"Who Counts Now? Re-making the Canadian Citizen"[1]

Patricia Cormack
James F. Cosgrave
Lynda Harling Stalker

Abstract: This paper considers the implications of the 2010 cancellation of the Canada mandatory long-form census in terms of citizenship and the citizen-state relation. Inspecting census questions, Statistics Canada publications, and the arguments of ethnocultural groups pushing for reinstatement of the census, we find a version of citizenship rooted in ethnocultural group membership and the mosaic metaphor. The second part of this paper seeks an historical explanation for the cultural shift away from this version of citizenship that allowed for the cancellation of the census. Here we discuss the state monopolization of gambling. Inspecting advertising and government policy we find a rhetoric of counting that encourages a risk-assessing, individualized, neoliberal, and utilitarian citizen.

Key Words: census; governance; citizenship; Statistics Canada; state; gambling

Résumé. Cet article examine les implications de l'annulation, en 2010, du formulaire long obligatoire du recensement canadienne, pour le concept de la citoyenneté et pour la relation citoyen-État. Après avoir examiné les questions du recensement, les publications de Statistique Canada, et les arguments des groupes de pression ethnoculturels pour le rétablissement du formulaire long, nous trouvons une notion de la citoyenneté ancrée dans l'appartenance ethnoculturelle et dans la métaphore de "la mosaïque culturelle". La deuxième partie de cet article cherche une explication historique pour ce mouvement culturel, loin de cette dernière notion de la citoyenneté, qui a permis l'annulation du l'obligation de remplir le formulaire long. Ici, nous discutons la question du monopole d'État sur les jeux d'argent. Après avoir examiné la publicité pertinente et la politique gouvernementale, nous trouvons une rhétorique de comptage qui encourage une conception du citoyen en tant que "évaluateur de risques,» qui est individualiste, néolibérale et utilitariste.

Mots clés: recensement; gouvernement; citoyenneté; Statistique Canada; état; jeux d'argent

INTRODUCTION

On June 17, 2010 the Government of Canada issued an Order in Council that authorized the cancellation of the nation-wide, decadal mandatory long-form census. It was replaced by a mandatory short-form census, with most of the questions from the previous long-form census shifted to the new voluntary National Household Survey. This announcement was met with a firestorm of resistance from organizations and communities all over Canada and the resignation of Munir Sheikh, Chief Statistician of Statistics Canada — the government agency charged with administering the census. Business, planning, and advocacy groups argued that without these data their work would become impossible to execute. For example, a damning Canadian Medical Association editorial stated that "… Canada will stand alone among developed nations in not having detailed information about its population" (Cohen and Hebert 2010:E541). Other groups argued that their very existence as parts of the Canadian multicultural mosaic was at stake. Without being officially counted, they argued, they would cease to "count." It is such groups we discuss here, specifically in terms of how they think and talk about counting and citizenship. As we will discuss, these Canadians have come to understand and represent themselves in terms of the categories articulated since Confederation in census questions. Moreover, they understand their capacity to appear "officially," and hence gain access to resources and political representation, as dependent on their being counted as linguistic, regional, cultural, ethnic, and religious groups.

We investigate this change in census policy by way of an historic comparison with another area of citizen-state relations — the legalization and state monopolization of gambling in Canada. As these two case studies show, the rhetorics of counting that constitute the census and the discourse around gambling are radically different, generating contrasting versions of citizenship. In the first case study we inspect census questions, Statistics Canada publications, and the arguments of ethnocultural groups pushing for reinstatement of the census, and find a version of citizenship rooted in ethnocultural group membership and the mosaic metaphor. The second part of this paper seeks an historical explanation for the cultural shift away from this version of citizenship that allowed for the cancellation of the census. Here we discuss the case of state monopolization of gambling. Inspecting advertising and government policy we find a rhetoric of counting that encourages a risk-assessing, individualized, neoliberal, and utilitarian version of citizenship. State-owned gambling and the withdrawal of the census point to versions of state conduct vis-à-vis citizens, and frame the citizen in particular ways. While

the withdrawal of the census appears to signify a withdrawal of the state from the lives of citizens, the gambling example shows a curious form of state expansion into their lives. Ironically, the move of the state into gambling enterprises foreshadows the construction of the citizen offered in the government arguments against the long-form census. Its logic has set the cultural and political stage for the withdrawal of the census.

