, 25 per cent are single-parent families, and if you are only going to put 20 per cent of them into housing you are still going to have five per cent of single parent families looking for housing forever and ever, amen.

Mr. Goyette: I think that when I talk about the 20 per cent, I am talking about what might be considered to be the best of our layman knowledge *a desirable objective*, but, certainly, in some projects, the percentage would be higher than that (Ontario Supply Committee, Legislative Debates, July 13, 1971, p.S-2171, my emphasis).

The quota had, however, a further effect: it created a link between the prevalence of public assistance recipients, and single parent families in particular, with problems and undesirability. The link is reinforced, also, through opposition to the quota which, attempting to deny these qualifications, also positioned these women's families in relation to them. Independent of their source of income, from employment or government assistance, these families began to be discursively associated with problem families living in public housing in common ways. This association is expressed in a variety of forms.

Mr. Makarchuk: ... How do you arrive at the arbitrary 20 per cent? If you have 25 per cent you will have a problem; 20 per cent you may not have a problem. It is very difficult to decide. ...

Mr. Goyette: Well, as a general guideline, we tried to keep it if we could at about 20 per cent, on the notion that one would like to have two-parent families in the neighbourhood so that if any sort of tenant association or community activity in sports or softball, this kind of thing, takes place there would, indeed, be a mixture of people that could participate (Ontario Supply Committee, Legislative Debates, July 13, 1971, p.S-2171).

Nevertheless, the 20% quota was not formally abolished but rather, it was gradually and slowly abandoned. According to the Ontario Welfare Council (1973, p.8) the increased numbers of

mother-led families on the waiting lists led to the breakdown of the OHC quota system. An internal memorandum of the Management System Branch dated of May 4, 1971 indicates that the production of smaller units also led to the weakening of the quota:

In view of the many two bedroom vacancies that will be coming on stream in the near future, and the difficulty of finding *good father-led employed families*, could we not raise substantially the percentage of mother-led families per project? Unless we can get this agreement, it is going to be impossible to fill the vacancies within reasonable length of time (AO RG 44-16, Box 1, my emphasis).

In 1972 an internal review of the tenant selection policies undertaken by the Management Systems Branch concluded that more research was needed 'to determine the effect produced on the social environment by various kinds of population mix' (p.21. AO RG 44-16). By 1973, some municipalities, such as Windsor where two-thirds of the waiting list represented mother-led families, substituted the 20% quota for a total ban on the construction of rent geared to income family units (The Ontario Welfare Council, Public housing review, 1973, p.8. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 13) a measure that anticipated the federal actions.

Tenant body.

Despite this preoccupation with population composition, little was known about who was living in public housing until the late 1960s. OHC administrators and workers were interested in building dwelling units for families, for seniors or a mix of these groups. Community groups and advocates were concerned with expanding the program to satisfy the housing needs of generic 'low income families' described in the NHA of 1954 as: 'a family that receives a total family income that ... is insufficient to permit it to rent housing accommodation adequate for its needs at the current rental market in the area in which the family lives' (section 2:3). Data about OHC tenants were collected by each local housing authority without an aggregation by the Province. They provided sparse, irregular and unclear indications both of the composition of the tenant body

and of applicants. In particular these data did not provide a clear indication of the numbers of women raising children alone living in the projects.

These women were invisible outside the Tenant Selection Department. Data for Metro Toronto, which, according to OHC, housed a higher proportion of women raising children alone, was kept by OHC which operated the Metro Housing Authority (MHA). The periodic reports to the Social Services and Housing Committee of the Council of Metro Toronto, in June 1969, registered families headed by a single parent as 32.6% of the MHA tenants. The same source shows that, in 1970, just over one half of MHA tenants, or 52.3%, were employed; one quarter received some form of public assistance (either GWA or FBA); and a further 22.4% derived their income from pensions and unemployment insurance (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4). In May 1971 this source reported that 6.1% of total new tenancies were families on Family Benefits (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4), a category that included not only women raising children alone but also disabled persons. In June 1971, it registered 20% of all tenants as recipients of GWA or FBA and 24.3% of new tenants as composed by mother-led families (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4). A special tabulation of tenant income for each project in Metro Toronto in March 1970 shows that 7.3% of tenant families received their income from Family Benefits. This proportion varied from 0 to 20.8% according to project but in 80.3% of them the number of families receiving Family Benefits did not exceed 10% (derived from Tenant Income Data, Minister's correspondence, AO RG 44-1-2, Box 3). The Housing Registry of Metro, in routine reports, recorded the numbers of applications from women in receipt of Family Benefits, a classification that excluded pensioned and working mothers raising children alone as well as those that were in the welfare rolls waiting for Family Benefits. The proportion of these applications in Metro Toronto was small (less than 10%)

although it almost doubled in the period of 2 years, from 4.2% in May, 1969 to 8.3% in July, 1971. The same source for September, 1969 suggests that 28.2% of the applicant families were composed of one parent and child or children (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4).

These proportions suggest that although applied with variations and under opposition from several fronts, at least in Metro Toronto, the 20% quota was effective in maintaining the numbers of those in receipt of social assistance approximately within its targets. Although with the remarkable absence of women raising children alone, Dennis & Fish (1972) provide some general tenant descriptors for public housing in Canada.

[S]ome 57 per cent of households in public housing in 1970 were headed by wage earners, 21 per cent were elderly persons in receipt of old age pensions and 20 per cent were recipients of social assistance. ... Three-fifths of the tenants in public housing, the working poor, have incomes higher than might be expected. ... In Ontario 56 per cent of the working families have incomes in excess of \$6,000 (p.184).

The 20% quota may be considered less efficacious in terms of containing families headed by a single mother within 20% of the population, again taking Metro Toronto as an indication. This broader group seems to be maintained, however, around the 30% mark which can hardly be seen as a large proportion. In 1973 families headed by females represented 28.7% of all low income families in Canada although they were only 8.6% of all Canadian families showing their dramatic over-representation among poor families (Ross, 1975, p.16). The 20% quota affected not only the numbers of women raising children alone in public housing projects but also their status and the meaning of their presence in these spaces. As a group of people that had to be contained under the threat of a widespread epidemic of problem families, these women were stigmatized and segregated. Although public housing cannot be assigned as the birth place of these sentiments, it gave them a visible and defined public image in the urban space. The quota, including the process of its application and contestation, created a macro mechanism at the

population rather than individual level. It both expands and changes the complex of popular imagery at the same time that is also draws policy makers, administrators and other housing workers to the problematic of dependent mother.

From dwelling units to tenants.

The American war on poverty and its effects in Canada (see Struthers, 1994, ch.7) generated an interest among social scientists for the measurement and description of poverty and the poor, particularly as it manifested itself in the late 1960s urban and housing context. Studies of the Economic Council of Canada emphasized the national significance of housing and urban problems and the government created the Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research (see Marjorisbanks, 1971). The 'increasing gaps between the rich and poor, the problems of mental illness, crime, juvenile delinquency, family desertion and illegitimacy [...] combined with chronic unemployment and continuing poor wages' figured prominently among the issues of housing by the late 1960s (R. Andras, Federal Minister Responsible for Housing in an address to the Property Forum 69, September 25, 1969, p.4-5. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 7). The brief of CMHC to the Senate Special Committee on Poverty in Dec 10, 1969, attempts to characterize housing need in Canada:

These families [public welfare recipients] were found to be experiencing serious problems of overcrowding and lack of plumbing and other facilities in the dwelling they occupied; one in five of these households was living in a structurally unsound building (over four times the national average). On an average, the families concerned were paying 47 percent of their income on shelter, evidently implying that families with children were going short of other things in order to house themselves even in this quality of accommodation (p.4. AO RG 44-1-1, Box 8).

The same document described tenant families in subsidized units as having an average income of \$3,240 per year and 3.3 children per family (p.6). As well, 25% of tenants of public housing received some form of social assistance or pension and 33% were single parent families

with a variety of income sources (p.7). Statistical descriptors filled the pages of housing reports and documents producing an increasingly sophisticated characterization of the poor, their housing needs and their shelter conditions (e.g., Adams, Cameron, Hill & Penz, 1971; Canadian Welfare Council, 1969; Economic Council of Canada, 1969; Dennis & Fish, 1972, chap.2). On May 14, 1970, the CAS sent OHC extensive documentation about the disadvantages of having children placed with them because of homelessness (AO RG 44-1-2). A concern with the poor was also claimed by the Hellyer Report (Canada, 1969) to produce a "problematic" characterization of public housing offering just opinions to justify the causes and characteristics highlighted.

The big housing projects, in the view of the Task Force, have become ghettos of the poor. They do have too many "problem" families without adequate social services and too many children without adequate recreation facilities. There is a serious lack of privacy and an equally serious lack of pride which leads only to physical degeneration of the premises themselves. The common rent-gear-to-income formulas do breed disincentive and a "what's the use" attitude toward self and income improvement. There is a social stigma attached to life in a public housing project which touches its inhabitants in many aspects of their daily lives. If it leads to bitterness and alienation among parents, it creates puzzlement and resentment among their children ... Mr Goldfarb's interviews with public housing tenants confirmed that these people do believe they face a range of negative stigmas in dealing with the community around them. He, too, found a lack of community spirit and individual self-discipline. He suggested that the problems of living in public housing were "akin to those experienced by some Indians who are on reserve" (Canada, 1969, p. 53-54).

This renewed interest in the poor contributes to shift the focus of public housing issues from dwelling units - starts, construction techniques, quality, size and type - to tenants. The image of public housing was transformed into that of a space inhabited by the poor, as portrayed by the Hellyer Report through the image of *ghettos of the poor*. A review of tenant selection policies in 1972 by the Management Systems Branch of OHC answers the question 'who are the people who become the recipients of housing subsidies?' with a vague statement: 'they are not a monolith' (p.1. AO RG 44-16, Box 6). The review proposed, however, that the families with compounded problems had increased in numbers and mentioned, specifically, a particular group contained by the 20% quota (p.3).

The majority of public assistance recipients were mothers (few fathers) with dependent children - most of them emotionally upset or divorced and a few widowed - and persons unable to work because of prolonged illness or incapacity (p.10).

The image of the ghetto was, no doubt, influenced by the American public housing experience and its critique (see Bratt, 1989; Freedman, 1969; Meehan, 1979). This experience, as characterized by Hirsch (1983), can be described as 'making the second ghetto' and involving the use of funds by municipalities to clear deteriorated inner-city neighbourhoods and to turn these areas into business or commercial districts. Public housing was, then, located in neighbouring African American areas accommodating usually, low income Black households displaced by slum clearance (Bauman, 1987; Bristol, 1991; Rainwater, 1970).

Examining this wealth of data and debate, Dennis & Fish (1972), challenging the Hellyer Report, emphasize that 'public housing in Canada is not a ghetto for the destitute poor or the exclusive preserve of welfare families and does not suffer the same stigma experienced in the American program' (p.184). However, despite the 20% quota as a containment technology, the image of the ghetto was a powerful one and was used widely in Canada, as illustrated in the declarations of the MPP for Scarborough North celebrating the cancelling of a project in March 27, 1973:

If the project that was cancelled had been built, I am positive that we would have been looking at ghetto-like situations in the future (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 14).

In addition to the image of the ghetto the dependent mother starts also to figure prominently among the imagery of public housing. A survey of public knowledge and attitudes commissioned by OHC in 1972 revealed that 72.5% of Ontarians believed that people living in public housing were 'fatherless families' and this proportion increased to 77.5% if Metro Toronto residents were excluded (Canadian Facts Co Ltd, 1972). Popular characterizations of public housing tenants

began to discuss the negative image of recipients of public assistance, reinforcing this association.

There is a tendency too, to think of public housing occupants as "welfare families". Some are: at the end of March this year, in 19,665 OHC units in Metro, 25.7% of the families were on either provincial family benefits or municipal general welfare assistance, while another 27% had incomes from various kinds of pensions. But 47% were employed. And another 5% of OHC tenants are what social workers call "problem families", the same proportion that is found in the general population. Alcoholism, marital discord, parent-child conflicts and mental illness aren't exclusive of the poor (*Toronto Daily Star*, June 12, 1972).

Rose's statement on April 17, 1973 to the Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy, chaired by Professor Comay gives form to the argument that public housing carries within it an inherent contradiction for tenants:

While he approves of the high quality of OHC accommodation, Dr. Rose indicates that it is these features which have heightened the differences among the poor in such a way as to cause a division into two groups - those who get full housing assistance and those who get none. In conclusion it is suggested that this inequitable system may be causing tenants to become more dependent and at the same time making it more difficult for those on modest incomes to become independent (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 11, file: Comay Report).

The discovery of poverty brought to the forefront of public discussion an attention to the poor and to the social programs of the welfare system. This discussion popularized for the Canadian reality the commonly repeated American understanding of public housing as ghettos of the poor. The discovery of tenants and their conditions of life, illustrated by detailed statistical analysis and enriched by a public imagery of problem families fed, within the context of federal concerns about large public expenditures, the revival of sentiments associated with the threat of the slum. The spaces of public housing started assume the image of certain problematic groups among which the dependent mother and her children enacted a central role.

Tenants' movements and the gendering of tenants.

Tenants become visible not only in expert reports and politicians discourses. They also come alive through their own protest and grass-roots activities. For example, the *Toronto Star* of Aug 30, 1969 documents several tenant protests in which sit-in, occupations and invasions were

used. In most cases these protests involved evicted 'fatherless families' with 'inadequate rental budgets' (see also *Star*, July 2 1970). As part of the Canadian war on poverty, the Company of Young Canadians initiative allocated grants to groups of people to do research on downtown communities as well as to establish several community organizing projects (see Fraser, 1972). 'Tenant power' became a common term and frequent descriptions of action, such as the St. Louis rent strike, were openly discussed in the press and among housing experts (e.g., *Globe & Mail*, Feb 17, 1970).

It is only recently that the phrase "tenant's rights" and "tenant's participation" have emerged. That they have become such common expression in the whole field of rental housing stems from the changing nature of our housing and social attitudes (Report to Chairman & Members, Board of Directors 1970, Appendix A, p.6. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1).

In the US, tenant activism developed steadily from 1970s to 1980s when the National Tenants Union was established (see Gilderbloom, 1988; Heskin, 1981, Marcuse, 1981). In the early 1970s renters began demanding control on rents, adequate living conditions, eviction protection and political participation. Tenants' activism and struggles for rent control began, then, to assume a major role in spreading progressive ideas around municipal reform, right to housing and quality of living (Capek & Gilderbloom, 1992; Dreier & Atlas, 1980; Lipsky, 1970). Urban social movements sprung up worldwide (see Castells [1975] documentation of such movements in Paris, Montreal and Santiago de Chile) and brought tenants' and housing issues to the forefront of a radical political agenda (see collection edited by Pickvance, 1976).

OHC followed closely the activities the American National Tenants Organization Inc. and the so-called *grass roots democracy* movement in the US (see Alinsky, *Harper's Magazine*, March 1970. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1; see also Bailey 1974). At home, OHC maintained the tenants' movement under careful scrutiny, sending their own staff to public meetings and

compiling detailed accounts of names of attendants and the topics of discussion (e.g., Report from meeting at Regent Park United Church, May 5, 1970. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). The immediate grievances of tenants' associations centred on unwillingness or delays in making repairs and doing general maintenance work; inadequate social and recreational facilities; vandalism, lack of building security, and inadequate policing of the conduct of other tenants. In addition to these physical issues, many problems conceived until then as individual were expressed in a collective form: lack of privacy, unreasonable rules and regulations, interference with the reasonable use of the premises; generally unresponsive attitudes and unwillingness to listen to reasonable complaints and requests for services (see Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.198).

Examples of these demands can be found in a submission from the La Salle Project in Thunder Bay where half of units were occupied by low-income single parents families since the housing authority encountered difficulty enforcing the 20% quota. The La Salle Tenants Association demanded renovations 'to reduce ghettoisation', an appeal mechanism to the point-rating system, the allocation of one of the units to serve three functions: an immunization clinic for the convenience of mothers with small children afflicted with transportation problems, a permanent library, and a space for tenants meetings as well as baby sitting (letter from the La Salle Tenants Association to OHC, Nov. 27, 1970. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1).

Newly formed organizations and associations demanded tenant participation in management (see, for example, a variety of letters from Don District Housing Committee, Aug. 28, 1970; Metro Tenants Association, July 10, 1970; Ontario Housing Tenant Association, Nov. 23, 1970 [AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1]). Activism by tenants' associations increased in 1971 with the Ontario conference of Public Housing Tenants in July 1971 and in October the Ontario's Poor

People's conference (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4). In 1971 some tenants went on rent strike demanding more say in planning, site selection and project management (Sayegh, 1987, p.163).

Richardson (1972, p.176) summarizes their situation:

Public housing in Canada (and in the U.S.) has usually been rammed through without any consultation with or involvement of the people it was designed to help; these people have often been subjected to crude examinations to determine their eligibility for help; and they have been given no say in the way their own houses are administered. The result has been the creation of ghettos of the urban poor, who have been easily identifiable, and have been avoided by their more affluent neighbours.

In Toronto, a fortnightly sheet about city hall affairs published by four aldermen and a community newspaper, *The Toronto Citizen*, promoted local issues and the activities of citizens' groups. In 1969 the federal government, for the first time in Canada, offered a grant to a tenant organization, the Community Improvement Association of Regent Park, which developed an active Community Development Association with a newspaper, regular meetings and contacts in the US tenants' movement (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). Manuals were produced in major Canadian cities illustrating how to start and organize citizens' movements around housing issues (e.g., Lorimer, 1972). Tenants, in a process that parallels the thinking of social scientists and bureaucrats, started to think about who they were. The newspaper of the Ontario Housing Tenants Association published articles interviewing tenants, exploring their identities among themselves. Here for the first time tenants started to assume a gendered identity with working mothers and single parent mothers assuming very visible positions. In an article entitled "Who wants public housing? We do!", the Ontario Housing Tenants Association describes some tenants groups:

Now here are a few types of tenants living in public housing: women whose husbands have deserted them and their children; women with children who rather than spending a life of misery with the wrong man, leave. Now where are they to go for decent accommodation for themselves and their children at reasonable rates (Ontario Tenants, vol.1(5), May 1972. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 8).

Tenants' mobilization radicalized the demands on the public housing system and represented an increased threat to OHC management. Its most powerful and developed expression only occurred in late 1970s (for analytical insight into Alinsky's influence in Toronto see Fowler, 1992) but early that decade Dennis & Fish (1972) confided their suspicions:

Between the lines, one senses the general feeling that left-wing militant agitators are involved in the formation of associations (p.209).

This activism although just in its formative stages in the early 1970s brought, for the first time, many women raising children alone in contact with each other and physically together. It provided them the opportunity to discuss and develop many of their issues into collective demands to OHC. It allowed them to claim dependent mother as a subject identity with rights and to use that identity to their advantage as suggested in Chapter 6.

The activities of the women's movement occasioned a series of studies focusing on women and their needs which brought special attention to women raising children alone. The Royal Commission on the Status of Women (Canada, 1970) showed that there were specific groups of women such as sole support mothers, who were extremely poor (p.309), disadvantaged in the labour market (p.319-325), and suffered humiliation and discrimination in approaching welfare administration (p.315).

Such families [one-parent families] occupy a marginal position in Canadian society. The social problems experienced by the single parent mother range from feeling herself as an outcast to concern about rearing her children without father's influence. Frequently she is in a difficult financial position ... We have recommended a guaranteed annual income for sole-support parents (Canada, 1970, 287).

Demanding increased resources and opportunities to benefit women, this particular focus helped to separate single mothers from the generic "low income families" and attributed specificity to their needs. The Royal Commission insightfully anticipated the effects of this special focus.

An important aspect of life for poor women is the inadequate supply of low cost housing. If she is a

sole-support mother she may encounter prejudice among landlords, who consider her a poor tenant risk ... Public housing as we have known it in Canada has been criticized: some projects are described as ghettos, and there is a reluctance to stigmatize such housing by restricting its occupancy to welfare families and specially sole-support mothers on welfare. We are concerned that such fears should not inhibit the provision of public housing of various types and designs (Canada, 1970, p.319).

An outburst of policy studies in the early 1970s explored the housing problems of women raising children alone. A study from Carleton University School of Social Work of September 1972 examined the effect of type of household, employment status and type of dwelling on shelter costs of families on welfare. It found only one significant relationship: families with female heads paid a higher proportion of their income on rent (p.3, AO RG 44-1-2, Box 9). Results from a MCSS survey of 1970 added that these women encountered considerable rejection from prospective landlords in the private sector. Although 30.5% of the mothers receiving family benefits in Metro lived in public housing they were less satisfied with aspects of their housing environment than those renting privately (MCSS, 1973, from p.158).

The female-headed family on social assistance is disadvantaged financially and in other ways in renting in the private housing market. Complaints in the public housing sphere tend to focus on the social aspects of the environment. Substantially more women in public housing projects reported that they did not consider that they were living in a good place for child rearing as compared with those who either owned or rented housing in the private sector. The type of housing, e.g., whether high-rise apartment or row housing, was less important in this respect than the public/private dichotomy. The social implications of utilizing public housing as a means of providing adequate housing for larger families headed by female parent on social assistance warrant attention (p.10).

These studies highlighted not only the poor housing conditions of mother-led families and the particular difficulties they experienced but also the complexities involved in the interventions. Reporting these finds, the *Toronto Daily Star* (June 11, 1973) comment that 'Welfare mothers were trapped in public housing' because they were faced with a lack of alternatives that offered the same economic advantage. The visibility of tenants, and particularly of female headed families among them, is demonstrated by the choice of tenant representative appointed to the Ontario Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy. Donna Gamble, a widow from Windsor, was involved

in the Downtown Community Citizen's Organization and six other organizations dealing with tenants and poverty and became the first tenant representative in Provincial affairs. *The Windsor Star* (November 17, 1972) reported:

She said public housing at first seems too good to be true for many people because it means taking them out of a much worse situation. But after you have been in it for a while "you realize you are living with a big hand over you".

This visibility is further illustrated by the increased specificity assigned to the housing issues associated with sole support mothers. These began to be understood as unique but also intrinsically linked to the management of problem families. As an illustration see the recommendation of the Association of Housing Authorities to the Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy:

That OHC do a study on the special problems of single parent families, and the information gleaned therefore be given to the authorities so that they may cope with problem families more adequately.
 That OHC seek to acquire smaller parcels of land throughout communities so that integration in the community of single parent families might take place.
 That where apartments are constructed which may house large percentages of single parent families, permanent recreation and social facilities be incorporated into the design.
 That since single parent families tend to congregate in large cities, housing authorities in such cities require increased staff in Community Relations Department to deal with their problems
 That OHC take the initiative in seeking to co-ordinate all the governmental social welfare agencies concerned with single parent families, so that maximum benefits may be accrued these families for tax dollars spent (May 1973, AO RG-1-2, Box 11).

One of the most important issues that emerged from this focus on mother-led families was the demand that provision of shelter be linked to child day care facilities (see Andrew & Rodgers, 1997). After a resolution of the Provincial Council of Women of Ontario to encourage the establishment of more day care centres in early 1970, letters from the women's advisory committees of different municipalities poured into political representatives' desks, the Department of Social and Family Services as well as OHC (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 3, file: Minister's Correspondence, 1970). Day care emerged as a specific problem of women and in particular

single mothers living in public housing.

It has been represented to me that there are a number of one-parent families for whom special rental accommodation might be planned. Where such families have young children, the problem in caring for the children while the one parent is at work is obviously a very real one, and difficult for people to resolve in a urban society. It has been suggested to me that some resolve it by seeking various forms of public assistance, so that they can care for the children and not work.

Are there substantial numbers of such families? Is this a serious problem? If it is, it might be worthwhile encouraging the Ontario Housing Corporation to build some accommodation specifically for such families, including with it the appropriate supervised nursery school accommodation and reception facilities for school children returning from school before the end of the parent's working day (Letter from E. Dunlop, MPP York-Forest Hill April 17, 1970. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 3, file: Minister's Correspondence).

As a result OHC resolved to include day care centres in its plans providing municipalities agreed to lease the space (June 5, 1970. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 3, file: Minister's Correspondence, 1970).

In addition the Department of Social and Family Services began to articulate solutions for the problem of public housing and dependent mothers through techniques new to OHC: the formation of an inter-department committee with the inclusion of representatives from the interests of tenants sitting alongside technical representatives (Aug 19, 1970. AO RG 44-1-2).

The gendering of public housing tenants, then, came as a result of several processes which occasioned a burst of interest in mother-led families and their housing issues around 1970. These families, irrespective of their source of income, were singled out by OHC management as associated with undesirability in aggregations. The discussions and debates around the 20% quota gave them a certain visibility. Their visibility was enhanced and explored by an attention to the poor and their housing circumstances which shifted the focus of housing issues from production of dwellings to tenants and their problems. In parallel activities of both the tenants' and the women's movements brought single mothers to the forefront of the public housing debate. They provided the opportunity and the environment for women raising children alone and activists to demand solutions to their specific problems and in many situations to actually improve their

conditions of life.

The ghetto: a deterrent to normal family life.

These developments, on the other hand, also produced an effect on OHC and its management. As we have seen, public housing was under strong attack in federal government circles as well as in most municipalities where increased resistance to rezoning for public housing was escalating. Following the Hellyer Report explanations about what happened to public housing abounded. In 1970, the federal government announced assistance for tenants' participation and neighbourhood improvement. Discussing the implementation of this support, OHC insisted on blaming the problems of public housing on the incidence of *problem families*:

In recognition of the strain imposed on municipal, social and recreational facilities by high density projects having high child counts and a proportionally high incidence of families with social or financial problems, the Federal proposals indicated that financial assistance will be given to provide such facilities in both new and existing projects (Report to Chairman & Members of the Board of Directors, OHC, 1970, p.2, AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1).

Although monies were made available for the construction of facilities by CMHC and OHC, both the operating costs of running a program and staffing it were regarded by these agencies as a responsibility of the tenants' organization except for self-help or educational programs approved by CMHC. Issues of lack of schools, recreation facilities, supermarkets, drugstores and other commercial services were considered by OHC as external to its responsibilities: either an issue of parental supervision of delinquent children or a responsibility of municipalities and tenants' association to run activities on OHC grounds (see letter exchange between local planning councils and OHC regarding concerns in the Thristletown Housing Project, April to July, 1970. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 2). On their part management insisted on tenants assuming responsibility towards their environment enforcing in particular firm supervision of their children against vandalism and loitering activities (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). In 1972 the

Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto reported that families composed of one adult and one or two children constituted 50% of all FBA cases and for them the most salient reason for service is children's behaviour. As well, they reported, 51% of those on FBA lived in public housing (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 9). The problem, OHC insisted, was for the Social Services Department.

Unless supplemented by social services, an intolerable situation results, both for the majority of families living in the projects, and for the Property Managers who must manage them. These families, some multi-problem, require continuous and varied help, guidance, and assistance, financial and otherwise, and in some cases, even direct supervision (Metro Toronto Housing Authority, 1972, p.2, AO RG 44-16).

And social scientists concurred:

When these high population and children counts are compounded with large-size projects and/or with the problems of location mentioned above, frictions with neighbours, vandalism, problems in schools, and so on, became noticeable..... While "problem" families are a small minority, there will be more than in a private rental project and their conduct may disturb other tenants. Because society singles out public housing tenants as failures, unable to pay their own way, many of the residents are not there by choice but by necessity (Dennis & Fish, 1972, p.183, 198).

Attributing the problems of public housing on the concentration of unsupervised children in public housing was a common argument. Delinquency and vandalism had traditionally been associated with lack of supervision and linked to single mothers (see chapter 3). A letter from Concerned Citizens' Committee of Guelph from Nov. 24, 1972 asserts this sentiment:

The high density of low rental homes in any one area provides a natural *dumping ground* for welfare families, mostly mother-led. The lack of parental control is obvious. Vandalism reaches alarming proportions in this area, which is the only area in Guelph to need six foot wire guards around the trees in the streets. ... It is felt, however, that much of the delinquency arises as much from home environmental attitudes as from lack of parental control (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 7, my emphasis).

The link between delinquent children and mother-led families is expressed through a series of word associations - e.g., welfare families, mostly mother-led; lack of parental control; vandalism - and the use of a specific example that, although not claiming to describe all situations, produces nevertheless a very concrete image linked with the words. The following example also uses word

associations and even suggests spatial segregation and eugenic techniques as solutions:

Those [destructive tenants] usually involved are low-income, multi-problem families with four or more children (they are, of course only a small minority of the families who fits into this category). Often the problem family is headed by one parent, usually the mother - although as unemployment rises, the father too may be fanning emotional disturbances in the home. ... According to workers in the field, significant improvement in the family situation often is observed if such families can obtain space in OHC development where there is a system of regular inspection. ... high on the list of needs is information on birth control. Social workers have noted that many families which can cope when there are three or four children tend to fall apart with added responsibilities (The Globe & Mail, June 14, 1972).

Problem children provided the rationale for local campaigns against public housing. The Planning Department of the Borough of Etobicoke, for example (see also letters from the Board of Education, April 6, 1972; from the Borough of Etobicoke, April 13, 1972; from citizen's Association of Finch and Leslie, December, 28, 1972), attempting to pressure OHC into converting four bedroom units into three bedroom, claimed that concentrations of poor children were unmanageable:

[B]ecause of the high child population which is intrinsic to public housing, the heavy concentration of low income families in the North end is creating great pressure on available community facilities (Report on District Nine: Northern Etobicoke, 1972, p.10. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 12).

These claims were carefully refuted by activists (Letter by J. Hood to OHC in July 13, 1972, AO RG 44-1-2, Box 12), showing both the low number of enrolment in school and the percent of public housing (2%) in the total housing stock of Etobicoke. In an article entitled "Low rental housing plan opposed by area residents" the *Welland-Port Colborne Tribune* explains:

Everybody in the neighbourhood knows about the wildness of the kids in another low-cost development blocks away, due to poor parental supervision (Aug 23, 1972).

In North York, a local newspaper, *The Mirror Enterprise* describes some of the problems of their community:

Half of the pupils at Flemington's two public schools were suffering from malnutrition, illness, medical or physical defects. 40% of the 1,300 elementary school pupils came from single parent families precluded supervision due to work requirements' (May 17, 1972. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 12).

This new understanding of the problem of public housing was noted by the Ontario Welfare

Council, in a study published in April 1973:

There is a particular problem with the situation of the mother-led family on public assistance. In our high cost of living cities they rapidly become the predominant group on public housing waiting lists. ... There has been a strong shifting of the composition of the waiting list in almost everywhere towards public assistance recipients and in particular towards mother-led families (A Study of Housing Policies in Ontario p.4,8. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 13).

In Sarnia, March 1973, applications from single parent families were half of the waiting list for public housing (not necessarily on FBA), while in Stratford mother-led families formed 1/3 of tenants and about ½ of the waiting list. In the La Salle Project, in Thunder Bay, the ration of single parents family dropped from 50% in the mid 1960s to 25% in 1973. In Kitchener-Waterloo the proportion of single parents families was 25% of the tenants of public housing in 1973 (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 13). Although it is difficult to assert the actual increase in applications from mother-led families and equally hard to substantiate claims about their predominance among tenants, the attention these families received from public housing analysts was remarkable as were the almost unanimous blaming tone.

If, as seems desirable, the housing management created under federal-provincial-municipal or provincial auspices considers the need for housing as the prime determinant in selecting families for accommodation in relatively scarce public housing, the social situation in such housing projects becomes a deterrent to normal family life, on the one hand, and an obstacle to further public participation in housing programs on the other (Rose, 1980, p.171).

In addition to this elaborate imagery relating delinquency and vandalism to single mothers, strong social opposition to the Divorce Act of 1968 also produced a series of changes in the public perception of single mothers. The Act, a victory of the women's movement, also gave women raising children alone increased visibility. The press, to illustrate stories regarding public housing increasingly, used examples of tenants who were divorced instead of widows or deserted women (e.g. *Toronto Star* Sept 18, 1973, letters to the editor reacting to article on Sept 14 on single mother's homelessness). A discussion on homelessness, for example, in an article in the

Barrie Examiner, Nov 14, 1972 reported on the eviction of a separated woman and her four kids.

The Bramalea Guardian in Aug 17, 1972 interviewed divorced mothers resident of public housing. The divorced woman, however, carried a social stigma which was immediately transferred to the tenant mother-led family. In 1971 OHC received a complaint from a tenant who accused a divorced woman of practising prostitution because her children were not all the same colour (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). See the underlying tone in the following commentaries made in the decision to deny a tenant's request for changing accommodation in Oct 2, 1970:

Mrs A. is 22, is divorced after 2 months marriage, has a 2 ½ years old daughter she previously lived in a deplorable basement apartment and OHC gave her a new apartment in February 1970 (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 2, my emphasis).

These new understandings of and focus on women who raise children alone and their specific housing needs shaped the amendments to the NHA in 1973. They created new governmental practices through housing needs. Early in 1973 the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, Ron Basford, pronounced 'a fundamental right of Canadians, regardless of where they live or their economic circumstances, to enjoy adequate shelter at reasonable cost'. He announced a change in the role of CMHC from a 'lending institution to the building industry' to 'the instrument of federal social policy in the field of housing and community planning' (House of Commons Debates, vol XX, no5, January 11, 1973). This marked change in function is explained by CMHC itself with the use of newly discovered concerns regarding the wellbeing of populations:

Although NHA direct aid to low income groups had increased and the stock of public housing continued to grow, the number of low income families, individuals and elderly people in need of assistance remained high. There were increasing social problems being experienced in large scale projects, prompting a sustained anti-public housing reaction. These concerns, coupled with the rise in public housing operating losses, spurred the federal government to consider alternative techniques of providing for low-income housing (CMHC, 1990, p.7).

Shortly after the NHA was amended offering an assistance program to help low income families to purchase their own homes and diverting the responsibility to house those unable to do so to non-profit and cooperative corporations (third sector housing). The curtailing of loans from CMHC put OHC in a precarious position, unsure of future developments and unable to negotiate new construction. OHC's request for block funding similar to that negotiated by the government of Quebec was denied. It was the end of the public housing expansion phase. From then on public housing funds were gradually withdrawn and in 1979 allocations to the program were directed at maintaining existing subsidy commitments.

The 1973 amendments also officially introduced the Neighbourhood Improvement Programs which authorized CMHC to contribute and lend through the provinces toward improving housing conditions (Sayegh, 1987, p.137). Eligible activities were: costs related to selecting the neighbourhood and planning; acquiring or clearing land for community facilities, and low and medium density housing; constructing or acquiring and improving recreation or social facilities; developing maintenance standards; making loans for commercial improvements; relocating the dispossessed; and the cost of employing persons to implement the project. In Ontario, a newly created Ministry of Housing assumed responsibility for OHC and public housing was renamed assisted rental housing (Rose, 1980 p.114-137).

Thus solutions to the problematic public housing experience can be summarized under three different initiatives. The first involved an acknowledgement of the differentiated tenant body of public housing and the development of different solutions for each group. For the non-problematic low income families led by an employed male head, new mortgage lending measures were introduced in the NHA in 1973 to facilitate home ownership. The second initiative

addressed the separated and problematic residual groups of social assistance recipients but primarily female-headed families. Their housing needs would be addressed by the voluntary sector. Grants for co-operative and non-profit organizations - third sector housing in today's nomenclature - were enhanced while funding for public housing decreased and eventually totally halted. Since single mothers were constructed as a specific and separate group they seemed ideal for initiatives in the non-profit housing sector where a portion of the units could specially catered to families such as mothers on social assistance (brief discussing a report by MCSS in 1973 AO RG 44-1-2, Box 15). Since 1971 the Ontario Welfare Council was directly calling for an 'increased variety of specialized housing types including ... residences for single parent families' (Resolutions of the Ontario Welfare Council Conference, May 1971. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4).

Thirdly, for the already existing public housing projects new management methods were attempted. Their main thrust was a concern with the wellbeing of tenants and they relied heavily on tenant participation in management of the project. Tenant participation was not a new initiative. Grants had been available to tenants' associations under the joint support of Department of National Health and Welfare and CMHC since the 1970s. Increased legitimacy and recognition of the movement, however, was accompanied by extensive regulation:

Participation is envisaged as ranging from informal association/ management meetings to tenants advisory committees, to the appointment of tenants to housing authorities. No specific guidelines are set out, but notice is given of the intention to fund a series of seminars on Tenant Participation in association with the Canadian Welfare Council. In addition, grants will be available to duly constituted Tenants' Associations to assist in defraying administrative expenses. To qualify for these grants a Tenants' Association will need to be formally organized and comprised of at least 50% of the tenants concerned. It should have elected officers and a constitution defining its objectives which should include, at least, the initiation and carrying out of recreational and other programs and to represent the interest of tenants (Report to Chairman & Members, Board of Directors, 1970, p.2. AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1).

Management training also was the object of federal attention and CMHC suggested the

creation of facilities directed at providing public housing management training (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 1). In fact, tenant management schemes became one of the hallmarks of the post-1973 assisted rental housing programs since construction was drastically reduced as of this date initiating a new period in the history of public housing in Canada (for review and analysis of tenant management schemes see in Canada: CMHC, 1987, Vakili-Zad, 1993; in the US: Chandler, 1991; and in Britain: Goodlad, 1998).

In summary, public housing was an experiment which, although conceptualized and implemented as an economic measure in isolation from the people it was ultimately to house, was brought to an end not as an economic failure but, primarily, for generating a social problem: its aggregation of marginal populations was seen as a threat to normal urban and community life. Although placed at a secondary level, the actual composition of this population was the product of a stringent quota with origins in practices aiming at defining spaces of normalization. The 20% quota specified abstract characteristics for family eligibility which dispensed with face-to-face contact and amounted to the specific containment of certain undesirable groups, chiefly mother-led families. This group of women began to be noticed through the war on poverty - which brought, through the American public housing image of ghettos of the poor, an emphasis on those that inhabit the projects - and the tenant and women's movements - which provided the opportunity and environments for a rich discussion on the specificity of mother-led families' needs but which also challenged the administration's practices and rationalities. Also of particular relevance in the construction of the dependent mother as the representation of the public housing population are the particular interpretations of government representatives and analysts of a newly defined public housing problem: families whose spatial concentration generated problems that

could affect the whole community.

This new population construct is, then, different from the subject dependent mother created through mothers' allowance. Through the allowances, a series of pathologies and characteristics were assigned to individual families. In the population construct, individual families are not relevant. What is at stake is their predominance and interaction in a particular group. In fact the population construct avoids individualizing while attributing specific public visibility and differentiation to the concentration of dependent mothers. Dependent mothers are seen as a group and it is as such that their problematic status for the community is articulated. They constitute a marginal population inhabiting marginal spaces and defining the activities, approaches and understanding of the new urban spaces of marginality. This population construct enlarges the identity dependent mother and assigns to it a variety of spatial characterizations which were constitutive of public housing such as isolation, peripheral and substandard locations, high density housing, and lack of services.

From Tenants to Marginal Populations

This case study has explored how the governmentalization of the single mother complex has incorporated provision of housing as a practice of rule of women raising children alone. The two chapters addressed, respectively, the definition and apparatus of a Canadian public housing program and the transformations in the conceptualization of this program. They illustrated the interactions of social welfare rationalities and practices with the dependent mother as well as the process of constant change and reformation which shapes the activities of social policy.

Support for motherhood was articulated early in the development of welfare in Canada.

This support included a concern with shelter but considered shelter a private matter. That is unlike, for example, the mother's spending habits or moral conduct which were targeted with specific interventions, appropriate shelter was a matter which each mother had to solve in the market like all the other citizens. Good quality shelter constituted a reward for those successful in the workforce. The general thought was: if a man, and I use the gender intentionally, wanted a good house and a good life for his family, he had to work for it. Social support for those unable to work allowed a lower standard of living at the peril of discouraging work. In other words, provision of income and goods for people outside the labour market followed the principle of less eligibility which lies at the roots of the welfare system. With large scale industrialization and urbanization in Western nations, however, the private sector was unable to provide shelter of good quality for the masses of workers and a series of ideas emerged about how to articulate the provision of family homes.

Around the end of World War I, advocates and policy makers concerned with the shelter problem constructed a particularly deserving group of workers for whom a shelter solution was necessary, the veterans. As a war matter, this group was a federal responsibility and housing, despite the traditions of the BNA, began to be associated with the federal level. Women raising children alone were considered deserving members of society as mothers of future workers and their eligibility to public support was conceived in terms of their exceptional status: those that through no fault of their own could not care for their family. They belonged to a category of others while housing was conceived as a problematic issue for the norm, for the way of life of the average worker. The very conceptualization of women raising children alone as beneficiaries of mothers' allowances excluded them from claiming right to a decent home conceived with the

veteran in sight.

Some Western nations developed municipally constructed and managed housing with funds from the central government. Canada, however, was reluctant to embark on public housing experimentations until World War II, when the idea of government provided housing in Canada was substantially transformed. The new formulations of a comprehensive welfare system which extended protection to all groups of the population, and the experiences of government with the management of the wellbeing of populations, and in particular the wartime provision of houses for war munitions workers, brought an understanding of new capacities and responsibilities. The role of government in housing was formulated as encompassing measures for the whole population and public housing was expressed as a specific part of the general plan addressing those unable to procure themselves shelter through the private market. Low income rental housing was provided by the three levels of government through a program contained in scope and aimed at a residual group chosen through very meticulous investigation. Still municipal housing under the Federal-Provincial Partnership was not associated with any particular group of people. It was not a right of individuals and its provision was rooted in eliminating the threat and social expenditures associated with slum areas. Women raising children alone had no special claim to the privilege of subsidized housing and pragmatic managers took great care that public housing became an example of normality rather than the domain of any particular group. Meanwhile the shelter costs of those excluded from subsidized low rental housing began to threaten the foundations of the postwar recovery: shelter allowances and income support programs were grossly insufficient generating increased agitation around urban issues and poverty. Public housing, as a large scale construction program initiated in 1964, was in large measure the result of formulating the issue in

terms of generating construction activity to recover from the economic slump. In addition, design concepts were developed to guarantee the production of housing that would be physically differentiated from that produced by the private market.

Given this broad set of intentions and developments that generated the public housing program, it is not surprising that its practices were very diverse, driven by construction interests and at times contradictory. The Ontario government, through OHC, produced, managed and allocated the units to people. The proposal call method provided housing primarily through the construction of large, high density, high-rise projects on the fringes of urban areas. These construction and location practices constituted distinct and segregated spaces in the urban fabric particularly devoid of urban services and amenities. The characteristically small number of bedrooms in a unit built for economic reasons, facilitated the accommodation of small families and, particularly of mother-led families, who, in the view of some managers, were more suited to apartment block living. In themselves, these practices disregarded the contemporary child behaviour literature which considered apartment living inappropriate for families with children while they confirmed OHC administrators and Provincial politicians' belief, expressed in many documents, that these women should be grateful for what they were 'given'.