Our analysis contributes to discussions of contemporary forms of state conduct and governing (Dean 1999; Nicoll 2010). The individual-izing discourse is important for our discussion because it sustains both the argument for the long-form census withdrawal, and the legitimacy and use of gambling as a form of state conduct. The counting of citizens in our two case studies thus also addresses the question of the "public good" as it is conceived in early 21st century Canada.

Case 1: Census, Citizen, and Mosaic

Hundreds of groups publicly opposed the removal of the mandatory long-form census. These included organizations representing health, antipoverty, planning, religion, marketing, law, insurance, ethnicity, language, teaching, research, youth, aging, women, family, childcare, unions, chambers of commerce, municipalities, provinces, and civil rights organizations. This list is notable in that it points to the number of organizations and professions that depend on statistical data in or-der to plan, manage, advocate, and do business. For many organizations and agencies, census data allow them to prove the existence of various groups, locate them statistically, present the problem to government, and measure the effectiveness of their actions once implemented. One of the professional groups to protest the removal of the mandatory long-form census was the Canadian Sociological Association, citing both loss of data and the issue of the "common good" (Canadian Sociological As-sociation 2010). Certainly these assertions about the value of such data are true, but sociologists are also well aware of the strange contradiction of counting people and their attributes. Counting is a primary tool in the rhetoric of the "social fact," but also a social practice that must be under-stood and inspected like any other. In his attempt to make the case for a "science of society" (1982), Emile Durkheim famously used statistics to argue that suicide was a product of social rather than individual forces (1951). On the other hand, W.E.B. Du Bois questioned this quantitative gaze, noting that in their efforts to point to social problems, sociolo-gists count only apparent failures and humiliations of vulnerable groups, and overlook the less quantifiable realities like the effort and determina-

tion behind their apparently small advances. Speaking as a member of the African-American community, he said that sociologists "gleefully count [our] bastards and prostitutes" (1965:218). Max Weber (1946) stated that while there is no shame in calculation, the broader culture of modern rationality threatens to turn all moral questions into utilitarian ones and by extension, all sociologists into technocrats. Simmel (1971), foreshadowing Foucault, argued that social categories like "the poor" do not exist until they are administratively acted toward on this basis. Even Durkheim, especially in his later work, would have to concede that the statistic is a "collective representation" within the classificatory systems of modern society. The very authority and logic of the statistic must come under inspection (1965). This classical literature all suggests that sociology should study how modern societies generate meaning, as they lend themselves an identity by way of rituals of counting.

In contemporary Canada this ratification of group identity by way of state counting manifests in the hundreds of cultural, ethnic, linguistic, regional, and religious organizations opposed to the census reform. While the Conservative Party and Prime Minister Steven Harper argued that this change of policy reflects an expressed desire on the part of Canadians for more privacy, official documentation could not verify this claim (Thompson 2010). In other words, for many people, privacy of self is less important than their membership in a group and the official acknowledgment of their group. For example, the lawyer representing Aboriginal groups (arguing that the removal of the census violates the Charter of Rights and Freedoms) stated in court: "If you're not counted, then no one is accountable to you"(MacDonald 2010). The Federation of Francophone and Acadian Communities stated: "The consequence of not having reliable and representative data … to develop programs and services for Francophones could well be an erosion of the vitality of French … in Canada" (Quinty 2011).

For French-speaking minorities, census data help them to count when they make the case for minority language education to provincial governments. According to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms they have this right "where numbers warrant." Legal commentators note that this entitlement can be undermined by slow administration on the part of school boards and government; if assimilation occurs while this population is waiting for this service, it undermines their capacity to make their argument based in numbers (Canadian Legal Information Institute 2004).

Religious organizations added to this argument for access to money and resources, the concern that religion itself could become socially and politically invisible — that is, overly privatized. The Canadian Islamic

Congress also expressed concern that opinions about minority religious groups will regress without the authority of census data (Delic 2010). The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada asked: "If a religious group doesn't show up in StatsCan's numbers, will they have influence in the public square? Or will their influence potentially go unnoticed?" (Storey 2010)

In counterpoint to the government's argument that the removal of the census was to guard a desire for privacy, religious organizations, including the two quoted here, argued that religious Canadians feel hesitant about stating their faith publicly, so that they must be encouraged to identify themselves in an official and anonymous way to assert their right to their collective religious identity. This is similar to the concerns of women's groups, who made unpaid housework socially "appear" by lobbying until such questions were added for the first time on 1996 Canadian census (Luxton and Vosko 1998). Aboriginal and francophone groups — and the Canadian Council on Social Development on behalf of a number of groups — took the government to court in an attempt to reinstate the long-form census, arguing that such data gathering about them is guaranteed on constitutional grounds. Aboriginal groups also have criticized the use of the term "First Nations/Indian Band" in the voluntary National Household Survey, arguing that the term excludes those who live off reserve in the count — lowering the number who will identify as Aboriginal (Ditchburn 2010).