The dwellings were built through the technologies that made shelter needs into a practical concept which allowed implementation. Defining the type of dwelling created antagonistic land use disputes and discrimination against public housing at the local level. Despite the size, location and hostile bias embedded in public housing, affordability implied a series of financial advantages of the rent-geared-to-income scales and of the calculations excluding day care costs. These made public housing the most viable shelter option for public assistance recipients - of whom women

raising children alone constituted a large part - particularly as the value of allowances decreased in the highly inflationary late 1960s. The rent calculation practices made public housing a desirable and rare good creating enormous waiting lists. Scarcity was added to subjective and regulatory allocation practices which were enforced through the point rating system. These practices gradually reframed bad and costly housing as normal and required special case status as a condition of eligibility to public housing. Individual women raising children alone and their advocates claimed this special case status - or a right to public housing on the grounds of their difficult situation - initiating a selection practice that later became institutionalized in OHC forms as well as shifting attention to single mothers as a special group of tenants.

All these practices influencing who was selected as a tenant of public housing were developed under an explicit population formation principle: the 20% quota. This quota defined female-led families as undesirable in aggregations exceeding 20% of any project population and, in particular, it restricted the total number of families in receipt of mothers' allowance to 10%. There was a contradictory set of practices in place: a general explicit directive restricting the total body of women raising children alone allowed in any project as well as a variety of implicit practices which encouraged these women's tenancy and made public housing almost the sole feasible shelter for them despite its design and location adversities.

In addition to these program mechanisms, other connected social processes brought very specific meanings and issues to public housing. The war on poverty shifted the focus of discussion about housing from construction of dwellings to tenants and their quality of life generating an enormous amount of scientific investigation around composition of tenants and their characteristics. The tenants' activism in the US and in Canada shook OHC management,

challenged practices, demanded participation in decisions and brought attention to the leaders and participants in these movements who were in large part sole support mothers. Through the tenants' and urban movements poor women had an opportunity to discover each other and to articulate their common needs and claims. The women's movement gave voice, publicity and specificity to these women's needs. It promoted demands such as day care facilities in public housing projects and forced issues of sole-support mother's housing onto the public agenda. Women raising children alone became not only the individual dependent mother receiving benefits defined by government departments. They were also active agents, demanding and defining directions for policy. These demands were within the parameters delimited by social policy but these women were assuming the subject identity created by a social welfare program - the dependent mother as a bearer of rights - and recasting the terms of these policies. As a group they brought many improvements to their lives: the 20% quota was gradually dropped, single mothers were chosen as representatives of tenants voicing their demands, and day care was incorporated into OHC's public housing spaces.

Government representatives and managers of OHC, on the other hand, also in interaction with these social processes, changed their practices and recast the terms of public housing provision and their understanding of its subjects. Women raising children alone and their children, described as delinquents and lacking parental supervision, were blamed as the cause of a deteriorated environment in public housing. The single mother's image became that of the typical tenant of public housing, an area condemned by its own inhabitants as well as by the whole city as the site of social problems. These processes contributed to the creation of a subject that is particularly visible and segregated in the urban space and shoulder a major share of the blamed for

the failure of the public housing experiment.

In all, the processes, technologies and interactions described in this case study can be summarized into three broad aspects through which satisfying the shelter needs became the means of ruling women raising children alone: those which facilitated and attracted those women to locate themselves in public housing; those that created public housing as a contested and antagonized space and; those that made the inhabitants of public housing a problematic population. These attributed a population dimension to the dependent mother: from a description of an individual's situation the dependent mother assumes also the characterization of a problem population. The marginal population construct incorporates the dependent mother subject in a way that is active and acted upon. Its essence is the immaterial mean - a mere statistic - but its popular image is the individual dependent mother, who is, after the public housing experiment, clearly visible and distinctive in the urban space. As a population, dependent mothers assume an existence which is beyond that of an individual but that of a group posing a threat in its number rather than its nature. They become understood as a social phenomenon carrying the potential of being a threat to society in their interactions with other people.

A further effect of these strategies is a change in the character of public housing from a space of normalization to a space of containment and marginalization. In its origins public housing carried the intention of providing help to those unable to procure themselves housing in the "normal" way - through mortgaged home-ownership. It was a space of normalization for the *other*. However, the focus on tenants, the emphasis on their problematic integration in the community, and the streamlining of the different groups among them made public housing the option of last resort for those that could not be housed elsewhere. It no longer carries the

functions of transforming tenants into future home owners and their space into ideal communities. It carries the stigma and problematic status of a group constituting a deterrent to “normal” community and urban life. As individuals dependent mothers are still subjected to the normalizing and supervisory processes of Family Benefits and these aim at relocating these women to non-profit or cooperative housing, leaving public housing as the habitat of marginal populations.

The strategies of public housing also incorporated housing needs in the government of dependent mothers. Housing becomes the most important and most expensive need of the dependent mother and it involves a variety of subjection practices. Claiming a special status, admission screening, supervision and good housekeeping represent just a few of the ways through which the lives of these women are shaped. Public housing represented also in Canada, one of the first public meeting places for dependent mothers and a focus point for their organizing and collectively transforming of the practices which oppressed them. While these may be forgotten today, buried under a variety of demands and struggles around shelter and single motherhood, it is important to understand programs of government as practices of liberty and to envision agency as the continued opening of possibilities for change rather than a definite and ultimate accomplishment.

Chapter 8:

WORKING FROM WITHIN:

RESTAGING SINGLE MOTHERHOOD

In part, I see myself as working within discourses that operate through ontological claims - "there is no doer behind the deed" - and recirculating the "there is" in order to produce a counterimaginary to the dominant metaphysics. Indeed, I think, it is crucial to recirculate and to resignify the ontological operators, if only to produce ontology itself as a contested field. ... The reason why repetition and resignification are so important to my work has everything to do with how I see opposition working from within the very terms by which power is reelaborated. The point is not to level prohibition against using ontological terms but, on the contrary, to use them more, to exploit and restage them, subject them to abuse so that they can no longer do their usual work (Interview with Judith Butler, Prins, 1998, p.279).

The Complex of Meanings of Single Mother

The case studies presented here have been studies on and around the nature of single motherhood. They have departed from a questioning of the ontological assumptions of the social policy sciences about the single mother and have produced a variety of discussions around the "there is" - borrowing the expression from the above quote - of single mother. The intention, as skilfully put by Butler, has been to "recirculate and resignify" its ontological operators, to "restage" and "subject to abuse" what feeds and reproduces single motherhood, what makes its nature. Like many other social concepts single mothers has become a somewhat sterile categorization of certain women's lives. Approaches to understanding women raising children alone have carried a barrage of assumptions which come complete with needs assessment and the

solutions to the problems that come to define and form this group of women. These assumptions have roots in a historical unwavering faith in the liberal model of family and domesticity which, despite its changes, transformations, and the constant challenges has maintained a central trust in the male breadwinner model.

In this thesis I have shown that to talk about single mothers is to invoke the variety of images, knowledges, assumptions and judgements the term carries with it. In the introduction, I gave a flavour of these meanings and their profound importance not only for the group of women defined as such but also for society as a whole. In their multiplicity these meanings have characterised women who raise children alone, primarily, as a problem: a problem for society, a problem for the future of their children and a problem for their own selves and self esteem. This discourse of problems has been fuelled by liberal socio-scientific practices about the family and its role in society as well as theories of welfare which developed since the nineteenth century in Western societies (reviewed in Chapter 2). These practices and theories have been counterpoised by a variety of critical proposals which although managing to dislodge the liberal articulations of causality of problems and single motherhood, have neither achieved an improvement in the circumstances of women raising children alone nor challenged the problematic status attributed to them.

With the core critiques to predominant mainstream theories, single mothers as a domain of knowledge gained sophistication and the problems encountered by the women addressed by this domain were understood with renewed light and depth. The identity single mother, however, continued to refer to a pre-existing problematic subject. Single mother - or the various other attributes used to refer to women who raise children alone, such as lone mother, female head of a

family with children, and so forth - became a descriptor of a being or a thing in itself. That is, it became such a defined and clear identity that it carried a pre-determined path and future for both the mothers and their children: their life chances and possibilities calculated with numeric certitude, their attitudes and behaviours predictable, and the solutions to their problems primarily an issue of employment. Single mother, as an expression, refers to a finished comprehensive and contradictory set of circumstances and duties associated with a vague, ambiguous, complex and problematic group of individuals whose key to a good life rests in their engagement in the labour force.

This state of affairs led me to question the nature of single mothers: what is *single mother*? Is it a concrete being struggling with survival in an adverse situation or, perhaps, can we conceive of single mothers as an abstract figure of welfare programs which, with no material existence, only refers to or represents a grim reality? In any case, what is the relationship of single mothers with welfare? My exploration reflected a search for a definition, the yearning for meaning that could guide action towards a better world in general and, in particular, ways in which these actions could be expressed through social interventions. This means that, in fact, I was looking for the answer to three articulated questions: What is the nature of single mothers? How do social practices operate regarding the women and their families in this group? How can we act in relation to social interventions and, in particular, challenge current oppressive practices?

Foucault and contemporary Foucaultian based analyses provide a fitting theoretical framework to tackle these questions. They centre their investigations on the exploration of forms of power that insinuate themselves so profoundly amidst ourselves that it is difficult to imagine how we might alter them. In particular the body of literature loosely described as governmentality

focuses on a variety of power relations expressed in the form of the government or management of populations towards the wellbeing of society. Using insights from this literature I proposed to approach the investigation into the nature of single mothers through the analytic of the single mother complex. Under this analytic, single mother is formulated as a complex of significations and meanings, a collection of rationalities. This assemblage of values, beliefs, ideas, expectations, postulates, knowledges, and judgements is, in fact a collection of power relations which links together a variety of ethical and socio-scientific discourses. This complex in articulation with practices of government, such as welfare, produces multiple effects which are both outcomes of and inputs to the complex. Among these effects is the constitution of ways to govern women raising children alone and the materiality of single mothers itself. That is, the governmentalization of the single mother complex created or invented each poor individual woman raising children alone as a subject of welfare through its programs of action. It created the dependent mother, a single mother who is a subject of welfare. In a second effect this woman is re-created not only as an individual subject but grouped with others and given visibility, identity and collective interests in society becoming through these processes a marginal population. In summary, what I proposed was that the articulations between rationalities around women raising children alone and the practices of welfare continually invent the dependent mother as a body with subjectivity and individual needs as well as a group with collective existence and combined bearings on society.

To look at these two effects I took us through two case studies. The study of mothers' allowances isolated the formation of the dependent mother - the material substance of the governmentalization of the single mother complex. The study of public housing showed how she attained the dimension of a marginal population. Both effects are real, interact with each other

and contribute to the formation of women who raise children alone as the subject single mother. Clearly they are not the only effects of this complex formation which, for example, interacts with the legal apparatus and produces the divorced mother. They provide not an all encompassing answer to the ontological question “what are single mothers” but rather the case studies show a few partial and fractured ways of seeing single mothers and their interactions with welfare. Meanings and ideas about single mothers were opened up and turned around shedding a light of intelligibility rather than exhaustiveness in the single mothers question. The case studies focus, not on the historical development of this subject, but on the particular effects of the practices of social welfare policies in the constitution of single mothers. They showed, as the introductory quote by Butler highlights, the importance of repetition and re-signification in the way ruling works.

In this conclusion I will discuss these two effects and consider some implications of using this analysis within the field of policy analysis and social interventions. First I will review what the first case study has told us about the formation of the dependent mother through the implementation of the mothers’ allowance initiative. Proceeding, I will summarize the interaction of this subject with the public housing program and the incorporation of a population dimension to its individual characterization. Then I will return to Judith Butler’s thoughts on subjectivity to expand on how can we reconcile these understandings with a theory of agency and resistance which is essential for the formulation of practices that attempt to change society. Finally I will comment on directions for the reformulation of social policy today.

The Dependent Mother

In the first case study, I looked at the implementation and development of the mothers' allowance initiative from 1920 until its transformation into Family Benefits in 1967. Following the implementation of this initiative not only has allowed insights into the processes of governmentalization of the single mother complex but it has, most importantly, traced an important effect of these processes: the creation of a new being, the dependent mother. The materialization of this new welfare subject was made possible through the several interactions between means, apparatuses and mechanisms of government which gradually made mothers' allowance into a practical intervention. The dependent mother is the real, live representation of the single mother complex in the welfare system: she is subjected to the Family Benefits program but, at the same time, she is what gives this program its reason for being. This means that the dependent mother can only be understood within the signifying practices of Family Benefits.

At its very onset in 1920, the mothers' allowance legislation in Ontario was more an intention of action than a defined and detailed intervention. It was the result of a variety of alliances among disparate forces, encompassing several different aims and campaigns, and reflecting a myriad of emerging charitable practices. It combined several rationalities for supporting certain families outside of normality - deserving poor mothers raising children alone - with a variety of practices emerging from the activities of women working in urban charitable organizations towards reformation and improvement of the poor. This articulation inaugurated in Ontario, as Struthers (1994) has pointed out, a new form of government of the wellbeing of the population: for the first time the Province assumed responsibility for the direct intervention in the private lives of a group of people in the name of the wellbeing of all society. The novelty of the

situation required the invention of new practices and mechanisms as well as the adaptation of old ones. Implementation, throughout the 40 years of the program, was a constant incorporation of new technologies and practices and a permanent transformation of traditions and rationalities which were consolidated in the Family Benefits Act of 1967.

The “other” family, or the family out of normality, constitutes the subject of government. But the government of these families is of importance in so far as they may exhibit the potential for reformation, or in other words, the justification for intervention lies in their capacity to be transformed into “normal” self-supporting families. While the mothers’ allowance initiative recognizes the value of mother-work in raising healthy and fit workers it is only the poor mother judged suitable for transformation in her abilities and subjectivity who can benefit from the initiative. Beneficiaries were carefully screened and selected through multiple mechanisms of eligibility. The various eligibility rules reflected these preoccupations through a variety of procedures of exclusion from and inclusion into the program. Some of them reflected racial beliefs, such as the superiority of the English or those who opted for that nationality. Others reflected a belief in the weakness of character of mothers who should be able to cope, such as the exclusion of mothers with one child or those with a certain income source. The eligibility criteria defined primarily the very few who could become a candidate for change and raise the future normalized workers. As the intervention grew in management experience and established itself as a program of government, control was transferred to professional staff and a developing administrative machinery incorporated intrusive and discretionary practices based on the activities of middle class volunteers of the early days. Administrative structures remained a powerful tool for defining the boundaries of normality and for consolidating the authority of civil servants in

designing those boundaries.

These three broad programmatic issues - development of justifications for the initiative, formation of eligibility criteria, and establishment of an administrative machinery- constitute central processes in the practices of mothers' allowance through which the dependent mother becomes transformable, categorical, and administrable. At another level, I have shown that the constitution of the dependent mother was also achieved through several detailed practices and technologies of government. Among them supervision, a sophisticated multipurpose technology of government, allowed flexibility and sensitivity to individual family's circumstances and provided the family with a matrix of ideal behaviour and expectations. It is not a question of restricting and binding these women to unwanted rules but a question of creating a form of life which the poor mothers in receipt of the allowance had to learn to live through their own choice. Supervision strengthened the mothers through support, encouragement and advocacy as well as guided and evaluated their mother-work. It was extended through a web of institutions and organizations which provided an invisible grid of normality and expectations for these women. Their gradual, persistent integration into the grid is a question of their own internalizing and assuming its values and behaviours as an identity.

In addition to providing each family with a matrix of normalized life, supervision also developed the established parameters through which good motherhood is understood, measured and accounted for. Through its ritualized and repetitive surveillance of certain aspects of family life - such as health conditions, children's upbringing, home environment, budgeting and family management - it compiled key indicators of good motherhood and housekeeping. These were enmeshed in the class, racial, religious and moral values of the visitors or workers that were

embedded in the program, and formed the key elements of the development and accumulation of knowledge around these families and processes of change. Supervision and record keeping routinized and institutionalized the lives of families through an elementary, orderly and coherent representation of the family's life amenable to simplistic interventions. In addition to this reduction, the lives and experiences of poor mothers were further compartmentalized through the structures of delivery of the initiative which effectively separated the economic and personal needs of mothers. A case-work and counselling component of mothers' allowance, provided by private charitable agencies, developed along side but independent of the public component which focused on income needs. This divided subject became a field of professional expertise through technologies of assessment, diagnosis, treatment and evaluation.

Encouragement to proceed into complete self-sufficiency, hence accomplishing the process of normalization, was provided by the paltry allowance. The small amount, diminished by inflation, and which had necessarily to be supplemented through work of the mother or her children, with its accompanied deductions, complicated calculations, created a certain level of stability for the family but its overall effect was also to constantly remind the family that independence and wellbeing only came with self support. The mothers' allowance was a residual program only reluctantly funded, in fact permanently underfunded, by the province constantly reminding private citizens of their duty towards poor families. Its final incorporation within a national system of welfare, which resulted in the Family Benefits program represents a further process through which the dependent mother was created. It involved the re-casting of mother-work as a temporary obstacle to participation in the labour force, rather than a necessary activity, further emphasizing the urgency of mothers moving into self-sufficiency and undermining their

contribution to society.

I called the life form resulting from the governmentalized single mother complex the dependent mother. This individual human being is not to be confused with the wife who is psychologically and financially dependent on her husband according to the family wage formula as popularized by Friedan (1963). The word dependency, as Fraser & Gordon (1994) demonstrated in the US context, carries with it today 'special assumptions about human nature, gender roles, the causes of poverty, the nature of citizenship, the sources of entitlements and what counts as work and as a contribution to society' (p.311). The dependent mother is a poor woman raising her children without a male partner and without a decent income - either from wages or other sources - and who is completely and utterly dependent on Family Benefits for the precarious survival of her family. She is locked in permanent poverty by the low levels of the benefits without the possibility of improving her income. The regularization of waged work introduced in 1957 and enshrined in Family Benefits rigidly delimits the number of hours the mothers can work, condemning them to unemployment. Even as married mothers entered the labour force (with complementary salaries), single mothers not only were limited from doing so but also could not afford to leave the program since wage levels of women in general required an additional income to allow survival.

Further, the contribution of the dependent mother to society, the mother-work of raising future workers, is re-defined and acted upon as an obstacle to a normalized life. This transformation in the meaning of mother-work reflects the consolidation of the axis employed / unemployed in the Family Benefits through the integration in a national welfare system. It marks the devaluation of child raising work and the definition of motherhood primarily in relation to the

mother's position vis-à-vis the labour market. Mothers to whom the labour market could not offer a wage sufficient for the support of their family become described as dependent on a system which no longer provides them with a reward for a capacity to raise children but with a compensation for a deficiency: the inability to be fully employed. Consequently, needs - 'a political instrument meticulously prepared, calculated and used' (Foucault, 1979, p.26) - of the dependent mother are defined in terms of labour force engagement within a centralized decision making structure subordinated primarily to budgetary decisions. The emphasis on addressing need - basic necessities of life such as food, shelter, clothing and essentials for normal living calculated through a budgetary method - which was introduced with Family Benefits did not bring adequacy to the allowance. Needs of the dependent mother represent those activities which will take her to self-support: survival measures geared towards employability and training. She is endowed with rights to benefits defined according to needs, but these remained attached to a goal of self support and primarily at the rhetorical level.

The dependent mother also has a very specific subjectivity shaped by a variety of practices and processes. The sense of lack of control over her family's life can be clearly associated with the tutelary practices of supervision, allowance calculation and its low levels. In-kind and tagged benefits supplemented the allowance giving her family an advantage over other poor families but this supplementation came under a discretionary form which subjected her to the judgement of allowance administrators. Discretion, inscribed as a permanent feature of the program, is the guarantor of flexibility in each individual case as well as a source of insecurity for families who depend on the allowance. Unlike other families, the private matters of the dependent mother's family are public and transformed into a measure of accountability. Intense and delicate

investigation becomes the distinctive feature of the program and marks the beneficiaries' mode of subjection: they are the few who have their lives publicly scrutinized and sanctioned in particular ways. The highly regulated and scientific practice of field workers developed from the institutionalization of the protective intensive meddling of local volunteers. The individualized plan for the future becomes a public goal for each family. The dependent mother is also humiliated and defeated. The contradictions between the expectations of the program and the actual possibilities set these families up for failure. The permanent cost-cutting atmosphere and the constant questioning of her parenting, budgeting and management skills render the mother incompetent and embarrassed. Her life is also compartmentalized with a separation of material needs and personal needs enforced through a separation of private and public delivery agencies and disconnected services.

These processes of subjection to the Family Benefits rules take place through the framework of social welfare policies addressing the needs of real, material women, bending them to approximate an ideal, a norm of behaviour and obedience for the other. The case study has demonstrated that the dependent mother is not the exclusive domain of rationalities and historical assumptions but also that she is made coherent within a discursive system of practices. This system of practices transcends the function of the translation of rationalities into action to become itself a creative and productive component. As illustrated the programmatic components of developing justifications, a system of eligibility criteria and an administrative structure for the initiative as well as its integration into a national welfare system have profound effects in the constituted identity of the dependent mothers. In addition, specific technologies developed through the activities of supervision, calculation of amounts and allocation of in-kind benefits and

services produce and reproduce this subject in a constant and contingent process.

The Marginal Population

The preoccupation with the wellbeing of populations which is articulated with the single mother complex did not find expression exclusively through the welfare system of income maintenance. The second case study looked at how the practices and rationalities of the single mother complex developed and interacted with other governmental programs using the example of the public housing program. This interactive process created not only an expanded web of governmental practices over families without a male head but also a group dimension to the dependent mothers as a marginal population. The public housing case study aimed specifically at examining the interactions among rationalities, practices and subjects. In doing so its underlying theme was an exploration of agency and the continuing constitutive processes that yield its possibility. This aim contrasts and complements those of the first case study which focused on illustrating the formative effects of practice.

Provision of shelter for the families of urban workers, veterans and service men was an important tool in the definition of the normal family's way of life in Canada. It was achieved through the supply of subsidized mortgages by the federal government for new detached homes in the suburbs and generated a normalized way of life for the postwar workers and their families. For those unable to follow this model of self-sufficiency, among them poor women raising children alone, shelter was a question of trickle down and constituted a major problem. A few experimental and contained initiatives attempted to provide housing at low rents but it is only in 1964 that a public housing program started in Canada on a large scale. It represented a very

specific way of addressing shelter needs.

During the early 1960s many studies demonstrated that despite the postwar prosperity, poverty was rampant among the Western societies. Canada was no exception. Here, the cost of housing was isolated as one of the main reasons since the exorbitant price of rents was eating up large portions of the incomes of families and individuals. As well, a program of provision of public housing was seen by the federal government as an important economic strategy to energise an economy showing signs of recession. This program was intended as a major strategy to combat poverty by suppling housing at subsidized rents and, at the same time, creating jobs and activating the economy. It was proposed as the creation of a new, clean, safe, and humane urban environment for the poor who just needed a chance to participate in the postwar prosperity and a major improvement to the urban environment. The federal, provincial and municipal levels of government participated in the production of public housing, through financial aid and various other activities over the life of the program.

This multi-purpose initiative, however, was marked by failure: a failure that was attributed by administrators to the types of spaces and the concentration of problem families they generated. As a central image of these families, the dependent mother and her children were isolated as the significant cause of many of these problems. In fact, a variety of contradictory and disparate activities, at several levels, articulated the links between the dependent mother and public housing, and these constituted clearly differentiated processes. These processes ascribed a population dimension to dependent mothers, characterizing them as problematic in large concentrations, and their children as delinquents who could affect the balance of “normal” neighbourhoods and schools. They formulated public housing as a ghetto: a contested, antagonized and marginal

space associated with multi-problem families of women raising children alone who constituted a deterrent to normalized family life. They also generated new ways to rule the dependent mother through her diminished shelter options and through the definition of specific ways of housing her family. Far from intentional, unified and directed these outcomes were examined, in the case study, as emanating from a variety of activities which reflected a multitude of agents, aims, influences and practices.

A central theme in articulating a justification for public housing in the period following World War II was need. The magnitude of shelter need and the characterization of those in need were essential in bringing the federal government to bear some responsibility for housing. But need was not only used around rationalities. Transforming shelter need into a practical guide for implementation of public housing was a long process which produced three main components: adequacy, type of dwelling and affordability. Discourses and practices around these three components made public housing into a program that produced dwelling units, with very determined characteristics and dynamics, rather than a social program serving the needs of a population.

The size and location of public housing projects have been discussed as one of the main problems with the program, traditionally attributed to economies of scale and land cost. I prefer to describe these issues as activities which created the new spaces of marginalization or exclusion: a series of activities that promoted the re-organization, concentration and visibility of groups of the poor in new urban spaces. This process started with the needs assessment technique which transformed all the shelter needs of individual families into an abstract number of units completely dissociated from the families themselves. The units were produced by market developers under

minimal requirements and made public housing a home built for a collection of indicators rather than families. The process resulted in small units, located in many cases in large high-rise complexes in peripheral locations with no services and transportation. This both differentiated and marked these spaces in the urban tissue as stigmatized and segregated spaces occupying locations which were not appropriate for the privately accessed, normal family housing.

In addition, the approval of projects often antagonized neighbours and the municipality. The result of disregarding municipal preferences and development plans, the absence of guidelines for construction and the frequent land use disputes created an atmosphere of rejection and hostility towards public housing both in its surrounding neighbourhoods and in the municipality as a whole. This means that, even before the projects were inhabited, their definition for the masses of tax payers who funded them was as a segregated, isolated, distinct, annoying and problematic space. It made public housing second rate housing, although its construction and physical conditions were better than many privately owned buildings. It drew a boundary line where normality stopped. Public housing constituted the new spaces of marginalization since, in contrast with the traditional slum, these spaces were not gradually formed, and they had no association with the people who were to inhabit them, disconnected from their ties of family, employment and friends. Living in public housing disorganized previously established supports, families and ways of life.

The projects were also colonized by activities which set an atmosphere of intrusion, surveillance and mistrust. I have described practices of classification and reduction of people's lives, of surveillance and control, of enforced gratitude, of limiting consumption, moral regulation and others. These can be exemplified by the many activities of tenant selection and project

management. The regulatory mechanisms of tenant selection were stringent and discretionary practices which marginalized and humiliated prospective tenants. They told tenants that they were entering not a normal tenancy arrangement but a special space for the poor where ideas of rights and dignity were subjected to discretionary and concealed rules. Project management was distant and centralized, and decisions were delayed and not accountable to tenants. These practices consolidated and spread a variety of negative attitudes towards tenants, and contributed to defining the projects as special areas outside the normality of society. They labelled the tenants as people unable to manage their own lives and more than that people who needed guidance and assistance handling housekeeping and child supervision. Public housing was not only a new environment, far from the previous supports and services, but also a completely new set of rules over which tenants themselves had no control and which re-socialized them in an atmosphere of distrust, surveillance and control.

Another type of process encompasses activities which both attracted and facilitated the relocation of women raising children alone, and also bound them together with these new spaces of marginality. Smaller units demanded smaller families of which women raising children alone represented a larger proportion than two parent families. In addition, project managers seemed to find the high-rise form ideal for mother led-families under the rationale that apartments required less maintenance than houses or that mothers could more easily support each other in this form. In fact, despite extensive contemporary literature arguing against location of children in high-rise apartments mother-led families were consistently judged the only suitable family to occupy this form of units. A further set of activities is represented by the application of the rent-geared to income formula which offered the advantage of making decent housing affordable for single

parent families with only one wage. For families receiving Family Benefits the full rent was covered.

Public housing, then, makes the life of dependent mothers viable, although not comfortable, through its delicate balance between income and rent. It becomes the forced housing of choice for poor women raising children alone and they figured prominently in the waiting lists. And finally, the establishment of special cases to solve the long waiting list problems determined single motherhood as a special circumstance with priority for housing. As a result, despite its location, isolation and lack of facilities, public housing became the survival option for dependent mothers and an option to which they had some chance of admission. The association of these women with public housing is further consolidated through other processes such as the debates around the 20% quota, and the demands and activities of the tenants and women's movements. These publicized and made visible the dependent mother as an inhabitant - a form of life - of the newly formed spaces of marginality.

The 20% quota invented women raising children alone and their children, as a problematic population by making the eligibility of these women dependent not only on their personal circumstances but also on their numbers in any single project. This articulated rationality implied that dependent mothers represented a problem in their concentration and interaction with others like them and with the population in general. In fact, it is this concentration and the relations it generated which are associated with a variety of problems of this space: their unsupervised children and their effects in the school system, the frictions among neighbours, vandalism and the lack of services and recreation facilities. This problematic population is also described with reference to the individuals who formed it. These individuals, primarily seen and exemplified as

dependent mothers, were characterized as bitter and alienated. They lacked community spirit and individual self-discipline, and their lack of pride led to physical degeneration of the premises under a disincentive to self improvement. They needed direct and constant supervision from the appropriate departments.

In this sense the dependent mothers gained a few more dimensions with these processes and practices. If on one hand they were physically reorganized and concentrated in very definite and marked spaces of marginality, on the other hand, the variety of mechanisms to manage and govern these newly created spaces of marginality were centred on a preoccupation with control and containment of problems in terms of their group interactions. The dependent mothers were re-created with a marginal population dimension which had several implications for the government of these women. The formation of these new spaces brought a collection of people together who had one thing in common: their tenancy in public housing. Tenants' movements sprang up everywhere and the rights of the tenants incorporated the vocabulary and practice of administrators, the press and society in general. The dependent mother figured prominently in these movements, and with the emerging women's movement their rights and demands were given voice and new expression. These women, organized in groups, in many ways redefined the concept of public housing by counterposing the picture of a derelict environment inhabited by delinquents with the public declarations of who they were, their jobs, what they did and how public housing was important for them. Through their demands and discussions the physical deficiencies of public housing became clear and from a strict definition of number and size of units the planning of projects began to incorporate a discussion of day care, leisure and social services, as well as connection to the transportation system. Many stringent rules were dropped and

criteria for tenant selection became public. Also of extreme relevance is the requirement to incorporate *participation* into the practices of management which, although an issue which only came to fruition later, represents a legacy of the public housing experiment and its mechanisms of government of dependent mothers.

This experiment had profound effects on the lives of dependent mothers and the way they can address their shelter situation. With the formulation of different groups of tenants in the projects, the federal government subdivided even further the badly housed people into sub-categories for which specific solutions were formulated. Dependent mothers as a group would be primarily housed through third sector housing - cooperatives or non-profit corporations - which could cater to specific tenant selection and supervision issues in smaller, dispersed housing forms. It transferred the management of this marginal population to the voluntary sector. The already built stock of public housing became the housing of marginal groups waiting for the opportunity to move into less stigmatized spaces.

The public housing program, therefore, was changed and alternative options were open and solutions were framed in different terms. These changes are, however, far from the liberating promises which words such as agency and resistance evoke. But they definitely constituted a re-articulation of the forces that created both the program and its marginal population. Can we understand these re-articulations as agency and resistance?

Considering Agency and Resistance

The examination of the effects of the governmentalization of the single mother complex has provided several insights into the process of subject formation. It showed the formation of

the dependent mother through the repetition of regulatory norms spawn within the mothers' allowance initiative and developed within the public housing experiment. The dependent mother came into existence, hence, as an effect of the very programs that were articulated to address her needs. But far from giving these programs a role of creator or *doer*, to use Butler's terminology, the case studies showed how this generative process of regulatory and normalizing procedures is not a unified and coherent intention but a myriad of different forces which generate certain effects. The process is fluid, unstable, diverse and never finished. The result of this process gives, however, the impression of a very defined subject whose existence is dependent on her subjection to the very regulatory and normalizing procedures which sustain her. This subject seems predetermined and finished with a traceable path and future. And in the case of the dependent mother this is not a figure of speech: her survival depends on her eligibility and accommodation to the program rules. How can we, then, conceptualize all the changes and transformations that occurred in the subject, in the programs and in the complex itself?

At the level of the subject, the impression of permanent stability and rigidity of the dependent mother or the marginal population is just temporal since as these subject positions materialize they immediately re-enact the very forces that constitute them (see theoretical formulations in Butler, 1993 also reviewed in Chapter 3). That is, the dependent mother becomes the enabling force that allows the governmentalization of the single mother complex to take place. The relations of power in that complex are effected by the subject in the sense that without a dependent mother there is no program and from this perspective programs are the product of the subject's agency. Subjection or the subject formation is not an achieved act but a constant becoming that is renewed in the performative acts of subjection. It is in this constant and

contingent becoming of the dependent mother as an individual or a marginal population, in their everyday manufacturing, in their visibility, location and subjectivity, as well as in the constant and continuous re-materialization of the single mother complex itself that agency can be found and exercised.

Agency, then, is not to be understood within the familiar terms of free will - a freely choosing subject that summons its own inherent will to challenge oppression; neither in those of determinism - a finished and complete construction whose existence is defined externally. It is in subjection and its creative power that agency is to be found. And, in its turn, resistance becomes the opening of possibilities in each "reiterative or rearticulatory practice" (Butler, 1993, p.105). Agency and resistance become, under these understandings, the creation of a space of possibilities which are not the negation of the complex and its governmentalized form - the Family Benefits or the public housing program - but the opening of a breach for change and transformation. These openings are not necessarily "good" or "bad" for women but simply the possibility of change: a possibility that in re-enacting the rules of submission something different can change the rules themselves.

Agency and resistance can be illustrated in the second case study. In the experiment of public housing changes to ruling happened very clearly with the claiming of the rights to a decent and affordable home. These changes were not a negation of the public housing program but an opening of the options which were immediately acted upon and changed again. In this sense agency and resistance lose the liberator and finished status traditionally associated with them to find expression in a constant and interminable possibility for change and transformation. Some of these transformations may indeed bring improvements to certain aspects of the lives of individuals

but these improvements are always and necessarily temporary. Resistance also can take place everywhere, in the small details of the reenactment of the rules or in the broader definition of central arrangements. To my understanding, resistance, or the opening of possibilities, depends not only on the agency of the subject but also on the alignment of a variety of circumstances exterior to the subject. These may be found in the coincidental focusing of multiple actions and effects that facilitate and yield resistance as seen here in the tenants and women's movements of the 1970s and their interactions with public housing.

The sources used in the case studies - the texts of rule as defined in Chapter 3 - raise important issues pertaining to the study of agency and resistance. In the two case studies presented here, resistance was primarily discussed through the public housing experiment and only peripherally through the formation of the Family Benefits program. This is directly due to the types of texts of rule examined in each case study. In consulting the Annual Reports from the mothers' allowance initiative I had access to a selected and organized set of program information, picked and re-constructed through the lenses of how the Province's administrators intended to portray the program. In consulting the Ministers' correspondence in the housing study, the variety of program issues is given less coherence, although there is filtering regarding what is kept in the files. A greater assortment of issues is recorded and the voices of different actors are preserved through their own letters and documents opening the analysis to include agency and resistance. Reports and other official program recordings constitute the traditional sources for policy analysis studies and these accounts have filtered the issues and shaped the directions of these studies. The use of Ministers' correspondence highlights how this production of reality is accomplished.

Challenging Oppressive Practices

This study has shown the dependent mother and her marginal population manifestation as constituted, but not totally determined, by governmental programs and interventions. Emphasizing this permanent becoming of the subject, it discussed how the appearance of stability and completeness of these effects of a governmentalized single mother complex - i.e., the dependent mother and the marginal population - are temporary and in fact constantly being re-created. In this sense governmental programs and social policy interventions function by constructing subjects and creating rules of subjection, but this does not necessarily mean that they are artificial or unnecessary subjects. Neither does it mean that these interventions are essentially oppressive. Quite the opposite: it means that these ways of governing populations may be vehicles for change and transformation. Although change and transformation do not guarantee improvement, the possibility exists of realizing the yearning for a different world as discussed by bell hooks (1990). Sovereign or oppressive acts would not allow that possibility. As a start, then, social policies within the democratic welfare framework offer the possibility of change.

This possibility construes both working within an interventionist social welfare framework and articulating its critiques to be opportunities for challenging oppression. First, this challenge can come from a better understanding of how interventions work. That is, by inaugurating a renewed emphasis on studying interventions and practices in their specific manifestations, rather than considering them a direct translation of intentions, an emphasis on practices of liberation can be brought to the forefront. An attention to practices generates interests and knowledges which are specific, local and multidisciplinary. It establishes the importance of studying each case in its uniqueness while reaching out to other examples in an attempt to illuminate a variety of different

experiences. This means that the theoretical study of practices, by opening the potential for particularly localized analyses of interventions, offers the potential to build bridges among experiences and to develop solidarities which are not based on a fixed set of outcomes and ideals.

Second, the aim under this focus on practices is not to attribute fault but to understand how social welfare practices can contribute to certain exclusionary or oppressive processes. The study of social welfare practices draws attention to the mechanisms that allow for the expression of agency of individuals and groups of people as part of the process rather than as indicator of failure. In this sense, implementation and practice become more than applied policy but the site of transformation, challenge and change. In all this, the focus of study calls attention to developing a more reflexive and open way of implementing programs and developing practices.

Challenges are also a function of reframing the parameters of the dominant approaches and methods in order to expose their assumptions and their concrete effects. Re-framing or *recirculating* and *resignifying*, as used by Butler in the opening quote, means working from within the social policy frameworks but undermining their assumptions. One way of doing that is to question those assumptions in the manner of the questioning of the nature of single mothers undertaken here. Another is to explore the formation of a relationship such as that of single mothers and public housing rather than taking it for granted. The point is not to establish a standard way of resignification but to achieve the effects of change in the naturalized workings of a particular assumption.

Further, change and challenge are chiefly facilitated both by developing interventions that are more open and inclusive and by dedicating attention to implementation practices that are less rigid. In other words a fundamental way to challenge oppressive social practices is the

development of interventions geared to change and challenge where opportunities for inputs and reformations can be maximized on a variety of fronts. For example, policies can incorporate the temporality of the subject by not defining needs as a constant. As this study showed, practices of government constitute important processes in defining the subject and its way of life. It follows, hence, that more attention to implementation and its formative effects must incorporate the day-to-day activities of those interested in facilitating change. This means giving attention to the effects of transcoding concepts into activities, incorporating a diversity of opportunities and assessing the directions and effects of practical activities. It means developing a series of skills regarding listening and interpreting which are sensitive to people and contextualized knowledges.

What this framework does not offer is a roster of normative principles from which to judge or develop social policies and social interventions in general. Following the footsteps of the other contemporary authors who refuse to substitute a set of guidelines for an alternative set, this study calls for detailed case studies, for the careful and local development of initiatives, and for attentively crafted alliances which can allow fluidity and account for unfinished processes. If it does not provide clear steps to follow it does open up new ways to think about, and to question, social policy and social interventions.

REFERENCES

- Abel-Smith, B. & Townsend, P. (1965). *The poor and the poorest*. London: Bell.
- Abowitz, D. (1986). Data indicate the feminization of poverty in Canada too. *Sociology and Social Research*, 7 (3), 209-213.
- Abramovitz, M. (1988). *Regulating the lives of women*. Boston: South End Press.
- Adams, I., Cameron, W., Hill, B., & Penz, P. (1971). *The real poverty report*. Edmonton: M. G. Hurting Limited.
- Adams, T. (1974/1934). *The design of residential areas: Some basic considerations, principles and methods*. New York: Arno Press.
- Agbayewa, M. O. (1991). Father in newer family forms: male or female. In J. Veevers (Ed.) *Continuity and change in marriage and family* (pp. 478-483). Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Agnew, V. (1995). *Resisting discrimination*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Allen, J. (1992). Post-industrialism and post-Fordism. In S.Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 169-220). Cambridge, UK.: Open University Press/Polity.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatus. In L. Althusser, *Lenin and philosophy* (pp. 127-187). London: Verso
- Amott, T.L. (1990). Black women and AFDC: Making entitlement out of necessity. In L. Gordon (Ed.), *Women, the state, and welfare* (pp. 280-298). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Andrew C. & Rodgers, S. (Eds.) (1997). *Women and the Canadian State*. Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Arat-Koc, S. (1989). In the privacy of our own home: Foreign domestic workers as a solution to the crisis in the domestic sphere in Canada, *Studies in Political Economy*, 28 (Spring), 33-58.
- Arendell, T. (1986). *Mother and divorce: Legal, economic and social dilemmas*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Armitage, A. (1988). *Social welfare in Canada* (2nd. ed). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.
- Armitage, A. (1995). *Comparing the policy of Aboriginal assimilation*. Vancouver, BC.: University of British Columbia Press
- Armitage, A. (1996). *Social welfare in Canada revisited*. Don Mills, Ont: Oxford University Press Canada.
- Axworthy, N.L. (1972). *The Task Force on Housing and Urban Development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Princeton University, USA.
- Bacher, J. (1986a). Canadian housing policy in perspective. *Urban History Review*, XV (1), 3-18.