While opinion polls show most Canadians support the mandatory long-form census (Angus Reid 2010), there are others who have resisted it. For some groups and individuals the census is more than just a threat to individual privacy. As Curtis notes (2002:12), 19th century Quebec peasants, who were accustomed to paying heavy tithes to the Church, also saw the census as preparation for a tax grab and refused to cooperate with enumerators. (In our discussion of gambling we will see how making it into a pleasurable recreation can solve this problem of taxation.) Recently in Canada, Sandra Finley was found guilty of violating the census laws by refusing to fill in the 2006 census. Finley argued that both privacy and the use of companies associated with the US military (Lockheed Martin) to process the information were at issue. The presiding judge commented in her ruling that the census is necessary for planning and administration, and that the rights of the individual must be weighed against the common good. Given that the judge made this comment on a law that is no longer in effect, this statement takes on a particularly political edge.

Undoubtedly, census is the first step in state administration of its citizens. Canada's first census, conducted by France in 1666, was clearly a task in colonial information gathering in the interest of understand-

ing what France could get out of this new territory. Knowing who was in this territory, and what threats they might pose to French hegemony, was essential. For the British, the census later served the same purpose (Statistics Canada 2005).

Michel Foucault (1991) argued that "populations" are artifacts of counting and governance. The census organizes people into official categories and makes these groupings seem natural so that the administration of citizens in and through these categories also comes to seem natural and obvious. The longer people are administered in this way, the more they come to identify themselves by these ways of being counted. In its discussion of the 1891 census, Statistics Canada explains that Canadians had to be socialized "through newspapers and from pulpits" to cooperate with census takers (Statistics Canada 2005). In his study of the historical rise of the Canadian census during the 19th century, Curtis (2002) notes that the census was an essential part of state formation because this "making of populations" shapes citizens for the state. The authority of these measurements as self-evident and apolitical attests, Curtis argues, to the power of the modern state to "frame social representations" (2002:24). Curtis gives intriguing examples of how populations are reflections of administrative goals as well as the legal and social ideologies of their time. For example, 19th century Quebec women were counted as being where their husbands or fathers were, while men were counted as being wherever they actually happened physically to be at the time of enumeration. Obscenely, American slaves were counted as 60% of a white body (Curtis 2002:25).

Curtis argues that the census is an important part of state formation in that it helps establish the notion of citizen by way of its questions and counting. He also points to the fact that citizens respond to the census in various ways in a negotiation of citizenship. In Canada, part of the necessity for the census was to work out the details of regional representation in the parliament, as mandated by the BNA Act. In other words, in the context of a democracy, counting is linked to the notion of representation as well as administration. People who understand their political interests within the context of their particular group membership want to make sure that they appear as a large constituency. For example, Robert Brym (1999) argues the 1996 census claim of a decline in the number of Jews in Canada could be faulty because the category of "Jew" is a complex mixture of ideas that include race, ethnicity, and religion.

Certainly Statistics Canada is aware that its categories are precarious constructs. In "Canada's Ethnocultural Mosaic," they state:

The concept of ethnicity is fluid and is probably one of the more com-

plex concepts measured in the census. Respondents' understanding or views about their ethnicity, awareness of their family background, number of generations in Canada, the length of time since immigration, and the social context at the time of the census can all affect the reporting of ethnicity from one census to another. Increasing intermarriage or unions among various groups has led to an increase in the reporting of multiple ancestries, which has added to the complexity of the ethnic data. (Statistics Canada 2010)

While conceding that ethnicity is a "concept" and increasingly "fluid," Statistics Canada is not prepared to give up on the notion of ethnicity. As the above-mentioned document explains: "[s]ince 1970, the demand for statistical information on ethnicity has increased with government policies in the area of multiculturalism and diversity." The problem of counting ethnicity is treated as a technical concern that is being exacerbated by citizen's temporal distance from lands of origin, their "views about ethnicity," and their tendency to out-marry. As we will show, allowing citizens to claim multiple identities in the census solves this technical problem. More importantly, however, this statement acknowledges the dynamic between state and citizen in that the latter's "demands" for such an ethnic identity are accommodated and encouraged. Finally, as we will discuss, even in the hands of Statistics Canada, the "facts" of counting ethnicity become folded into the metaphor of mosaic.