- Bacher, J. (1988). W.C. Clark and the politics of Canadian housing policy, 1935-1952. *Urban History Review*, XVII (1), 5-14.
- Bacher, J. (1988b). Too good to last? Social services innovations of wartime housing. *Women and Environments* (winter), 10-13.
- Bacher, J. (1993). *Keeping to the marketplace: The evolution of Canadian housing policy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bailey, R. Jr. (1974). *Radicals in urban politics, the Alinsky approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baines, C., Evans, P., & Neysmith, S. (Eds.) (1991). *Women's caring: Feminist perspectives on social welfare*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Baker, M. (1990). The perpetuation of misleading family models in social policy: Implications for women. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 7 (2), 169-182.
- Baker, M. (1994). Family poverty and work/family conflicts: Inconsistency of social policies. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 33, 45-61.
- Ball, M., Harloe, M., & Martens, M. (1988). *Housing and social change in Europe and the USA*. New York: Routledge.
- Bannerji, H. (Ed.) (1993). *Returning the gaze*. Toronto: Sister Vision Press.
- Barrett, M. (1987). The concept of difference, *Feminist Review*, 26, 29-41.
- Barrett, M. (1991). *The politics of truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Barrett, M. (1992). Words and thing: Materialism and method in contemporary feminist analysis. In M. Barrett, & A. Phillips (Eds.), *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates* (pp. 201-219). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Barry, A.; Bell V. & Rose, N. (1995). Introduction to special issue: Alternative political imaginations. *Economy & Society*, 24(4), 485-88.
- Barry, A., Osborne, T. & Rose, N. (Eds.) (1996). *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bartky, S.L. (1988). Foucault, femininity, and the modernization of patriarchal power. In I. Diamond & L. Quinby (Eds.), *Feminism and Foucault* (PP. 61-86). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Battiste, M. A. & Barman, J. (1995). *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Bauman, J. (1987). *Public housing, race and renewal: Urban planning in Philadelphia 1920-1974*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Cambridge, UK.: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern ethics*. Oxford, UK.: Blackwell.
- Bella, L. (1979). The provincial role in the Canadian welfare state: The influence of provincial social policy initiatives

- on the design of the Canada Assistance Plan. *Canadian Public Administration*, 22, pp. 439-452.
- Bellan, R. (1971). *The evolving city*. Toronto: Coop Clark.
- Benhabib, S. (1992). *Situating the self: Gender, community and post-modernism in contemporary ethics*. New York: Routledge
- Berger, P.L., & Berger, B. (1983). *The war over the family: Capturing the middle ground*. London: Hutchinson.
- Berry, B.J.L. (1973). *The human consequences of urbanization*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Best, R. (1996). Successes, failures and prospects for public housing policy in the United Kingdom. *Housing Policy Debate*, 8 (3), 535-563.
- Binford, H.C. (1985). *The first suburbs*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Birch, E.L. & Gardner, D. (1981). The seven-percent solution: A review of philanthropic housing, 1870-1910. *Journal of Urban History*, 7 (4), 403-438.
- Bishop, A. (1994). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression*. Halifax, NB.: Fernwood Publishing.
- Bourne, L. S. & Ley, D. (Eds.) (1993). *The changing social geography of Canadian cities*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Boyson, R. (1971). *Down with the poor*. London: Churchill Press.
- Brandt, G. C. (1982). "Pigeon-holed and forgotten": The work of the subcommittee on the post-war problems of women, 1943. *Histoire Sociale/Social History*, XV (29), 239-259.
- Bratt, R. G. (1989). *Rebuilding a low-income housing policy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Briggs, A. (1967). The welfare state in historical perspectives. In C.I. Scotland (Ed.), *The welfare state* (pp. 25-45). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Briggs, X.S. (1997). Moving up versus moving out: Neighbourhood effects in housing mobility. *Housing Policy Debates*, 8(1), 195-234.
- Bristol, K. G. (1991). *The Pruitt-Igoe myth*. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 44 (3), 163-171.
- Brown, A., & Campbell, G. (1914). Infant mortality, *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 4(8), 693.
- Brown, J. C. (1988). *In search of a policy: The rationale for social security provision for one parent families*. London: National Council for One Parent Families.
- Brush, L.D. (1996). Love, toil, and troubles: Motherhood and feminist politics. *Signs*, 21(2), 429-454.
- Burns, D. & Silzer, V. (1987). Housing policy. In S.A. Shankar (Ed.), *Canadian social policy* (Rev. ed., pp. 65-87). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Burrows R. & Loader, B. (Eds.) (1994). *Towards a post-fordist welfare state?* London & New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (1991). Preface. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 1-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cairns, A. & Williams, C. (1992). *The politics of gender, ethnicity and languages in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Callahan, M. (1991). A feminist perspective on child welfare. In B. Kirwin (Ed.) *Ideology, development and social welfare: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 137-156). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Callahan, M. (1992). *The voices of women in child welfare*. Toronto: The Policy Research Centre on Children, Youth and Families.
- Calliste, A. (1991). Canada's immigration policy and domestics from the Caribbean: The second domestic scheme. In J. Vorst (Ed.) *Race, class and gender: Bonds and barriers* (pp. 136-165). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Canada (1969). *Report of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer
- Canada (1970). *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada (1970)*. Ottawa: Information Canada.
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1979). *Report on the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation*. Ottawa: CMHC.
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1987). *Tenant participation in the management of public housing*. Ottawa: CMHC.
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1990). *Evaluation of the public housing program*. Ottawa: CMHC, Program Evaluation Division.
- Canadian Council of Child and Family Welfare (1930a). Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission. *Child Welfare News*, 6 (1), 40.
- Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare (1930b). Ontario Commission on Public Welfare. *Child and Family Welfare*, 6 (4), 18-21
- Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare (1933). The administration of relief. *Child and Family Welfare*, 9 (1), 40-47.
- Canadian Council on Child and Family Welfare (1934). Mothers pensions in British Columbia. *Child and Family Welfare*, 9 (6), 31.
- Canadian Council on Child Welfare (1927). The Mothers' allowance controversy. *Child Welfare News*, 3 (1), 30-32.
- Canadian Council on Child Welfare (1929). Summary report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Child Welfare Act of Manitoba and its administration, 1928. *Child Welfare News*, 5 (3), 3-33.
- Canadian Council of Social Development (1977). *A review of Canadian social housing policy*. Ottawa: Canadian Council of Social Development

- Canadian Council of Social Development (1992). Single parenthood: Gender differences. *Perceptions*, 16 (2-3), 27-32.
- Canadian Facts Co, Ltd (1972). *Public knowledge and attitudes, Ontario Housing Corporation*. Toronto: Ontario Housing Corporation.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1940). What is modern case work anyway? *Canadian Welfare*, 15 (6), 21-23.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1944). The Whitton and Marsh proposals - a comparison and a contrast. *Canadian Welfare*, 19 (7), 11-14.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1946a). Divorce procedure in Ontario. *Canadian Welfare*, 21(3), 19-20.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1946b). Dominion-Provincial Relations and Social Security. *Canadian Welfare*, 21 (1), 36-37.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1948). Across Canada. *Canadian Welfare*, 24 (2), 30-33.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1954). Family desertion. *Canadian Welfare*, 30 (6), 2-3.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1957). *Social services for unmarried parents*. Ottawa: The Canadian Welfare Council.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1961). *Family desertion: Its causes and effects*. Ottawa: The Canadian Welfare Council.
- Canadian Welfare Council (1969). *Some preliminary findings: The housing conditions of public assistance recipients in Canada, 1968*. Ottawa: Canadian Welfare Council.
- Capek, S. & Gilderbloom, J. (1992). *Community versus commodity: Tenants and the American city*. Albany, NY.: State University of New York Press.
- Carby, H. (1982). White woman listen! Black feminism and the boundaries of sisterhood. In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back*. London: Hutchinson.
- Carroll, B.W. (1989). Post-war trends in Canadian housing policy. *Urban History Review*, XVII (1), 64-74.
- Carver, H. & Hopwood, A.L. (1948). *Rents for Regent Park*. Toronto: Civic Advisory Council of Toronto.
- Cashmore, E.E. (1985). *Having to: The world of one parent families*. London: Counterpoint.
- Cassidy, H. (1948). Outstanding issues in social security. *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting on the Canadian Conference on Social Work*, 42-56. Hamilton: Canadian Conference on Social Work.
- Castel, R. (1991). From dangerousness to risk. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect* (pp. 281-298). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Castells, M. (1975). *Luttes urbaines*. Paris: Francois Maspero.
- Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1969). *Brief to the Senate Special Committee on Poverty*. Archives of Ontario, RG 44-1-Box 8 file OHC-S.
- Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (1970). *25th Annual Report*. Ottawa: CMHC

- Chandler, M.O. (1991). What have we learned from public housing resident management? *Journal of Planning Literature*, 6 (2), 136-143.
- Cheetham, J. (1976). Pregnancy in the unmarried: Continuing dilemmas for social policy and social work. In A.H. Halsey, *Traditions of social policy* (pp. 145-174). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Children's Aid and Infants Homes of Toronto (1952). *Influence of inadequate housing on families where neglect of children appears*. Toronto: Children's Aid and Infants Homes of Toronto.
- Chorney, H. (1990). *City of dreams: Social theory and the urban experience*. Toronto: Nelson Canada.
- Christian, B. (1987). The race for theory. *Cultural Critique*, 6 (Spring), 51-63.
- Clark, S.D. (1966). *The suburban society*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Clayton Research Associates Ltd (1990). *The housing industry: Perspective and prospective*. Working paper three: The housing industry and the economy in Canada, 1946-86. Ottawa: CMHC.
- Coard, B. (1971). *How the West Indian child is made educationally sub-normal in the British school system*. London: New Beacon Books.
- Cocks, J. (1989). *The oppositional imagination: Feminism critique and political theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, B. (1988). *Caring for children*. London: Family Policy Study Centre.
- Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of social control: Crime, punishment and classification*. London: Polity Press.
- Cohen-Schlanger, M., Fitzpatrick, A., Hulchanski, J.D. & Raphael, D. (1995). Housing as a factor in admissions of children to temporary care: A survey. *Child Welfare*, LXXIV (3), 547-562.
- Colwill, J. (1994). Beveridge, women and the welfare state. *Critical Social Policy*, 14 (2), 53-78.
- Comacchio, C.R. (1993). *"Nations are built of babies": Saving Ontario's mothers and Children, 1900-1940*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Comacchio, C.R. (1997). 'A postscript for father': Defining a new fatherhood in interwar Canada. *Canadian Historical Review*, 78 (3), 385-408.
- Copp, T. (1974). *The anatomy of poverty: The condition of the working class in Montreal 1897-1929*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Corrigan, P. & Sayer, D. (1985). *The great arch: English state formation as cultural revolution*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cousins, M. & Hussain, A. (1984). *Michel Foucault*. London: Macmillan.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Crichton, A. & Jongbloed, L. (1998). *Disability and social policy in Canada*. North York, Ont.: Captus Press.
- Cross, E. (1939). Dependency in Ontario. *Canadian Welfare Summary*, 14 (6), 1-6

- Cruikshank, B. (1993). Revolutions within: Self-government and self-esteem. *Economy and Society*, 22(3), 327-344.
- Cruikshank, B. (1994). The will to empower: Technologies of citizenship and the war on poverty. *Socialist Review*, 23(4), 29-55.
- Cummings, J. (1980). Sexism in social welfare: Some thoughts on strategy for structural change, *Catalyst*, 8, 7-34.
- Curtis, B. (1988). *Building of the educational state: Canada West 1836-1871*. Sussex & London, Ont.: Falmer Press & Althouse Press.
- Daenzer, P. (1993). *Regulating privilege: Immigrant servants in Canada, 1940-1990*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Dale, J., & Foster, P. (1986). *Feminists and state welfare*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Daly, G. (1989). The British roots of American public housing. *Journal of Urban History*, 15 (4), 399-434.
- Darroch, G. (1983). Early industrialization and inequality in Toronto, 1861-1899. *Labour/Le Travail*, 11, 31-61.
- David, M.E. (1985). Motherhood and social policy, a matter of education. *Critical Social Policy*, 4(3), 28-43.
- Davis, A. (1981). *Women, race and class*. London: The Women's Press.
- Deakin, N. (1987). *The politics of welfare*. London: Methuen.
- Dean, M. (1991). *The constitution of poverty: Toward a genealogy of liberal governance*. London: Routledge.
- Dean, M. (1994a). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Dean, M. (1994b). "A social structure of many souls": Moral regulation, government, and self-formation. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 19 (2), 145-168.
- Dean, M. (1995). Governing the unemployed self in an active society. *Economy and Society*, 24 (4), 559-583.
- Defert, D. (1991). Popular life and insurance technology. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.) *The Foucault effect* (pp. 211-233). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Delaney, J. (1991). The garden suburb of Lindenlea, Ottawa. *Urban History Review*, XLX (3), 151-165.
- Deleuze, G. (1979). Foreword. In J. Donzelot, *The policing of families* (pp. i-xci). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Dennis, M. & Fish, S. (1972). *Programs in Search of a Policy, low income housing in Canada*. Toronto: Hakkert.
- Dennis, N. & Erdos, G. (1993). *Families without fatherhood* (2nd ed.). London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.
- Department of National Health and Welfare (1960). *Mothers' allowance legislations in Canada, Memorandum no 1*. Ottawa: Department of National Health and Welfare.
- Department of Health and Welfare (1961). *Government expenditures on health and social welfare, Canada: 1927-59*. Ottawa: Department of Health and Welfare.

- Department of Health and Welfare (1969). *Changes in Social Assistance Legislation in Canada in 1967 and 1968*. Ottawa: Department of Health and Welfare.
- Desrosiers, H., Le Bourdais, C., Lehrhaupt, K. (1994). *Vivre en famille mono parentale et en famille recomposée: Portrait des Canadiennes d'hier et d'aujourd'hui*. Montréal: Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Diamond, I. (1982). Women and housing: The limitations of liberal reform. In E. Boneparth (Ed.), *Women, power and policy* (pp. 109-117). New York: Pergamon.
- Djao, A. W. (1983). *Inequalities and social policy: The sociology of social welfare*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dobson, H. (1940). Whither, the Canadian family? *Canadian Welfare Summary*, 16 (6), 2-6.
- Donzelot, J. (1979). *The policing of families*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Dooley, M. D.; Finnie, R.; Phipps, S.A. & Naylor, N. (1995). *Family matters: New policies for divorce, lone mothers and child poverty*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Doucet, M. & Weaver, J. (1991). *Housing the North American city*. Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Doyal, L., & Gough, I. (1991). *A theory of human needs*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Doyal, L. (1981). *The political economy of health*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Dreier, P. & Atlas, J. (1980). The housing crisis and the tenants' revolt. *Social Policy (January)*, 13-24.
- Drolet, M. (1997). L'empowerment et intervention familiale: Concept paradoxal occultant parfois la pauvreté. *Reflects*, 3 (1), 55-79.
- Drover, G. & Kerans, P. (1993). New approaches to welfare theory: Foundations. In G. Drover & P. Kerans (Eds.), *New approaches to welfare theory* (pp. 3-29). Aldershot, UK.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Durham, M. (1991). *Sex and politics: The family and marriage in the Thatcher years*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Dyck, R. (1995). The Canada Assistance Plan: The ultimate in co-operative federalism. In R.B. Blake & J. Keshen (Eds.), *Social Welfare Policy in Canada: Historical Readings* (pp. 326-339). Toronto: Copp Clark Ltd.
- Economic Council of Canada (1969). *Measuring the costs of poverty: Some considerations and estimates* (sixth annual review). Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada
- Ehrenreich, B., & English, D. (1978). *For her own good: 150 years of expert advice to women*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Eichler, M. (1985). *The pro-family movement: Are they for or against families*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.
- Eichler, M. (1988). *Families in Canada today*. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing.
- Eichler, M. (1993). Lone parent families: An instable category in search of stable policies. In J. Hudson, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Single parent families* (pp. 139-156). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing Inc.

- Eisenstein, Z. (1981). Reform and/or revolution: Towards a united women's movement. In L. Sargent (Ed.), *Women and revolution* (pp. 339-362). London: Pluto.
- Eisenstein, Z. (1984). *Feminism and sexual equality*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Elliott, J.L. & Fleras, A. (1992). *Unequal relations: An introduction to race and ethnic dynamics in Canada*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall.
- Ellwood, D.T. (1988). *Poor support: Poverty in the American family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Elshtain, J.B. (1994). Single motherhood. *Dissent* (Spring), 267-69.
- Emms, P.F. (1990). *Social housing: A European dilemma*. Bristol, UK: University of Bristol
- Engeland, J., Che-Alford, J., Lo, O., Badets, J. (1997). *Lone parents, young couples and immigrant families and their housing conditions: A 1991 census profile*. Ottawa: CMHC.
- Engels, F. (1958). *The conditions of working-class in England*. London: Blackwell.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *Three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, P. (1983). *Perspective on work, women and welfare* (Working Papers on Social Welfare in Canada, Publication Series No. 10). Toronto: University of Toronto, Faculty of Social Work.
- Evans, P. (1984). Work and welfare, a profile of low-income single mothers. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 81-96.
- Evans, P. (1988). Work incentives and the single mother: dilemmas of reform. *Canadian Public Policy*, XIV(2), 125-136.
- Evans, P. (1992). Targeting single mothers for employment: comparisons from the United States, Britain, and Canada. *Social Services Review*, 66 (3), 378-98.
- Evans, P. (1995). Single mothers and Ontario's welfare policy: Restructuring the debate. In J. Brodie (Ed.), *Women and public policy* (pp. 151-171). Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Ermisch, J. (1991). *Lone parenthood, an economic analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community*. Crown Publishers Inc.
- Fallis, G. (1980). *Housing programs and income distribution in Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Economic Council.
- Fallis, G. & Murray, A. (Eds) (1990). *Housing the homeless and poor: New partnership among the private, public and third sectors*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ferguson, A. (1989). *Blood at the root: Motherhood sexuality and male domination*. London: Pandora Press.
- Finch, J., & Groves, D. (Eds.) (1983). *A labour of love: Women, work and caring*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fishman, R. (1987). *Bourgeois utopias*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fiske, J-A. (1993). Child of the state, mother of the nation: Aboriginal women and the ideology of motherhood. *Culture*, 13 (1), 17-35.

- Foster, P. (1991). Well women clinics. In M. Maclean and D. Groves (Eds.), *Women's Issues in Social Policy* (pp. 79-94). London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish* (translated by A. Sheridan). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1981). Omnes et singulatim. In S.M. McMurrin (Ed.), *The Tanner lectures on human values* (vol II). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984). What is enlightenment? In P. Rabinow (Ed.) *Foucault reader* (pp. 32-50). New York: Pantheon Books
- Foucault, M. (1990). *History of sexuality* (translation by Robert Hurley). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991b). Questions of method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect, studies in governmentality* (pp. 73-86). Hertfordshire, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Fowler, E.P. (1992). *Building cities that work*. Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Fraser, G. (1972). *Fighting back, urban renewal in Trefann Court*. Toronto: Hakkert Ltd.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly practices*. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fraser, N. (1992). Introduction: Revaluating french feminism. In N. Fraser, & S.L. Bartky (Eds.) *Revaluating french feminism: Critical essays on difference, agency and culture* (pp. 1-20). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Fraser, N. (1993). Clintonism, welfare and the anti-social wage: The emergency of a neoliberal political imaginary. *Rethinking Marxism*, 6 (1), 1-15.
- Fraser, N. (1994). After the family wage: Gender equity and the welfare state. *Political Theory*, 22 (4), 591-618.
- Fraser, N. (1996). Reply to Zylan. *Signs*, 21(2), 531-536.
- Fraser, N., & Gordon, L. (1992). Contract versus charity: Why is there no social citizenship in the United States? *Socialist Review*, 22 (3), 45-68.
- Fraser, N., & Gordon, L. (1994). Genealogy of "Dependency": Tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state. *Signs*, 19 (2), 309-336.
- Freedman, L. (1969). *Public housing: The politics of poverty*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Freeman, R. (1992). The idea of prevention: A critical review. In S. Scott, G. Williams, S. Platt, & H. Thomas (Eds.), *Private risks and public dangers* (pp. 34-56). Aldershot, UK: Avebury.
- French M. (1991). Becoming a lone parent. In M. Hardey, & G. Crow (Eds.), *Lone parenthood, coping with constraints and making opportunities* (pp. 126-142). Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York: Norton.

- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuss, D. (1989). *Essentially speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Galston, W.A. (1990-1991). A liberal democratic case for the two parent family. *Responsive Community*, 1(1), Winter, 14-26.
- Galston, W.A. (1991). *Liberal purposes: Good virtues and diversity in the liberal state*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. (1986). *Single mothers and their children*. Washington: The Urban Institute Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Gautier, P. (1986). *Les nouvelles familles*. Montreal: Edition Saint Martin.
- George, V., & Wilding, P. (1985). *Ideology and social welfare* (2nd. rev. ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- George, V., & Wilding, P. (1994). *Welfare and ideology*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Giddens, A. (1985). *The nation state and violence*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Gilbert, N.; Specht, H. & Terrell, P. (1993). *Dimensions of social welfare policy* (3r. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gilder, G. (1982). *Wealth and poverty*. London: Buchan & Enright.
- Gilderbloom, J. (1988). Tenants movements in the United States. In E. Huttman & W. van Vliet-- (Eds.), *Handbook of housing and the built environment in the United States* (pp. 269-282). New York: Greenwood.
- Ginsburg, N. (1979). *Class, capital and social policy*. London: Macmillan.
- Glendinning, C., & Millar, J. (1991). Poverty: the forgotten Englishwoman. In M. Maclean, & D. Groves (Eds.), *Women's issues in social policy* (pp. 20-37). London: Routledge.
- Glennerster, H. (1983). *The future of the welfare state*. London: Heinemann.
- Glennerster, H. (1989). Swimming against the tide: The prospects for social policy. In M. Bulmer, J. Lewis, & D. Piachaud (Eds.), *The goals of social policy* (pp. 108-128). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Godin, R.E., & Dryzek, J. (1987). Risk-sharing and social justice: the motivational foundations of the post-war welfare state. In R.E. Godin, & J. Le Grand (Eds.), *Not only the poor: The middle classes and the welfare state* (pp. 37-73). London: Allen & Unwin.
- Gözl, A. (1993). Family matters: The Canadian family and the state in the postwar period. *Left History*, 1(2), 9-49.
- Gomez-Pena, G. (1993). *Warrior for gringostroika*. St. Paul, MN.: Greywolf Press.
- Goodlad, R. (1998). Housing management matters: Citizenship and managerialism in the new welfare market. *Paper presented to ENHR Conference on Housing Futures*.
- Goodwin, J. (1992). An American experiment in paid motherhood: the implementation of mothers' pension in early

- twentieth-century Chicago, *Gender and History*, 4(3), 323-342.
- Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: An introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect* (pp. 1-51). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, L. (1988). *Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence, Boston, 1880-1960*. New York: Viking/ Penguin.
- Gordon, L. (1990). The new feminist scholarship on the welfare state. In L. Gordon (Ed.) *Women, the state, and welfare* (pp. 9-35). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gordon, L. (1991). On "Difference". *Genders*, 10, 91-111.
- Gordon, L. (1994a). *Pitted but not entitled: Single mothers and the history of welfare*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gordon, L. (1994b). Welfare reform: A history lesson. *Dissent* (summer), 323-328.
- Gough, I. (1979). *The political economy of the welfare state*. London: Macmillan.
- Graham, H. (1979). 'Prevention and health: every mother's business'. A comment on child health policies in the 1970s. In C.C. Harris (Ed.), *The sociology of the family: New directions for Britain* (Sociological Review Monograph, 28, pp. 160-185). Staffordshire, UK: University of Keele.
- Graham, H. (1987). Being poor: Perceptions and coping strategies of lone mothers. In J. Brannen, & G. Wilson (Eds.) *Give and take in families: Studies in resources distribution* (pp. 56-74). London: Allen & Unwin.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (edited by Q. Hoare & G.N. Smith). New York: International Publishers.
- Gray, J. (1993). *Beyond the new right: Markets, government and the common environment*. London: Routledge.
- Green, D. G. (1993). Editor's foreword to the second edition. In N. Dennis, & G. Erdos (Eds.), *Families without fatherhood* (2nd. ed., pp. vi-vii). London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.
- Groves, D., & Finch, J. (1983). Perspectives on the invalid care allowance. In J. Finch, & D. Groves (Eds.) *A labour of love: Women, work and caring* (pp. 148-166). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Guest, D. (1985). *The emergency of social security in Canada* (2nd ed.). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Gutman, H.G. (1976). *Work, culture and society in industrializing America*. New York: Knopf.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity*. Cambridge, UK.: Polity.
- Hadley R., & Hatch S. (1981). *Social welfare and the failure of the state*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Hall, P. (1987). *Cities of tomorrow*. New York: Basil Blackwell
- Halsey, A. H. (1993). Foreword. In N. Dennis, & G. Erdos (Eds.), *Families without fatherhood* (2nd. ed., pp. ix-xiii). London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.
- Hamburg, D.A. (1993). The American family transformed. *Society*, 30, 2, 60-69.