In keeping with the notion of the dispassionate collection of "facts," most questions in the 2011 National Household Survey are not justified, but simply asked. Question 25, for example, reads: "Where was each of this person's parents born?" It offers two choices of answer: "Born in Canada" or "Born outside Canada. Specify country." Questions 17 and 19, however, are different on this count. Question 19 reads "Is this person: White, South Asian, Chinese, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Arab, Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean, Japanese, Other — Specify." This question is accompanied by the following text: "This information is collected in accordance with the Employment Equity Act and its Regulations and Guidelines to support programs that promote equal opportunity for everyone to share in the social, cultural, and economic life of Canada." Question 19 is justified by the practical and legal need to ask about ethnicity-race, indicating awareness that this question might be sensitive for the respondent.

Question 17 ("What were the ethnic or cultural origins of this person's ancestors?") is not framed in terms of legal or practical obligations of the state, but rather the "good" of diversity itself: "This question collects information on the ancestral origins of the population and provides information about the composition of Canada's diverse population." As

explained in the form, this question is meant to get at the respondent's identification with a distant — almost always dead — group of people. In this case, categories are not offered, but instead four lines for writing in one's response, along with the instruction: "Specify as many origins as applicable using capital letters." Relative to other questions about ethnicity, this question invites a scope of imagination rather than the predetermined administration of population into practical-legal categories.[2] This deployment of imagination can be tied to the longstanding nation-building policies of the cultural mosaic — policies that, as Statistics Canada makes clear, support ongoing dialogue between state and citizen groups (Statistics Canada, 2011).

As we have indicated, both in its publications and in its censuses, Statistics Canada promotes the general good of multiculturalism and the metaphor of the mosaic. The earliest known use of the mosaic metaphor to describe Canada was by American writer Victoria Hayward (in 1922) and secondly by Kate A. Foster (in 1926). However, it was not until 1938 with the publication of *The Canadian Mosaic,* by John Murray Gibbon, that the metaphor became synonymous with Canadian society. Gibbon was a publicist with Canadian Pacific Railway, founding member of the Canadian Authors' Association, and deemed a person of national importance (McKay and Bates 2010; Henderson 2005). In *The Canadian Mosaic*, Gibbon, as a Scottish immigrant, sets out to "understand the Canadian people." In order to do this "we must know more than just the geography and scenery of Canada, and the customs and habits of the Canadians. We must also study their racial origins" (1939:vii). In identifying racial origins, Gibbon turns to the 1931 Canadian Census, which sets out the idea of origin as being biological, cultural, and geographical, traced through a patrilineal descent. From this he develops the iconic image of the Canadian mosaic:

> The Canadian people today presents itself as a decorated surface, bright with inlays of separate coloured pieces, not painted in colours blended with brush on palette. The original background in which the inlays are set is still visible, but these inlays cover more space than that background, and so the ensemble may truly be called mosaic. (1939:viii)

---

2. In this context, we note that #2 asks about "sex" with no practical or moral justification. It also disciplines the respondent into only two choices of sex — with no "other" category for transgendered citizens to fill in a third response. Significantly, while ethnicity is treated as a highly imaginative issue of identification with particular groups and categories, sex is treated as a much more restricted and biologically determined category — akin to race. "Male" is also the first choice, which represents neither the numerical nor alphabetical primacy of this group. It seems to follow on Simone de Beauvoir's 1949 observation that men are both the neutral and the positive signifier in western society, with women standing as the "second sex."