- Haraway, D. (1991). A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology and socialist-feminism in late twentieth century. In D. Haraway, *Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature* (pp.149-181). New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, M., & Crow, G. (1991). Introduction. In M. Harvey & G. Crow (Eds.) *Lone parenthood, coping with constraints and making opportunities* (pp. 1-18). Hemel Hempstead, UK.: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Harding, L.F. (1993a). "Alarm" versus "liberation"? Responses to the increase in lone parents - part 1. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 2, 101-112.
- Harding, L.F. (1993b). "Alarm" versus "liberation"? Responses to the increase in lone parents - part 2. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 2, 174-184.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking for women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (1997). Comments on Hekman's "Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited". *Signs*, 22(21), 382-391.
- Harman, L.D. (1992). Feminization of poverty. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 12 (4), 6-9.
- Hartmann, H.I. (1979). The unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism: Towards a more progressive union. *Capital and Class*, 8 (Summer), 1-33.
- Hartsock, N. (1983). The feminist standpoint: Developing ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In S. Harding & M. Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology and philosophy of science* (pp.283-310). Dordrecht: Reidel/Kluwer.
- Hartsock, N. (1990). Foucault on power: A theory for women?. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 157-175). New York: Routledge.
- Hartsock, N. (1997). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and methodology: Feminist standpoint theory revisited": Truth or justice. *Signs*, 22(2), 367-374.
- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hastings, C.J. (1918). Slum conditions in Toronto. *What is "the Ward" going to do to Toronto?* Appendix. Toronto: Bureau of Municipal Research.
- Havas, E. (1995). Family as ideology. *Social Policy and Administration*. 29(1), 1-9.
- Hayden, D. (1981). *The Grand Domestic Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Hayek (1944/1976). *Road to serfdom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hayek, F.A. (1949). *Individualism and the economic order*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Held, F. (1933). What is social case work? *Child and Family Welfare*, 9 (4), 29-32.
- Hekman, S. (1997). Truth and methodology: Feminist standpoint theory revisited. *Signs*, 22(2), 342-365.
- Hepworth, P.; Draper, R.; MacKinnon, F.R.; Rogers, D. & Splane, R.B. (1987). *Insiders looking back: Views and*

- origins of the Canada Assistance Plan. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 18, 23-42.
- Heskin, A. (1981). A history of tenants in the United States: Struggle and ideology. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (special issue on housing), 5 (2), 178-204.
- Hetherington, E.M., Camara, K.A., & Featherman, D.L. (1983). Achievement and intellectual functioning of children in one parent households. In J. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 205-284). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Hetherington, E.M., Cox M., & Cox, R. (1982). Effects of divorce on parents and children. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.) *Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development* (pp. 233-285). London: Erlbaum.
- Hewitt, M. (1994). Social policy and the question of postmodernism. In R. Page & J. Baldock (Eds.), *Social Policy Review* 6 (pp.36-57). Canterbury, UK.: Social Policy Association.
- Hewlet, S.A. (1986). *A lesser life*. New York: William Morrow & Company.
- Hindess, B. (1997). Politics and governmentality. *Economy and Society*, 26(2), 257-272.
- Hirsch, A. R. (1983). *Making the second ghetto: Race and housing in Chicago, 1940-1960*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson, B. (1994). Solo mothers, social policy regimes and the logics of gender. In D. Sainsbury, *Gendering welfare states*. London: Sage.
- Hodgetts, J. E. (1995). *From arm's length to hands-on: The formative years of Ontario's public service, 1867-1940*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hofstadter, R. (1995). *Social Darwinism in American thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- hooks, b. (1982). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. London: Pluto Press.
- hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminism, thinking black*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Hobson, B. (1994). Solo mothers, social policy regimes, and the logics of gender. In D. Sainsbury (Ed.), *Gendering welfare states* (pp. 170-187). London: Sage.
- Horowitz, R. (1995). *Teen mothers: Citizens or dependents?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Howe, D. (1994). Modernity, postmodernity and social work, *British Journal of Social Work*, 24, 513-532.
- Hulchanski, D.J. (1986). The 1935 Dominion Housing Act: Setting the stage for a permanent Federal presence in Canada's housing sector. *Urban History Review*, XV (1), 19-39.
- Hum, D. (1983). *Federalism and the poor: A review of the Canada Assistance Plan*. Toronto: Ontario Economic Council
- Hum, D. (1987a). Working poor, the Canada Assistance Plan, and provincial response in income supplementation. In J.S. Ismael (Ed.) *Canadian social welfare policy* (pp. 120-138). Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Hum, D. (1987b). Social security reform during the 1970s. In J.S. Ismael (Ed.) *Canadian social welfare policy* (pp. 29-47). Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hunsley, T. (1997). *Lone parents incomes and social policy outcomes*. Kingston, Ont: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University
- Hurl, L. (1984). The Toronto housing company, 1912-1923: The pitfalls of painless philanthropy. *Canadian Historical Review*, LXV (1), 28-53.
- Hurl, L. (1989). The nature of policy dynamics: Patterns of change and stability in a social assistance program. *Fourth National Conference on Social Welfare Policy* (Toronto, 24-27 October). Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Iacovetta, F. (1992). Making 'new Canadians': Social work, women and the re-shaping of immigrant families. In F. Iacovetta & M. Valverde (Eds.), *Gender Conflicts: New essays in women's history*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Irving, A. (1987a). *From no poor law to the Social Assistance Review: A history of social assistance in Ontario*. Unpublished back ground paper for the Ontario Social Assistance Review.
- Irving, A. (1987b). Federal-provincial issues in social policy. In S.A. Yelaja (Ed.), *Canadian social policy* (Rev. ed., pp. 326-349). Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Isaacs, M.B. (1987). Dysfunctional arrangements in divorcing families. In M. Lindblad-Goldberg (Ed.), *Clinical issues in single-parent households* (pp.47-60). Rockville, CT: Aspen Publications.
- Ishwaran, K. (Ed.) (1983). Families in crisis, editor's introduction. *The Canadian family* (pp.301-302). Toronto: Gage Publishing Limited.
- Itzin, C. (1980). *Splitting up: Single parent liberation*. London: Virago.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *Death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism: The cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC.: Duke University Press.
- Jessop, B. (1990). *State theory: Putting the capitalist state in its place*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Jessop, B. (1994). The transition to post-Fordism and the Schumpeterian workfare state. In R. Burrows & B. Loader (Eds.) *Towards and post-Fordist welfare state?* (pp. 13-37). London: Routledge.
- John, G., & Humphrey, D. (1971). *Because they're black*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Jones, A.E. (1978). *The beginning of the Canadian government housing policy, 1918-1924*. Occasional Papers 1/78. Ottawa: Centre for Social Welfare Studies.
- Jordan, E. (1981). *The housing needs of female-led one parent families*. Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- Jordan, B. (1991). Want. *Social Policy & Administration*, 25 (1), 14-26.
- Joseph, G. (1981). The incompatible menage a trois: Marxism, feminism and racism. In L. Sargent (Ed.), *Women and*

- revolution* (pp. 91-107). London: Pluto Press.
- Joshi, H. (1991). Sex and motherhood as handicaps in the labour market. In M. Maclean, & D. Groves (Eds.), *Women's issues in social policy* (pp. 179-193) London: Routledge.
- Josie, S. (1955). The American caricature of the unmarried mother. *Canadian Welfare*, 31 (5), 246-249.
- Kamerman, S.B., & Kahn, A.J. (1988). *Mothers alone*. Drower, MA.: Alburn House Publishing Company.
- Katz, S. (1992). Alarmist demography: Power, knowledge and the elderly population. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 6 (3), 203-225.
- Keane, J. (1988). *Democracy and civil society*. London: Verso.
- Keith, A.M. (1942). Facts about unmarried parenthood. *Canadian Welfare*, 18 (2), 15-16.
- Kelly, M. (1977). The new social services legislation - what is next?. *The Social Worker*, 45, 156-160.
- Kemeny, J. (1995). *From public housing to the social market*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kemp, P.A. (1997). *A Comparative study of housing Allowances*. London: The Stationery Office.
- King, D. (1930). Division of function between public and private agencies in the family field. Second Annual Meeting of the Canadian Conference of Social Work (pp.70-73). Toronto: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.
- Kinsman, G. (1994). Constructing sexual problems: "These things may lead to the tragedy of our species". In L. Samuelson (Ed.), *Power and resistance* (pp.165-188). Halifax, NS.: Fernwood Publishing.
- Kitchen, B. (1987). The introduction of family allowance in Canada. In A. Moscovitch, & J. Albert (Eds.), *The Benevolent State* (pp. 222-241). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Kitchen, B. (1990). Family policy. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Families: Changing trends in Canada* (pp. 306-329). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.
- Kitchen, B. (1992). Framing the issues: The political economy of poor mothers, *Canadian Woman Studies*, 12 (4), 10-15.
- Klein, R. (1988). The study of social policy. *The Political Quarterly*, January-March, 97-101.
- Klodawsky, F., Spector, A., & Hendrix, C. (1983). *The housing needs of single parent families in Canada*. Ottawa: Arc Research.
- Klodawsky, F. & Spector, A. (1984). Housing policy as implicit family policy: The case of mother led families. In *Changing Values: Proceedings of the Second National Annual Conference* (pp. 162-75). Ottawa: Family Services Canada.
- Klodawsky, F., Spector, A., & Rose, D. (1985). *Single parent families and Canadian housing policies: How mother lose*. Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- Klodawsky, F. & Mackenzie, S. (1987). Gender sensitive theory and the housing needs of mother-led families: Some concepts and some buildings. *Feminist Perspectives*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

- Koven, S. (1993). *Borderlands: Women, voluntary action, and child welfare in Britain, 1840-1914*. In S. Koven, & S. Michel (Eds.), *Mothers of a new world* (pp. 94-135). New York & London: Routledge.
- Kriesberg, L. (1970). *Mothers in poverty: A study of fatherless families*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Kunzel, R.G. (1993). *Fallen women, problem girls: Unmarried mothers and the professionalization of social work, 1890-1945*. New Haven, MA: Yale University Press.
- Land, H. (1971). Women, work and social security. *Social and Economic Administration*, 5 (3), 183-192.
- Land, H. (1978). Who cares for the family? *Journal of Social Policy*, 7 (3), 275-284.
- Land, H. (1979). The boundaries between the state and the family. In C.C. Harris (Ed.), *The Sociology of the family: New directions for Britain, Sociological Review Monograph* (28, 141-159). Staffordshire, UK: University of Keele.
- Land, H. (1980). Family wage. *Feminist Review*, 6, 55-77.
- Land, H., & Rose, H. (1985). Compulsory altruism for some or an altruistic society for all. In P. Bean, J. Ferris, & D.K. Whynes (Eds.), *In defence of welfare* (pp. 74-96). London: Tavistock.
- Landry, P. (1932). Home visiting by the Children's Aid Society. *Child and Family Welfare*, 8 (3), 6-10.
- Leeson, J., & Gray, J. (1978). *Women and medicine*. London: Tavistock.
- Leonard, P. (1994). Knowledge/power and postmodernism. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 11 (1), 11-26.
- Leonard, P. (1996). Three discourses on practice: A postmodern re-appraisal. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, XXXIII (2), 7-26.
- Lero, D., & Brockman, L.M. (1993). Single parent families in Canada: A closer look. In J. Hudson, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Single parent families* (pp. 91-114). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Lessard, A. (1932). Mothers' allowances and child protection. *Child and Family Welfare*, 8 (3), 16-22.
- Leung, L. C. (1998). *Lone mothers, social security and the family in Hong Kong*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Levesque, A. (1994). *Making and breaking the rules: Women in Quebec, 1919-1939*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.
- Lewis, J. (1983). Dealing with dependency: State practices and social realities, 1870-1945. In J. Lewis (Ed.) *Women's welfare, women's rights* (pp. 17-37). London: Croom Helm.
- Lewis, J. (1989). Lone parent families: politics and economics. *Journal of Social Policy*, 18 (4), 596-600.
- Lewis, J. (1992). Gender and the development of welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 3, 159-173.
- Lewis, J. (Ed.) (1997). *Lone mothers in European Welfare Regimes: Shifting policy logics*. London & Philadelphia: Jessica.
- Lewis, J. & Hobson, B. (1997). Introduction. In J. Lewis (Ed.), *Lone mothers in European Welfare Regimes: Shifting*

- policy logics* (pp. 1-20). London & Philadelphia: Jessica.
- Lindsay, C. (1992). *Lone parents families in Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- Lipsky, M. (1970). *Protest in city politics: Rent strikes, housing and the power of poor*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Little, M.H. (1994a). 'Manhunts and bingo blabs': The moral regulation of Ontario single mothers. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 19 (2), 233-247.
- Little, M.H. (1994b). 'No car, no radio, no liquor permit': *The moral regulation of single mothers in Ontario, 1920-1993*. PhD. Dissertation, York University.
- Little, M.H. (1995). The blurring of boundaries: Private and public welfare for single mothers in Ontario. *Studies in Political Economy*, 47 (Summer), 89-109.
- Little, M.H. (1997). Claiming a unique place: The introduction of mothers' pension in British Columbia. In V. Strong-Boag & A.C. Fellman (Eds.), *Rethinking Canada (3rd ed)* (pp. 284-303). Toronto, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Little, M.H. (1998). *No car, no radio, no liquor permit: the moral regulation of single mothers in Ontario, 1920-1997*. Toronto, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lister, R. (1991). Citizenship engendered. *Critical Social Policy*, 32(II), 65-71.
- Lister, R. (1995). Dilemmas in engendering citizenship. *Economy and Society*, 24(1), 1-40.
- Lord, S. (1994). Social assistance and "employability" for single mothers in Nova Scotia. In A.F. Johnson, S. McBride & P.J. Smith (Eds.), *Continuities and discontinuities: The political economy of social welfare and labour market policy in Canada* (pp. 191-206). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. New York: Crossing Press.
- Lorimer, J. (1972). *A citizen's guide to city politics*. Toronto: James Lewis & Samuel.
- Low, W. (1996). Wide of the mark: Use of "targeting" and work incentives to direct social assistance to single parents. In J. Pulkingham & G. Ternowetsky (Eds.) *Remaking Canada social policy: Social security in the late 1990's* (pp. 188-201). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing
- Lubove, R. (1962). *The progressives and the slums: Tenement house reform in New York, 1890-1917*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Luffman, M.L. (1950). Organizing a public housing project. *Canadian Council of Social Work, Proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting*, 126-129. Ottawa: Canadian Conference on Social Work.
- Lundqvist, L. (1992). *Dislodging the welfare state? Housing and privatisation in four European nations*. Delft, The Netherlands: Delft University Press.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mackenzie, S. (1988). Building women, building cities: toward gender sensitive theory in the environmental disciplines. In C. Andrews & B. Moore-Milroy (Eds.), *Life Spaces: Gender, household, employment* (pp.13-30).

Vancouver: UBC Press.

- Maclean, M., & Groves, D. (1991). Introduction. In M. Maclean, & D. Groves (Eds.), *Women's issues in social policy* (pp. 1-3). London: Routledge.
- MacLeod, F. (1983). *Transition house: How to establish a refuge for battered women*. Ottawa: National Clearing House on Family Violence, Health and Welfare Canada.
- Mann, M. (1988). *States, war and capitalism: Studies in political sociology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Marcill-Gratton, N. (1993). Growing up with a single parent, a transitional experience? Some demographic measurements. In J. Hudson, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Single parent families* (pp. 73-90). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Marcuse, P. (1981). The strategic potential of rent control. In J. Gilderbloom (Ed.), *Rent control: A source book* (pp. 86-94). Santa Barbara, CA: Foundation for National Progress.
- Marjorisbanks, R. (1971). *Urban objectives, frameworks, strategies and structures: A review of studies produced by CMHC policy planners, 1970-1971*. Ottawa: CMHC
- Marsh, L. (1950). *Rebuilding a neighbourhood*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Marsh, L. (1958). What is the welfare task? *Canadian Welfare*, 164-172.
- Marsden, D. (1969). *Mothers alone: Poverty and the fatherless family*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Martindale, D. (1960). *The nature and types of sociological theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Mayberry, M.J. (1957). Group activities for unmarried mothers. *Canadian Welfare*, June, 79-80.
- Mayo, M., & Weir, A. (1993). The future for feminist social policy. In R. Page, & J. Baldock (Eds.), *Social policy review, 5* (pp. 35-57). Canterbury, UK: Social Policy Association.
- McAllister, C. (1963). Who gets the low-cost housing? *Canadian Welfare*, May-June, 114-117.
- McCarthy, K.D. (1990). Parallel power structures: Women and the voluntary sphere. In K.D. McCarthy (Ed.), *Lady bountiful revisited: Women, philanthropy and power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- McClain, J., & Doyle, D. (1984). *Women and housing*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.
- McDaniel, S.A. (1994). Families, feminism and the state: Canada in the 1990s. In L. Samuelson (Ed.), *Power and resistance: Critical thinking about Canadian issues* (pp. 117-128). Halifax: Nova Scotia.
- McDaniel, S.A. (1993). Single parenthood: Policy apartheid in Canada. In J. Hudson, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Single parent families* (pp. 203-212). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- McGilly, F. (1998). *An introduction to Canada's public social services* (2nd ed). Don Mills, Ont: Oxford University Press, Canada.
- McHale, B. (1992). *Constructing postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.
- McIninch, F., & Pentick, M. (1993). Demographic trends: Summary, policy implications and research agenda. In J.

- Hudson, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Single parent families* (pp. 133-138). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- McIntosh, M. (1979). The welfare state and the needs of the dependent family. In S. Burman (Ed.) *Fit work for women* (pp. 153-172). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- McIntosh, M. (1981). Feminism and social policy. *Critical Social Policy*, 1 (1), 32-42.
- McKie, C. (1993). An overview of lone parenthood in Canada. In J. Hudson, & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Single parent families* (pp. 53-72). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1995). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McLennan, G. (1996). Post-Marxism and the 'four sins' of modernist theorizing. *New Left Review*, 218, 53-74.
- McMahon, M. (1990). *Metro's Housing Company: The First 35 Years*. Toronto: The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Ltd.
- McMillan, S. (1987). Forty years of social housing in Toronto. *Canadian Social Trends*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- McQuillan, K. (1992). Falling behind: The income of lone-mother families, 1970-1985. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 29 (4), 511-523.
- Meehan, E. (1979). *The quality of federal policy making: Programmed failure in public housing*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Melichercik, J. (1978/1987). Child welfare policy. In S.A. Yelaja (Ed.), *Canadian social policy* (pp. 195-223). Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Press.
- Miliband, R. (1969). *The state in capitalist society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Miller, G. (1997a). Introduction: Context and method in qualitative research. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (Eds.), *Context & method in qualitative research* (pp.1-11). London: Sage Publications.
- Miller, G. (1997b). Contextualizing texts: Studying organizational texts. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (Eds.), *Context & method in qualitative research* (pp.77-91). London: Sage Publications.
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and society*, 19, 1-31.
- Milroy, B. M. (1991). Taking stock of planning, space and gender. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 6 (1), 3-15.
- Ministry of Community and Social Service, (1973). *Family Benefit Mothers in Metropolitan Toronto*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Mink, G. (1990). The lady and the tramp: Gender, race and the origins of the American welfare state. In L. Gordon (Ed.) *Women, the state and welfare* (pp. 92-122). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Minson, J. (1980). Strategies for socialists? Foucault's conception of power. *Economy and Society*, 9(1), 1-43.
- Miron, J.R. (1988). *Housing in Postwar Canada*. Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Miron, J.R. (Ed.) (1993). *House, home and community: Progress in housing Canadians, 1945-1986*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Mishra, R. (1981). *Society and social policy* (2nd. ed., rev.). London: Macmillan.
- Mishra, R. (1989). The academic tradition in social policy: The Titmuss years. In M. Bulmer, J. Lewis, & D. Piachaud (Eds.) *The goals of social policy* (pp. 64-83). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Mitchinson, W. (1987). Early women's organizations and social reform: Prelude to the welfare state. In A. Moscovitch & J. Albert (Eds.), *The "benevolent" state* (pp.77-92). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Moore, M. (1989). Dual-earner families: The new norm. *Canadian Social Trends*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, cat. 11-008E, 12:24-26.
- Mohanty, C. (1992). Feminist encounters: Locating the politics of experience. In M. Barrett & A. Phillips (Eds.), *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates* (pp. 74-92). Cambridge, UK.: Polity Press.
- Morgan, P. (1981). From battered wife to program client: The state's shaping of social problems, *Kapitalistate*, 9, 17-39.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler & J. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 369-384). New York: Routledge .
- Mount, F. (1982). *The subversive family: An alternative history of love and marriage*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Murray, C. (1984). *Loosing ground*. London: Basic Books.
- Myles, J. (1985). Decline or impasse: The current state of the welfare state. *Studies in Political Economy* 26, 92-113.
- Myles, J. (1989). *Old age in the welfare state: The political economy of public pensions* (Rev. ed.). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Naples, N.A. (1997). The "new consensus" on the gendered "social contract": The 1987-1988 U.S. congressional hearings on welfare reform. *Signs*, 22 (4), 907-945.
- Nelson, B. (1990). The origins of the two-channel welfare state: Workmen's compensation and mothers' aid. In L. Gordon (Ed.), *Women, the state and welfare* (pp. 123-151). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Neuber, K.A. (1980). *Needs assessment, a model for community planning*. Beverly Hills,CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Neufeldt, A. (Ed.) (1993). *Independent living: An agenda for the 90's*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Independent Living Centres
- Ng, R. (1986). The social construction of immigrant women in Canada. In R. Hamilton & M. Barrett (Eds.), *The politics of diversity: Feminism, Marxist and nationalism* (pp. 269-286). London: Verso.
- Ng, R. (1988). *The politics of community services: Immigrant women, class and state*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Norris, P. (1984). Women in poverty: Britain and America. *Social Policy*, 14 (4), 41-43.
- Novac, S. (1986). Women and housing: An annotated bibliography. *CPL Bibliography no 178*. Toronto: York University.