To be sure this is a romantic metaphor, but its practical underpinnings are already present. Gibbon's intent was to publicize Canada for the purposes of tourism and immigration. As discussed by Henderson (2005), Gibbon was a pluralist who celebrated the diversity found in early 20th century Canada, while ignoring for the most part Aboriginal and non-European citizens. Gibbon promoted events like folk exhibitions that highlighted the more innocent versions of folk culture — especially craft, costume, and dance. In his book these essentialized and apolitical groups are each described in a chapter, with an accompanying colour sketch of their "typical" look and costume. Gibbon's use of mosaic metaphor as a whole made up of ethnic-racial-cultural groups is based in his composite constructs of these "types" — e.g. the "Hebrew-Canadian Type." These now seem stereotypical and offensive, but the census statistic does the same kind of work. It collects Canadians into various composite groups based on the assumption that these groups have some meaning and import. In his iconic 1965 study, *The Vertical Mosaic*, John Porter offered the title as "a term chosen to convey the idea that Canada was best understood not as an egalitarian melting pot but as a fixed hierarchy of distinct and unequal classes and ethnic groups" (Helmes-Hayes and Curtis 1998:8). The Gibbon vision of the mosaic was nothing more than a set of "collective delusions" that Canadians needed to recognize as mythical (Helmes-Hayes and Curtis 1998:8). As Porter put it, there is a "hierarchical relationship between Canada's many cultural groups" in terms of "class and power" (1965:xiii).

Multiculturalism is the government policy that entrenches the unifying myth of the mosaic into official Canadian identity. It stems from Lester B. Pearson's 1960s government's initiative to deal with the Quiet Revolution happening in Quebec (Seiler 2003). The government at the time set out to recognize the Quebecois through a policy of bilingualism and biculturalism. Many ethnic and race groups that did not fit into the "two founding nations" objected to this; Trudeau's 1970s response was to have "multiculturalism in the framework of bilingualism" (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission Report 1971). This was firmly entrenched in the 1988 Multiculturalism Act.

Since the 1990s a number of academic writers have criticized the mosaic and multiculturalism as meant to temper and depoliticize the racial and ethnic "other" in Canada (Bannerji 2010, Day 1998, Mackey 1999). One of the most widely read books of this type comes from Neil Bissoondath (1994), who argues that espousing multiculturalism reached cult-like status by the 1990s. A Canadian who did not toe the multicultural line was often cast as nothing less than a "traitor" and "racist" (1994:5). Yasmeen Abu-Laban (2003) believes that Bissoondath, while making

a valuable critique, might be simplifying the situation. She points out that there have been many dissenting voices to the multicultural rhetoric. Quebec, under the leadership of René Lévesque, criticized multiculturalism as undermining the unique claim of its heritage by leveling everyone into an "ethnic" (Abu-Laban 2003:258). Quebec offered an argument for "interculturalism," whereby "within the context of the supremacy of the French language, immigrants and minorities have a right to maintain aspects of their culture" (Abu-Laban 2003:258). Aboriginal groups also resisted the idea of multiculturalism, arguing it could weaken their claim to land titles if they were perceived as merely another ethnic group. Nevertheless, almost two decades later, francophone and Aboriginal groups have made the strongest arguments against the elimination of the long-form census — using legal arguments that come from the BNA Act and the Charter. Francophone and Aboriginal communities, those that did not perceive themselves as either pieces of the Canadian mosaic or ethnic members of multiculturalism, use the census to reinforce their status as distinct societies. In any case, the rhetoric employed often relies upon the discourses of diversity. Commenting on their Charter challenge, Federation of Francophone and Acadian Communities president stated "We're Canadian citizens. We're not just French citizens, so of course we understand the need for this information for the entire country" (CBC 2010).

In the 2011 Nels Anderson Lecture, "Taking Leave of our Census/Senses," given at the Canadian Sociological Association meetings, Monica Boyd argued that there were a number of elements that framed the decision around the abolition of the mandatory long-form census — the control exerted by Prime Minister Harper, the lessened power of civil servants to influence policy, and a general political trend toward neoliberalism. The Conservative government has continuously argued that the long-form census in some way violates individuals' right to privacy. This might be seen as the government's effort to no longer coerce Canadians to complete the census. However, if one of the goals of the long-form census is to help alleviate employment discrimination and disadvantage (as found in question #19 discussed above), it would be consistent with this neoliberal position to discontinue with the census tradition. Moreover, as a broader cultural shift it also helps explain the removal of more general "mosaic" questions (found in #17). Bradley and Luxton point out that neoliberals have a deep-rooted "opposition to anything that smacks of collectivism or economic redistribution.… They believe that individual freedom of choice is maximised through competition. Competition is perceived as a naturally occurring social good, and the best method of social organisation" (2010:7–8).

Case 2: Gambling, Citizen, and Neoliberalism

In order to understand the change to the Canadian census, we must consider socially broader and historically longer changes in the citizen-state relation. The history of gambling legalization and state monopolization offers stark parallels to the apparently new version of the citizen offered up in the post-mandatory census Canada. We find in the case of gambling the inducement of a neoliberal, individuated, and utilitarian citizen.