- O'Brien, C.A. (1994). The social organization of the treatment of lesbian, gay and bisexual youth in group homes and youth shelters. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 34 (winter), 37-57.
- O'Brien, M & Penna, S. (1998). *Theorising welfare: Enlightenment and modern society*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- O'Connor, J. (1973). *Fiscal crisis of the welfare state*. New York: St. James' Press.
- O'Connor, J.S. (1993). Gender, class and citizenship in comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: Theoretical and methodological issues. *British Journal of Sociology*, 44(3), 501-518.
- O'Malley, P. (1992). Risk, power and crime prevention. *Economy and Society*, 21(3), 252-275.
- O'Malley, P. (1996). Indigenous governance. *Economy and Society*, 25 (3), 310-325.
- O'Malley, P.; Weir, L. & Shearing, C. (1997). Governmentality, criticism, politics, *Economy and Society*, 26 (4), 501-517.
- Offe, C. (1974). Structural problems of the capitalist state. *German Political Studies*, 1, 31-56.
- Offe, C. (1984). Contradictions of the welfare state. London: Hutchinson.
- Offe, C. (1985). New social movements: challenging the boundaries of institutional politics. *Social Research*, 52 (4), 817-868.
- Ontario Association of Housing Authorities (1964). *Good Housing for Canadians*. Toronto: OAHA.
- Ontario Housing Corporation (1970a). *Report to Chairman & Members, Board of Directors*. Archives of Ontario, RG 44-1-2-Box 1
- Ontario Housing Corporation (1970b). *Report to the Social Services and Housing Committee of the Council of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto* (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 4, Minister files)
- Ontario Housing Corporation (1972a). *Background Paper with Respect to Rental Rates Paid by Ontario Housing Corporation - Tenants in Receipt of Social Assistance*. (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 13).
- Ontario Housing Corporation (1972b). *Notes on Recommendations in Regent Park Community*. (AO RG 44-1-2, Box 13.)
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1920-1921). Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LIV (VII).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1921-1922). Second Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LV (VIII).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1922-1923). Third Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LVI (VI).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1923-1924). Fourth Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LVII (V).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1924-1925). Fifth Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LVIII (V).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1925-1927). Seventh Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LX (V).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1927-1928). Eighth Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXI (V).

- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1928-1929). Ninth Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXII (V).
- Ontario Mothers Allowance Commission (1929-1930). Tenth Annual Report. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXIII (V).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1930-1931). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXIV (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1931-1932). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXV (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1932-1933). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXVI (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1933-1934). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXVII (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1934-1935). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXVIII (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1935-1936). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXIX (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1936-1937). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXX (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1937-1938). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXI (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1938-1939). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXII (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1939-1940). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXIII (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1940-1941). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXIII (IV).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1941-1942). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXV (III).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1942-1943). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXVI (III).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1943-1944). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXVII (III).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1944-1945). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXVIII (III).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1945-1946). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXIX (III).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1946-1947). Report of the Minister. *Ontario Sessional Papers*, LXXX (II).
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1947-1948). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1948-1949). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1949-1950). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1950-1951). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1951-1952). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1952-1953). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1953-1954). Report of the Minister.

- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1954-1955). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1955-1956). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1956-1957). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1957-1958). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1958-1959). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1959-1960). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1960-1961). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1961-1962). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1962-1963). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1963-1964). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Minister of Public Welfare (1964-1965). Report of the Minister.
- Ontario Welfare Council (1973). *A Study of housing Policies in Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Welfare Council
- Oppenheim, C. & Lister, R. (1996). Ten years after the 1986 Social Security Act. In M. May, E. Brunsdon & G. Craig (Eds.), *Social Policy Review* 8 (pp. 84-15), London: Social Policy Association.
- Orloff, A.S. (1993). Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review*, 58 (June), 303-328.
- Osborne, T. (1994). Sociology, liberalism and the historicity of conduct. *Economy and Society*, 23(4), 484-501.
- Owram, D. (1986). *The Government generation: Canadian intellectuals and the state, 1900-1945*. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press.
- Panitch, L. (1977). The role and nature of the Canadian state. In L. Panitch (Ed.), *The Canadian state, political economy and political power* (pp. 3-27). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Parton, N. (1991). *Governing the family: Child care, child protection and the state*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Parton, N. (1996). Social work, risk and the blaming system. In N. Parton (Ed.), *Social theory, social change and social work*. London: Routledge.
- Parton, N. (1998). Risk, advanced liberalism and child welfare: The need to rediscover uncertainty and ambiguity. *British Journal of Social Work*, 28, 9-32.
- Pascall, G. (1986). *Social policy, a feminist analysis*. London: Routledge
- Pascall, G. (1997). *Social policy, a new feminist analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Pearce, D. (1985). Toil and trouble: women workers and unemployment compensation. *Signs*, 10 (3), 439-59.

- Pearce, D. (1978). The feminization of poverty: Women, work and welfare. *Urban and Social Change Review*, 2 (Winter-Spring), 28-36.
- Pearce, D. (1990). Welfare is not for women: Why the war on poverty cannot conquer the feminization of poverty. In L. Gordon (Ed.), *Women, the state, and welfare* (pp. 265-279). Madison, WI : The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Pearce, F. & Valverde, M. (1996)(Eds.). Special issue. *Economy and Society*, 25(3).
- Penna, S. & O'Brien, M. (1996). Post modernism and social policy: A small step forward?. *Journal of Social Policy*, 25(10), 39-61.
- Penz, P. (1986). *Consumer sovereignty and human interests*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pickvance, C. (Ed.) (1976). *Urban sociology: Critical essays*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Pierson, C. (1991). *Beyond the welfare state*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Pierson, R.R. (1990). Gender and the unemployment insurance, debates in Canada, 1934-1940. *Labour/le Travail*, 25, 77-103.
- Pinker, R. (1990). *Social work in an enterprise society*. London: Routledge.
- Pinker, R. (1979). *The idea of welfare*. London: Heinemann.
- Piva, M.J.(1979). The condition of the working class in Toronto, 1900-1921. *Cahiers d'histoire no.9*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Piven, F.F. (1990). Ideology and the State. In L. Gordon (Ed.), *Women, the state, and welfare* (pp. 250-264). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Piven, F.F., & Cloward, R.A. (1971). *Regulating the Poor: The functions of public welfare*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Plant, R. (1988). *Citizenship, rights and socialism*. London: The Fabian Society.
- Porter, A. (1993). Women and income security in the post-war period: The case of unemployment insurance, 1945-1962. *Labour/ Le Travail*, 31 (Spring), 111-144.
- Porter, J. (1965). *The vertical mosaic: An analysis of social class and power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Poulantzas, N. (1973). *Political power and social classes*. London: New Left Books.
- Prins, B. (1998). How bodies came to matter: An interview with Judith Butler. *Signs*, 23 (2), 275-286.
- Pringle, R., & Watson, S. (1992). 'Women's interests and the post-structuralist state'. In M. Barrett, & A. Phillips (Eds.), *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates* (pp. 53-73) Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Procacci, G. (1991). Social economy and the government of poverty. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Ed.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 151-168). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Pulkingham, J. (1995). Investigating the financial circumstances of separated and divorced parents: Implications for family law reform. *Canadian Public Policy*, XXI (1), 1-19.
- Purdy, S. (1993). 'This is not a company; it is a cause': Class, gender and the Toronto Housing Company, 1912-1920. *Urban History Review*, XXI (2), 75-91.
- Rabinow, P. (1989). *French modern, norms and forms of the social environment*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rainwater, L. (1970). *Behind ghetto walls: Black family life in a federal slum*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Rich, M.E. (1938). A forward look in family welfare. *Canadian conference on social work, Proceedings of the 6th annual meeting* (pp. 74-80). Vancouver: Canadian conference on Social Work.
- Richards, J. (1997). *Retooling the welfare state*. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Richardson, B. (1972). *The future of Canadian cities*. Toronto: New Press.
- Riley, D. (1983). *War in the nursery*. London: Virago.
- Riley, D. (1988). *'Am I that name?': Feminism and the category of women in history*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Riley, D. (1992a). Citizenship and the welfare state. In J. Allen; P. Braham, & P. Lewis (Eds.), *Political and economic forms of modernity* (pp.179-227). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Riley, D. (1992b). A short story of some preoccupations. In J. Butler & J. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp.121-129). New York: Routledge.
- Room, G. (1979). *The sociology of welfare*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Roe, J. (1983). The end is where we start from: Women and welfare since 1901. In C.V. Baldock (Ed.), *Women social welfare and the state in Australia* (pp. 1-19). Boston: George Allen & Unwin.
- Rose, A. (1954). Adequate housing: Does it make better citizens? *Canadian Conference on Social Work, Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting* (pp. 79-86). Ottawa: Canadian Conference on Social Work.
- Rose, A. (1955). *An experimental study of local housing conditions and needs: A report to CMHC*. Ottawa: CMHC.
- Rose, A. (1958). *Regent Park, a study in slum clearance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Rose, A. (1980). *Canadian housing policies, 1935-1980*. Toronto: Butterworth & Co.
- Rose, D. & Wexler, M. (1993). Post-war social and economic changes and housing adequacy. In J.R. Miron (Ed.), *House, home and community: Progress in housing Canadians, 1945-1986* (pp. 239-256). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Rose, H. (1981). Rereading Titmuss: The sexual division of welfare. *Journal of Social Policy*, 10 (4), 477-502.
- Rose, N. (1984). *The psychological complex: Psychology, politics and society in England, 1869-1939*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the soul*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Rose, N. (1993a). Government, authority and expertise in advanced liberalism. *Economy and Society*, 22, 283-299.
- Rose, N. (1993b). Disadvantage and power after the welfare state (translation of Finnish title), *Jannus - Journal of the Finnish Society for Social Policy*, 1, 44-68.
- Rose, N. (1996). The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. *Economy and Society*, 25 (3), 327-356.
- Rose, N. & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43 (2), 173-205.
- Ross, B. (1995). *The house that Jill built: A lesbian nation in formation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ross, D.P. (1975). *Canadian fact book on poverty*. Ottawa, Ont.: The Canadian Council on Social Development.
- Ross, H.L., & Sawhill, I. (1975). *Time of transition: The growth of families headed by women*. Washington: Urban Institute Press.
- Rummey, J. (1951). The social costs of slums. *Journal of Social Issues*, VII (1-2).
- Russell, C.D., & Ellis, J.B. (1991). Sex-role development in single parents households. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 19 (1), 5-9.
- Rutherford, P. (1971). Tomorrow's metropolis: The urban reform movement in Canada, 1880-1920. *Canadian Historical Association, Historical Papers*, 203-224.
- Rutherford, P. (1974). *Saving the Canadian city: The first phase 1880-1920*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sands, R.G., & Nuccio, K. E. (1989). Mother-headed single parent families: A feminist perspective. *Affilia*, 4 (3), 25-41.
- Sandercock, L. (1995). Voices from the borderlands: A meditation on a metaphor. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14, 77-88.
- Sapiro, V. (1990). The gender basis of American social policy. In L. Gordon (Ed.), *Women, the state and welfare* (pp. 36-54). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Saunders, P. (1990). *A nation of home owners*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Sayegh, K.S. (1987). *Housing, a Canadian perspective*. Ottawa: ABCD-Academy Book
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault*. New York: Routledge.
- Sawicki, J. (1998). Feminism, Foucault and 'subjects' of power and freedom . In J. Moss (Ed.), *The later Foucault* (pp. 93-107). London, Thousand Oaks, CA, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Schames, G. (1990). Toward an understanding of the etiology and treatment of psychological dysfunction among single teenage mothers: part 1, a review of the literature. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 60 (2), Mar, 153-168.
- Scott, K. (1996). The dilemma of liberal citizenship: Women and social assistance reform in the 1990. *Studies in Political Economy*, 50 (Summer), 7-36.

- Scott, L. (1943). Building communities. *Canadian Welfare*, 19 (6), 31-34.
- Scott, S.; Williams, G.; Plat, S. & Thomas, H. (Eds.) (1992). *Private risks and public dangers*. Aldershot, UK: Avebury.
- Scruton, R. (1980). *The meaning of conservatism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Secombe, W. (1974). The housewife and her labour under capitalism. *New Left Review*, 83, 3-24.
- Sennett, R. (1970). *The uses of disorder: Personal identity and city life*. New York: Random House.
- Sewell, J. (1993). *The shape of the city: Toronto struggles with modern planning*. Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press.
- Sharpe, S. (1984). *The double identity: The lives of working mothers*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Shaw, S. (1991). The conflicting experiences of lone parenthood. In M. Hardey, & G. Crow (Eds.) *Lone parenthood, coping with constraints and making opportunities* (pp.143-155). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Singer, L. (1993). *Erotic welfare: Sexual theory and politics in the age of epidemics*. New York: Routledge.
- Skelton, I. (1996). The geographic distribution of social housing in Ontario, Canada. *Housing Studies*, 11 (2), 189-206.
- Skocpol, T. (1992). *Protecting soldiers and mothers: The political origins of social policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, D. (1981). The experienced world as problematic: A feminist method. *Sorokin Lecture no. 12*. Saskatchewan: University of Saskatchewan.
- Smith, S. (1946). A national housing program for Canada. *Canadian conference on social work, proceedings on the 10th annual meeting* (pp. 96-101). Halifax: Canadian Conference on Social Work.
- Snell, J. (1991). *In the shadow of the law: Divorce in Canada, 1900-1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Social Assistance Review Committee (1988). *Transitions*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto (1977). *Social allowances in Ontario*. Toronto: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto
- Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto (1994). Social security reform: A concern for follow up forum. *SPC News*, July, 8.
- Somerville, J. (1992). The new right and family politics. *Economy and Society*, 21 (2), 100-20.
- Soper, M. (1980). Housing for single parents: A women's design. In G. Wekerle; R. Peterson & D. Morley (Eds.), *New spaces for women* (pp. 321-332). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Spain, D. (1995). Public housing and beguinage. In J.A. Garber & R.S. Turner (Eds), *Gender in urban research* (pp. 256-270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Special Senate Committee on Poverty (1971). *Poverty in Canada*. Ottawa: Information Canada.

- Splane, R. (1965). *Social welfare in Ontario, 1791-1893*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Splane, R. (1987). Social policy-making in the Government of Canada. In S.A. Yelaja (Ed.), *Canadian social policy* (Rev. ed., pp. 224-244). Waterloo, Ont: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Stainton, T. & Swift K. (1996). "Difference" and social work curriculum. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 13 (1), 75-87.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Statistics Canada (1961). *Census, 1961*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada (1993). *Portrait of families in Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Steele, M. (1995). *Two kinds of housing allowance, 1980-93: An evaluation*. Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
- Stone, S.D. (1990). *Lesbians in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Stratton, P.R.U. (1952). Why subsidized rental housing? *Canadian Welfare*, 28 (6), 3-7.
- Strong-Boag, V. (1979). "Wages for housework": mothers' allowances and the beginnings of social security in Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 14 (1), 24-34.
- Strong-Boag, V. (1991). Home dreams: Women and the suburban experiment in Canada, 1945-60. *Canadian Historical Review*, LXXII (4), 471-504.
- Struthers, J. (1987a). A profession in crisis: Charlotte Whitton and Canadian social work in the 1930s. In A. Moscovitch, & J. Albert (Eds.), *The benevolent state* (pp.111-125). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Struthers, J. (1987b). Shadows from the 1930s: The federal government and unemployment assistance, 1941-1956. In J.S. Ismael (Ed.), *The Canadian welfare state: Evolution and transition* (pp. 3-32). Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Struthers, J. (1987c). "Lord give us men": Women and social work in English Canada. In A. Moscovitch, & J. Albert (Eds.), *The benevolent state* (pp.127-142). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Struthers, J. (1994). *The limits of affluence: Welfare in Ontario, 1920-1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Subcommittee on Housing and Community Planning (1944). *Report of advisory committee on reconstruction, IV*. Ottawa: King's Printer
- Sutherton, K. (1955). Another view. *Canadian Welfare*, 31 (5), 249-252.
- Swift, K.J. (1995). *Manufacturing 'Bad Mothers': A critical perspective on child neglect*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sypnowich, C. (1993). Some disquiet about "difference". *Praxis International*, 13 (2), 99-112.
- Tait, T. (1993). *Inside out: First Nations on the front line*. Vancouver, BC.: Lazara Press.
- Tarn, J. (1973). *Five per cent philanthropy*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Taylor, C. (1996). A world consensus on human rights. *Dissent* (Summer), 15-21.
- Taylor, D. (1989). Citizenship and social power. *Critical Social Policy*, 9 (2), 19-31.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (1991). *Social change, social welfare and social science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (1992). Who has the best tunes? Rights, needs and moral hazard. In N. Manning & R. Page (Eds.), *Social Policy Review*, 4 (pp. 261-279). Canterbury, UK.: Social Policy Association.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (1994). Postmodernism and social policy: A great leap backwards? *Journal of Social Policy*, 23 (3), 385-404.
- Taylor-Gooby, P., & Dale, J. (1981). *Social theory and social welfare*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tilly, C. (1984). *Big structures, large processes, huge comparisons*. London: Sage.
- Titmuss, R. (1938). *Poverty and population: A factual study of social waste*. London: Macmillan.
- Titmuss, R. (1958). *Essays on the welfare state*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Titmuss, R. (1974). *Social Policy*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Titmuss, R. (1968). *Commitment to welfare*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Townsend, P. (1984). Understanding poverty and inequality in Europe. In R. Walker, R. Lawson, & P. Townsend (Eds.), *Responses to poverty: Lessons from Europe* (pp. 1-27). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.
- Turner, J. (1972). Housing as a verb. In J. Turner & R. Ficher (Eds.), *Freedom to build, dweller control of the housing process* (pp. 148-175). New York: Macmillan.
- Turner, J. (1976). *Housing by people: Towards autonomy in building environments*. London: Marion Boyars.
- Ursel, J. (1992). *Private lives and public policy: 100 years of state intervention in the family*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Ursel, J. (1994). Eliminating violence against women: Reform or co-optation in state institutions. I.L. Samuelson (Ed.) *Power and resistance: Critical thinking about Canadian social issues* (pp. 71-92). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Ursel, J. (1997). Considering the impact of battered women's movement on the state: The example of Manitoba. In C. Andrew & S. Rodgers (Eds.), *Women and the Canadian state* (pp.155-179). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Vakili-Zad, C. (1993). Tenant participation and control in public housing in Canada. *Habitat International*, 17 (2), 91-103.
- Valverde, M. (1991). *The age of light, soap and water: Moral reform in English Canada*. Toronto: McClelland, & Stewart Inc.
- Valverde, M. (1992). Representing childhood: The multiple fathers of the Dionne quintuplets. In C. Smart (Ed.), *Regulating womanhood: Historical essays on marriage, motherhood and sexuality* (pp.119-146). London & New York: Routledge.