If some of the more prominent issues and vocal criticisms generated by the withdrawal of the mandatory long-form census relate to concerns about official ethnocultural representation, we note that Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's announcement that Canada would adopt a multicultural social policy follows shortly after the legalization of gambling and other activities through the *Criminal Law Amendment Act 1968–69*. This bill led to the decriminalization of homosexual acts, the legalization of abortion and lotteries, and the criminalization of drinking and driving. These governmental enactments were responding to, and representing, shifts in Canadian society that had been occurring in the 1960s. Significantly, while the decriminalization of homosexuality appeared to mark a shift in the state's orientation to certain moral matters (i.e., getting out of the bedrooms of the nation, as Trudeau put it in 1967), the legalization of gambling actually led, not to less state involvement in the activity, but more. This occurred, not by way of allowing and regulating private industry involvement, but by securing for the state the opportunity to monopolize gambling. The original objective of legalization was to provide funding for the 1976 Montreal Olympics. The *Criminal Law Amendment Act* gave authority to provincial governments to "manage and conduct" gambling games such as lotteries (Campbell 2009). In 1985 the Criminal Code was further amended. According to Campbell, "Importantly, this amendment permitted computer, video, and slot devices — prohibited in Canada since 1924 — to be managed and conducted exclusively by provincial authorities" (2009:71).

The diversity of ethnic groups demanding recognition in Canada (through increased immigration in the 1960s), the revenue-generating potential of lotteries, as well as the negative connotations traditionally associated with gambling, required new state strategies for the management of immigration and gambling. However, if multiculturalism and gambling represent problems of administration and integration, the definition and framing of each signified the integration of citizens into different social orders or imagined communities. It should be pointed out that gambling enterprises have been used in various jurisdictions (the US, Canada, and Australia) to manage or negotiate social, political, and

economic relations between states and indigenous groups (Belanger 2011; Mason 2000; Nicoll 2010). In the Canadian context First Nations casinos began to develop and proliferate in the 1990s (Belanger 2011).

One lesson offered by the social and moral career of gambling in Canada is that legalization of activities does not always mean less state involvement, but sometimes more. The idea that the state should own gambling in Canada points to a particular moral-political habitus in Canada — evidence of a bureaucratic, if not statist orientation.

In Canada, where provincial monopolies exist, a typical understanding of the government's interest in gambling is that it is a "tax grab" — merely a method of generating revenue for government coffers. This is true in a general sense, but further analysis suggests there is far more to the story. The state's increased involvement in gambling enterprises after the 1985 Criminal Code amendment, particularly through the expansion of casino and Electronic Gaming Machine (EGM) gambling in the early 1990s, suggests a shift in the citizen-state relationship. In effect, the move into gambling enterprises represents a salient example of the neoliberalization of the state and its relation to citizens.

It is significant to note that while a number of Canadian Crown Corporations have been privatized (e.g., PetroCan, Air Canada, CN Rail, TeleGlobe), gambling has been organized as a Crown Corporation by the provinces — where, in effect, the state acts like a corporation and enters directly and constitutes the consumer (gambling) market through the provincial monopolies. Not only has the Crown Corporation seen a diminished place in the economic life of Canada through these privatizations, but, with gambling, the Crown Corporation has changed its shape — seeking to influence the consumption activities of Canadians for the purpose of enabling state activities.

As we will see, this requires an orientation to the Canadian citizen as an individuated consumer, who is also asked to act "responsibly" in their gambling-consumption proclivities. The revenues accrued (gambler losses) will go to general revenues, community groups, and other state-funded initiatives (Ontario Lottery and Gaming Commission [OLG] 2011). This is dually significant: a Crown Corporation "benefitting" Canadians through the shaping and risk-managing of citizens' consumption activities (i.e., the transfer of money from individual gamblers to state revenue outputs), and the constitution of Canadians discursively as individual consumers. The citizen is oriented as the consumer — an individualized actor, rather than a member of a larger group category. Or, if there is an assumption of group identification, it is to the state and its utilitarian interests in the redistribution of revenues, proclaimed to be for the collective good of Canadians. But this assumption is not articulated

at the level of the individual consumer, or really in terms of the state's orientation to the citizen.

The representations of gambling in the lottery corporation advertising do not signify where the gambling revenue outputs go; rather it is the consumer phantasmagoria that is depicted, including images of societal escape: to yachts on the tranquil sea, to the isolated canyons of Utah. The "public good" is not a selling feature — indeed, the ads celebrate the freedom from work that is possible if one wins: the celebration of getting something for almost nothing. It is difficult to see the public good here — if it exists, it is only through a utilitarian conception in which the pursuit of exclusively private ends produces a common good.

As discussed, the long-form census oriented to conceptions of group belonging and a version of citizenship based on such identification. Canadians were framed as being more than just individuals. The political shift away from these conceptions and the voluntaristic orientation that underlies this shift shows certain affinities to the discursive framing of legalized gambling. The curious situation with gambling is that the apparent voluntarism of gambling — to consume it or not, and to be "responsible" for your own gambling behaviours (notably the excesses) — is supported by the state's role as monopolist and beneficiary of gambling enterprises. In other words, if the spirit behind the removal of the long-form census is precipitated on the idea that the state is impinging on individual privacy and freedom, the gambling example shows how the state only appears to withdraw from the pleasures, proclivities, and interests of Canadians. In other words, the state provides the opportunity for gambling activity — so that gambling is available like any other entertainment product — and promotes it. The individual is free to consume the product. However, this free consumption is framed by the state organization and monopolization: the state "withdraws" in order to constitute citizens in a particular way. According to Della Sala:

> It might be argued that the legalization of gambling is a sign of the "enabling" of state activity: after all, it is now regulating a widespread activity and reaping the financial rewards. However, it is doing so in recognition that it does not have the capacity to do otherwise. It also signals that the state does not have the moral authority or the capacity to act in the name of the social. It can intervene in the case of gambling because it does so in the name of promoting individual choice, "entertainment" and freedom. Individuals willingly give their money to the state — they invariably always do — through games of chance because they are assuming their own risks and they no longer have faith in the state mechanism to assume risk collectively. (Della Sala 2004:23)

This incapacity to act in the name of the social and to assume risk collectively has consequences, not only for the welfare state's ability to insure its citizens (through the funding of social programs and the social safety net), but for its definition of citizens and its approach to and definition of collective membership. Gambling gives us a clear example of a shift in governing — and relatedly of counting and surveillance; however, the census example also reveals a particular citizen-state relation. The withdrawal of the long-form census may or may not relate to state capacity: it does however posit citizens as *individuals.*

The raison d'etre for state-owned gambling is the revenue interest, but job creation and the stimulation of depressed economies are also important motives for gambling implementation. The "social good" of gambling is typically represented by the revenues generated by the government gambling corporations, such as the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation (OLG). Counting is featured first and foremost through the representation of these revenues:

> Ever wonder where the money goes? OLG generates $3.8 billion annually in economic activity in Ontario. (based on the period April 1, 2008 to March 31, 2009 — OLG 2011)

Similar representations of economic benefit are found on the other Canadian lottery corporation websites or through publicly available annual reports (see, e.g., Atlantic Lottery Corporation 2011).

Aside from the representations of benefit here in the OLG numbers, we note the money *extracted* from Ontarians (along with visitors from other provinces and countries). In other words, the benefit to Ontarians must be measured against the money removed from various local Ontario economies, so that state-owned gambling must be seen as in competition for expenditures in those economies. This is a form of state encroachment in economies (an example of the increase in state activity related to liberalization mentioned earlier) that is legitimized through the idea of individual choice: gambling is a legitimate consumer-entertainment activity. However, against the typical provision of such entertainments by private industry, it is the state that is the provider. This signifies more than merely collecting revenues.

An important shift occurred in gambling discourse after the 1985 amendment to the Criminal Code. In granting provinces full jurisdiction over "lottery schemes," the amendments paved the way for the massive explosion of legal gambling forms that we see today (Campbell 2009). Since the early 1990s the Canadian gambling landscape has come to include casinos, sports betting, EGMs, and scratch card games in convenience stores. The provincial governments are also moving into online

gaming. Prior to 1985 the primary state gambling form was lotteries. Lotteries were presented to the public in advertisements and in the draw programs themselves in terms of their collective-community benefit. Lotteries now advertise huge jackpots (up to $50 million for Lotto Max) and, as noted, represent individualized consumerist fantasies. As Lotto 6/49 says it, "Imagine the Freedom" not to work, and to consume without limit. The collective benefit is absent in the advertisements. An important question that arises here concerns the image of the community and the larger collectivity. To what collectivity does the individual lottery ticket buyer belong? What is the link between the individual and the "public good" the revenues support?