- Valverde, M. (1994). Editor's introduction. *Canadian Journal of Sociology (Special issue on moral regulation)*, 19 (2), vi-xii.
- Valverde, M. (1995). The mixed social economy as a Canadian tradition. *Studies in Political Economy (Summer)*, 33-60.
- Wade, C.B. (1946). The need for subsidized housing. In *Canadian conference on social work, proceedings of the 10th annual meeting*, (pp. 102-107). Halifax: Canadian Conference on Social Work.
- Wade, J. (1986). Wartime Housing Limited, 1941-47: Canadian housing policy at the crossroads. *Urban History Review*, XV (1), 41-59.
- Wade, J. (1994). *Houses for all: The struggle for social housing in Vancouver, 1919-50*. Vancouver: UBC Press
- Walby, S. (1992). Post-modernism? Theorizing social complexity. In M. Barrett, & A. Phillips (Eds.), *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates* (pp. 31-52). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Walters, W. (1994). The discovery of 'unemployment': New forms for the government of poverty. *Economy and Society*, 23 (3), 265-290.
- Ward, D. (1989). *Poverty, ethnicity, and the American city, 1840-1925: Changing conceptions of the slum and the ghetto*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wark, N.H. (1928). Methods of relief and family welfare in border cities. *Proceedings of the 1st annual meeting of the Canadian conference on social work* (pp.64-66). Montreal: Canadian Conference on Social Work.
- Wharf, B. (1991). Community, culture and control: Themes for the social service in northern communities. *The Northern Review*, 7 (Summer), 132-142.
- Wharf, B. (Ed.) (1994). *Rethinking child welfare in Canada*. Toronto: McLelland & Stuart.
- Watson, E.F. (1961). How much is enough in social assistance? *Canadian Welfare (January)*, 13-19.
- Wedderburn, D. (1965). Facts and theories of the welfare state. In R. Miliband, & J. Saville (Eds.), *The socialist register* (pp. 127-146). London: Merlin Press.
- Wekerle, G.; Peterson, R. & Morley, D. (Eds) (1980). *New spaces for women*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wekerle, G. (1984). A woman's place is the city. *Antipode (Special issue on women and the environment)*, 16 (3), 11-20,
- Wekerle, G. & Novac, S. (1991). *Gender and housing in Toronto*. Toronto: Equal Opportunity Division, City of Toronto
- Wekerle, G. (1993). Responding to diversity: Housing developed by and for women. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 2 (2), 95-113.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Weir, L. (1996). Recent developments in the government of pregnancy. *Economy and Society*, 25 (3), 373-392.
- Whitaker, R. (1977). Images of the Canadian state. In L. Panitch (Ed.) *The Canadian state, political economy and*

- political power* (pp. 28-68). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Whitehead, B. D. (1993). The new family values. *Utner Reader* (May-June), 61-66.
- Wiesenthal, D.; Wiezmann, F. & Mockler, S. (1991). Housing needs of Canadian single mothers and their children. *Le March research report no. 45*. Toronto: York University.
- Wilensky, H.L. & Lebeaux, C. (1965). *Industrial society and social welfare: The Impact of industrialization on the supply organization of social welfare*. New York: Free Press.
- Williams, C. (1984). *Decades of service*. Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services
- Williams, F. (1989). *Social policy, a critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Williams, F. (1992). Somewhere over the rainbow: Universality and diversity in social policy. In N. Manning, & R. Page (Eds.) *Social Policy Review*, 4 (pp. 200-219). Canterbury, UK.: Social Policy Association.
- Williams, F. (1994). Social relations, welfare and the post-Fordism debate. In R. Burrows & B. Loader (Eds.), *Towards a post-Fordist welfare state?* (pp. 49-73). London & New York: Routledge.
- Williams, R. (1988). *Keywords, a vocabulary of culture and society* (3rd. ed). London: Fontana Press.
- Wilson, E. (1977). *Women and the welfare state*. London: Tavistock.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wistow, G.; Knapp, M.; Hardy, B. & Allen, C. (1995). *Social care in a mixed economy*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Wood, E. (1956). Public housing and Mrs. McGee, *Journal of Housing*, 13 (11), 423-425.
- Wright, G. (1981). *Building the dream: A social history of housing in America*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Zaretsky, E. (1986). Rethinking the welfare state: Dependence, economic individualism and the family. In J. Dickinson, & B. Russel (Eds.), *Family, economy and state* (pp. 85-109). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Zylan, Y. (1996). Comment on Fraser and Gordon's "A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state". *Signs*, 21 (2), 515-530.
- Yasmeen, G. (1988). Mutual-aid and social networks. *Canadian Women Studies Journal*, 11 (2), 37-40.
- Yelaja, S. (Ed.) (1987). *Canadian social policy*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, I.M. (1994). Making single motherhood normal. *Dissent*, Winter, 88-93.

APPENDIX

The tables are primarily an indication of the numbers reported in the Annual Reports of mothers' allowances. They are tentative in the sense that in some cases they represent aggregations of the data reported. They also contain many discontinuities since ways of reporting changed considerably throughout the 46 years of the program.

Table 1
Reasons for Ineligibility for Mothers Allowance

- 1= citizenship or residency requirements
 2= economic circumstances encompassing: value of property or assets disqualify, sufficient income to maintain the home, in receipt of allowance from other funds, older children's earnings should maintain the home.
 3= not fit and proper, unsatisfactory home conditions
 4= lack of proof or reason for single status excluded in the Act
 5= child reasons: only one, not under 16, not in school, not with mother.
 6= medical: not permanently incapacitated or not under wife's care
 7= foster: not orphan
 8= other: withdraw, died, married, widower applying (ALREADY IN AGGREGATE FORM AS OF 1937-38).
 total=total of ineligible applications

year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	total
1920/21	7.34%	56.37%	2.70%	9.61%	12.42%	8.10%	0.54%	0.11%	926
1921/22	8.24%	34.96%	4.12%	12.61%	23.22%	11.11%	3.25%	2.75%	801
1922/23	10.38%	45.71%	4.19%	10.98%	10.38%	15.17%	0.80%	2.40%	501
1923/24	6.10%	45.10%	7.19%	8.93%	13.29%	15.47%	2.18%	1.74%	459
1924/25	10.5%	40.25%	6.00%	14.25%	9.25%	15.75%	2.00%	2.00%	200
1925/26	9.01%	37.50%	8.09%	15.69%	8.82%	17.65%	1.96%	1.47%	408
1926/27	9.39%	34.77%	5.84%	14.97%	14.21%	18.02%	1.52%	1.27%	394
1927/28	11.35%	39.24%	5.20%	15.37%	13.24%	13.48%	1.42%	0.71%	423
1928/29	7.81%	43.54%	6.61%	13.51%	12.31%	13.21%	2.10%	0.90%	333
1929/30	8.25%	40.29%	2.91%	15.05%	4.85%	26.70%	1.94%		206
1930/31	10.12%	26.19%	2.98%	16.87%	11.51%	27.18%	3.17%	1.98%	504
1931/32	14.50%	23.90%	2.89%	18.64%	10.00%	24.07%	3.90%	2.00%	590
1932/33	9.72%	23.77%	6.02%	20.52%	11.88%	24.38%	2.01%	1.70%	648
1933/34	8.36%	19.29%	3.86%	18.97%	11.25%	30.55%	2.25%	5.47%	622
1934/35	6.90%	18.03%	2.65%	18.57%	13.79%	30.77%	2.39%	6.90%	377
1935/36	6.58%	25.44%	3.76%	21.68%	9.93%	18.52%	2.89%	11.20%	1490
1936/37	4.36%	25.91%	4.20%	23.50%	7.24%	24.05%	2.34%	8.40%	1285
1937/38		9.34%	5.55%		3.45%	32.23%		49.43%	1766
1938/39		8.07%	5.32%		3.07%	38.75%		44.79%	1822
1939/40		10.20%	5.25%		3.10%	41.22%		40.23%	1618
1940/41									
1941/42		12.32%	7.42%		3.60%	39.15%		37.51%	917
1942/43		20.68%	6.35%		3.24%	25.14%		44.59%	740
1943/44		23.83%	3.77%		3.17%	18.25%		50.98%	663
1944/45		17.48%	2.13%		2.28%	8.05%		70.06%	658
1945/46		19.02%	4.90%		1.87%	3.17%		71.04%	694

year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	total
1946/47		18.23%	2.31%		2.58%	2.86%		74.01%	735
1947/48		3.1%	1.4%		2.2%	20.0%		73.3%	491
1948/49									
1949/50									
1950/51									
1951/52		10%							
1952/53		21%							
1953/54									
1954/55	1.7%	24.5%	3.3%	25.0%	2.8%	21.0%		20.5%	1,192
1955/56	1.3%	25.8%	3.2%	21.5%	2.1%	18.9%		27.2%	1,198
1956/57	1.2%	33.7%	6.6%	20.8%	0.9%	10.7%		26.1%	992
1957/58	1.3%	28.9%	19.6%	24.3%	0.9%	3.8%		21.2%	1,567
1958/59	1.2%	26.7%	21.0%	21.2%	0.6%	8.6%		20.7%	1756
1959/60	1.0%	30.3%	16.2%	13.5%	0.8%	10.5%		27.7%	1,498
1960/61	1.5%	28.0%	19.0%	13.1%	0.2%	14.8%		23.4%	1,310
1961/62	1.6%	25.0%	15.0%	11.9%	0.6%	17.0%		28.9%	1,272
1962/63	0	25.3%	14.1%	10.7%	0.8%	15.9%		33.2%	1,128
1963/64	0	27.4%	12.3%	12.1%	1.1%	14.9%		32.3%	1,329
1964/65	0	27.6%	5.6%	11.2%	0.6%	15.0%		40.0%	

Source: Annual Reports

Notes:

1. Blank cell indicates missing data
2. From 1937/38 onwards data were already aggregated in Annual Reports

Table 2
Ontario widowed and divorced female population

year	Widowed	Divorced	T=Female 15+	W+D/T
1871	36,418		792,261.00	
1881	49,165		948,368.00	
1891	60,289		1,044,834.00	
1901	69,916	120	7,485,990.00	0.09
1911	79,189	925	860,886.00	0.09
1921	99,423	1,371	1,014,566.00	0.10
1931	118,856	1,015	1,210,401.00*	0.10
1941	142,740	2,865	1,411,222.00	0.10
1951	177,072	7,668	1,677,865.00	0.11
1956	201,133	9,069	1,890,886.00	0.11
1961	223,010	13,228	2,122,295.00	0.11

Source: Statistics Canada, Census

Notes:

1. Blank cell indicates missing data
2. * denotes total female population

Table 3:
Composition of beneficiaries

year	widow	incap. fath.	deserted	foster	order in council	divorced	incarcerated	father caring	unwed
1920/21	87.2%	10.1%	2.0%	0.7%					
1921/22	84.5%	10.5%	3.2%	1.8%					
1922/23	84.1%	10.3%	3.2%	2.4%					
1923/24	82.3%	11.7%	3.4%	2.6%					
1924/25	81.0%	12.3%	4.0%	2.7%					
1925/26	78.3%	13.9%	4.9%	2.9%					
1926/27	76.0%	15.25	5.5%	3.3%					
1927/28	72.6%	17.5%	5.9%	4.0%					
1928/29	70.2%	19.4%	6.4%	4.0%					
1929/30	67.2%	22.1%	6.7%	4.0%					
1930/31	64.5%	24.6%	7.3%	3.6%					
1931/32	62.7%	26.7%	7.3%	3.3%					
1932/33	61.7%	28.1%	7.5%	2.7%					
1933/34	61.4%	28.7%	7.2%	2.7%					
1934/35	60.1%	30.2%	7.0%	2.7%					
1935/36	62.8%	27.1%	7.3%	2.8%					
1936/37	63.4%	26.6%	7.0%	3.0%					
1937/38	63.6%	27.2%	6.3%	2.9%					
1938/39	62.7%	28.5%	5.9%	2.9%					
1939/40	62.5%	29.1%	5.5%	2.9%					
1940/41									
1941/42	68.2%	23.9%	5.1%	2.8%					
1942/43	69.1%	23.4%	4.3%	3.2%					
1943/44	70.0%	22.7%	3.6%	3.7%					
1944/45	71.4%	21.7%	3.3%	3.6%					
1945/46	72.3%	21.3%	3.1%	3.3%					
1946/47	71.3%	21.4%	4.1%	3.2%					
1947/48	67.3%	23.6%	6.0%	3.1%					
1948/49	66.1%	21.6%	9.0%	3.3%					
1949/50	63.4%	21.1%	11.9%	3.5%	0.1%				
1950/51	62.7%	20.9%	12.9%	3.6%	0.3%				
1951/52	61.4%	21.6%	12.2%	3.7%	0.8%	0.3%			

year	widow	inc. fath.	deserted	foster	order in council	divorced	incarcerated	father caring	unwed
1952/53	62.0%	21.0%	11.5%	3.8%	1.4%	0.4%			
1953/54	60.8%	22.5%	10.5%	4.0%	1.4%	0.8%			
1954/55	60.8%	22.5%	10.3%	3.7%	0.6%	1.0%	1.1%		
1955/56	61.0%	22.3%	10.0%	3.7%	0.7%	0.8%	1.5%		
1956/57	57.5%	22.8%	10.2%	4.5%	0.7%	0.8%	1.4%	0.3%	1.8%
1957/58	50.1%	23.9%	9.9%	4.8%	1.0%	0.9%	1.4%	0.4%	7.6%
1958/59	44.9%	26.7%	n/a	5.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8.4%
1959/60	47.2%	25.1%	9.1%	5.6%	1.0%	1.5%	2.0%	0.6%	7.9%
1960/61	46.6%	25.2%	9.2%	5.6%	0.8%	1.6%	2.1%	0.7%	8.2%
1961/62	46.0%	25.6%	8.9%	5.8%	0.7%	1.7%	2.1%	0.6%	8.6%
1962/63	63.3%	GWA	11.1%	7.9%	0.7%	2.5%	2.7%	GWA	11.8%
1963/64	62.2%	GWA	11.1%	7.9%	0.7%	2.9%	2.8%	GWA	12.4%
1964/65	56.2%	GWA	13.8%	7.9%	5.5%	3.2%	3.8%	GWA	14.6%

Source: Annual Reports

Note:

Blank cell indicates missing data

Table 4
Mothers' allowance in Ontario: Number of beneficiaries and allowance amounts

Year	women	% chg	children	% chg	fam/mont	\$ allow.
1920/21	2,660	n/a	8,271	n/a	\$37.79	\$774,667
1921/22	3,559	33.8%	10,922	32.1%	\$35.49	\$1,382,138
1922/23	3,870	8.7%	11,791	8.0%	\$35.56	\$1,612,701
1923/24	4,058	4.9%	12,374	4.9%	\$35.66	\$1,707,894
1924/25	4,185	3.1%	14,577	17.8%	\$35.83	\$1,781,281
1925/26	4,412	5.4%	15,115	3.7%	\$35.91	\$1,876,885
1926/27	4,729	7.2%	16,060	6.3%	\$36.19	\$2,007,557
1927/28	5,139	8.7%	17,328	7.9%	\$36.64	\$2,190,407
1928/29	5,359	4.2%	18,605	7.4%	\$36.53	\$2,306,083
1929/30	5,626	5.0%	19,620	5.5%	\$36.49	\$2,394,088
1930/31	5,998	6.7%	20,906	6.6%		\$2,582,221
1931/32	6,228	3.9%	21,468	2.7%	\$37.00	\$2,698,788
1932/33*	6,523	4.7%	22,068	2.8%		\$2,819,111
1933/34	7,064	8.3%	23,173	5.0%		\$3,026,155
1934/35~	7,517	6.4%	22,417	3.3%		\$1,390,621~
1935/36b	10,413	38.5%	26,697	19.1%		\$3,946,816
1936/37	11,420	9.7%	28,700	7.5%		\$4,582,524
1937/38	11,901	4.2%	29,551	3.0%		\$4,851,641
1938/39**	12,215	2.6%	29,630	0.3%		\$5,000,040
1939/40	12,139	-0.6%	29,353	-0.9%		\$5,057,286
1940/41	11,151	-8.1%				7\$4,814,091
1941/42	10,086	-9.6%	24,706			\$4,318,536
1942/43	7,982	-20.9%	20,932	-15.3%		7\$3,310,346
1943/44	7,527	-5.7%	18,032	-13.9%	\$40.33	\$3,750,861
1944/45	7,082	-5.9%	16,811	-6.8%	\$41.68	\$3,581,251
1945/46	6,687	-5.6%	15,976	-5.0%	\$41.91	\$3,375,547
1946/47	6,587	-1.5%	15,688	-1.8%	\$42.20	\$3,291,408
1947/48	6,300	-4.36%	17,620	12.3%	\$57.50	\$3,344,073
1948/49	6,815	8.2%	17,398	-1.3%		\$4,378,430
1949/50	7,304	7.2%	15,581			\$5,126,718
1950/51	7,382	1.1%	15,885		\$63.01	\$5,284,893
1951/52	7,748	3.1%	16,843	8.2%	\$66.87	\$5,668,698

Year	women	% chg	children	% chg	fam/mont	\$ allow
1952/53	7,621		16,798		\$68.84	\$6,002,303
1953/54	7,059	-7.4%	15,896		\$72.37	\$6,219,337
1954/55	7,294	3.3%	16,496	4.5%	\$76.23	\$6,545,452
1955/56	7,266	0.4%	16,664	1.0%	\$77.90	\$6,760,779
1956/57	7,418	2.1%	17,309	3.9%	\$86.61	\$6,985,225
1957/58	8,580	15.7%	20,247	17.0%	\$104.38	\$8,947,401
1958/59	9,433	9.9%	22,632	11.8%	\$108.80	\$11,033,373
1959/60	9,722	3%	23,790	5.1%		\$12,138,215
1960/61	10,149	4.4%	25,049	5.3%		\$12,877,725
1961/62a	10,359	2.1%	25,537	1.9%		\$13,650,401
1962/63a	7,446	-28.1%	17,291e	-32.3%		\$12,870,362
1963/64a	7,747	4.0%	18,436e	6.6%		\$11,130,250
1964/65a	8,821	13.9%	21,406	16.1%		\$12,230,028

Source: Annual Reports

Notes:

1. Blank cell indicates missing data
2. ~ denotes change in fiscal year referring to a period from Nov. 1, 1934 to March 1, 1935
3. As of 1943/44 medical amount is extra
4. As of 1944/45 fuel is extra
5. As of 1956/57 unwed mothers began to be eligible
6. e denotes an estimate
7. a denotes exclusion of Dependent Fathers Allowances who were transferred to GWA as of 1962/63
8. b denotes inclusion of mother with 1 child as of 1935/36
9. women refers to number of families at the last month
10. children refers to total number of children per year

Table 5
Beneficiaries by nationality

year	% Canadian	% other British	% naturalized
1920/21	70.8%	25.3%	3.9%
1921/22	70.7%	23.0%	6.3%
1922/23	68.7%	24.2%	7.1%
1923/24	69.4%	24.0%	6.6%
1924/25	67.7%	25.0%	7.3%
1925/26	66.0%	26.0%	8.0%
1926/27	65.1%	26.3%	8.6%
1927/28	64.5%	26.6%	8.9%
1928/29	64.4%	26.7%	8.9%
1929/30	63.5%	27.4%	9.1%
1930/31	63.3%	26.9%	9.8%
1931/32	63.6%	26.2%	10.2%
1932/33	63.8%	25.3%	10.9%
1933/34	63.8%	25.1%	11.1%
1934/35	64.1%	24.6%	11.3%
1935/36	63.6%	25.7%	10.7%
1936/37	63.5%	25.4%	11.1%
1937/38	63.8%	24.7%	11.5%
1938/39	64.3%	24.0%	11.7%
1939/40	64.5%	23.8%	11.7%
1940/41			
1941/42	65.6%	22.6%	11.8%
1942/43	66.3%	22.1%	11.6%
1943/44	69.0%	20.0%	11.0%
1944/45	69.0%	19.5%	11.5%
1945/46	69.9%	19.2%	10.9%
1946/47	71.0%	18.5%	10.5%
average	65.6%	23.3%	11.1%

Source: Annual Reports

Note:
Blank cell indicates missing data

Table 6
Rate of rejection of new applications

1920/29	not available	
1930/31	513 cases ineligible of a total of ? applications	
1931/32	31.7% of 1,931 new applications	
1932/33	39.64% of 1,723	
1933/34	43.65% of 2,167	
1934/35	39.10% of 863	(only 5 months)
1935/36	36.70% of 3,855	
1936/37	58.18% of 2,408	
1937/38	35.68% of 3,425	
1938/39	43.3% of 4,207	
1939/40	35.60% of 2,989	
1940/41	not available	
1941/42	42.84% of 2,010	
1942/43	49.01% of 1,467	
1943/44	30.79% of 1,559	
1944/45	33.62% of 1,511	
1945/46	51.49% of 1,641	
1946/47	48.93% of ?	
1947/54	not available	
1954/55	43.66% of 2,730	
1955/56	48.38% of 2,476	
1956/57	41.10% of 2,414	
1957/58	43.82% of 3,576	
1958/59	48.45% of 3,624	
1959/60	43.48% of 3,445	
1960/61	39.83% of 3,289	
1961/62	43.77% of 3,121	
1962/63	38.84% of 2,904	(including dependent father)
1963/64	40.60% of 3,273	"

Source: Annual Reports

Year/ Reasons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total #	% bene.
1941/42b		15.5%	6.9%		43.1%	14.5%		10.3%	9.8%	2615	21.0%
1942/43b		39.9%	5.8%		26.7%	8.7%		8.3%	10.7%	3400	31.4%
1943/44b		22.0%	5.0%		38.1%	5.9%		11.8%	17.2%	1888	20.6%
1944/45b		20.6%	5.4%		31.8%	6.1%		10.5%	25.7%	1682	19.7%
1945/46b		23.6%	5.6%		31.8%	2.7%		12.4%	23.8%	1649	24.7%
1946/47b		24.0%	5.4%		21.9%	5.1%		13.5%	30.1%	1440	21.9%
1947/48b		1.3%	2.6%		28.0%	5.3%		13.0%	49.8%	1517	
1948/49b		1.2%	2.5%		30.1%	1.7%		16.5%	48.0%	1457	
1949/50b		5.7%	0.4%		39.2%	8.0%		11.9%	34.7%	1440	
1950/51b		4.0%	0.3%		36.9%	11.5%		12.3%	35.0%	1635	
1951/52b		4.2%	0.2%		19.4%	11.8%		17.4%	47.0%	1429	
1952/53b		2.4%			12.6%	11.4%		12.0%	40.0%	1866	
1953/54											
1954/55	0.7%	19.1%	4.5%	2.8%	34.1%	13.8%	1.7%	11.8%	11.5%	1605	22.0%
1955/56	1.7%	24.6%	3.6%	3.6%	33.6%	10.0%	1.1%	10.8%	11.0%	1940	21.1%
1956/57c		0.8%			37.7%		8.8%	51.4%	1.3%	374	21.3%
1957/58c		0.7%			36.9%		7.7%	42.2%	10.5%	439	19.0%
1958/59c					40.5%		9.6%	47.8%	2.1%	435	19.9%
1959/60c					41.8%		10.3%	46.1%	1.9%	438	20.2%
1961/61c					39.9%		5.9%	41.2%	13.0%	456	19.7%
1961/62c					46.4%		8.2%	43.4%	2.0%	467	19.9%
1962/63c					50.0%		7.7%	39.0%	3.3%	508	20.5%
1963/64											19.6%
1964/65											17.8%

Source: Annual Reports

Notes:

1. Blank cell indicates missing data.
2. * denotes change in fiscal year
3. a denotes mother with one child eligible
4. b denotes already tabulated
5. c denotes data not comparable with previous data.