If lottery corporations must represent benefit in dollar amounts generated, a feature of the gambling field is the monetary representations found in lotteries and other gambling forms. Indeed, the monetary representation is an important feature of gambling discourse: lottery jackpot advertisements are ubiquitous and the casino environment itself is rich with monetary representation. Significantly, the expansion of gambling since the early 1990s has meant the embedding of gambling into everyday Canadian life — it is easily accessible. It has become a feature of state (revenue) infrastructure, an important mechanism of revenue delivery from individuals to the state. However, the expansion and normalization of gambling has brought with it the social problem of the problem gambler. As Williams et al. (2011) note, one of the contentious issues in assessing the socioeconomic impacts of gambling is "how to capture and quantify the social impacts." As a consequence, "Some impact studies of gambling have simply ignored social impacts, choosing to only measure the most apparent and obvious economic benefits that are easily quantifiable (e.g., gambling revenue, tax revenue, employment numbers)" (Williams et al. 2011). Thus, "failing to measure social impacts is not an infrequent occurrence in the socioeconomic analysis of gambling" (Williams et al. 2011).

We raise this feature of the measuring and counting of legalized gambling because it demonstrates the selective uses and representations of counting and points to the political uses of measuring and counting. However, where Dubois noted critically the sociological counting of African-American social problems, Canadian provincial governments count their problem gamblers, but as part of their interest in risk-managing their involvement in gambling markets and governing gambling-citizens. Such political questions do not arise in the federal census — long or short form.

The problem gambler can be framed in a Durkheimian way: as signifying the problem of social integration under social conditions of neoliberalization and individualization. In other words, as gambling has been

liberalized (as a sociohistorical feature of the prominence of neoliberalism in Western societies), and the moral constraints and prohibitions removed, the individual must learn to constrain herself or himself. Analogous with Durkheim's analysis of suicide, problem gambling is a sociological and not solely psychological phenomenon; problem gamblers are a casualty of a diminished social or collective existence, and not just victims of gambling "pathology." In Canada, the individual "problem gambler" is an unintended outcome of state policy, i.e., a consequence of easily accessible gambling made possible by the state's gambling expansion and revenue interests. The relation between the problem gambler and the revenue interest has emerged as a governance issue for the state: how to generate and increase gambling revenues while also "solving" (i.e., risk managing) the social problem of the problem gambler.

The solution includes the integration of the problem gambler into the gambling economy through the discursive representation of the (social) problem in official gambling literature and in the gambling research field (Cosgrave 2010). Governments must take an interest in this social problem, and fund research to understand and solve it. Problem and pathological gamblers are counted through prevalence studies that seek to determine numbers and rates in the population.[3] The counting of these individuals demonstrates the state's scientific interest (thus also demonstrating a medical interest in the problem), and allows for the risk management of the (gambling) markets through which they generate revenues. It also allows the problem and the solution to be framed in particular ways — for example, as a problem of a small percentage of individuals who suffer pathology, or in messages of "responsible gambling" to the public.

The representations of gambling counting we have discussed constitute a rhetoric aimed at generating and administering a citizen who is encouraged to think in personal terms (individual risks and private wins), utilitarian terms (individual pathologies as outweighed by general benefits of revenues) and voluntarist terms (gambling as a voluntary and regressive rather than mandatory tax). We have also suggested that the problem gambler, as an object of counting and research, is the social problem representation of this individualizing orientation. Citizens, as gamblers, are exhorted to manage their gambling proclivities, to gamble "responsibly," while their losses accrue to the public good. And this public good does not discriminate: pathological gamblers are healthy con-

---

3. See, for example, New Brunswick 2009 Gambling Prevalence Study, http://www.gnb.ca/0162/gaming/2009_NB_Gambling_Prevalence_Study-e.pdf, Nova Scotia 2007 Adult Gambling Prevalence Study http://www.gov.ns.ca/hpp/publications/Adult_Gambling_Report.pdf, British Columbia Problem Gambling Prevalence Study 2008 http://www.linkbc.ca/torc/downs1/gamb%5B1%5D.pdf

tributors. Thus counting, in this rhetoric, allows for a cost-benefit notion of citizenship and governance, and introduces a new discourse of the public good. The outcome however, is a fragmented conception of the citizen, and the citizen-state relation itself.

Conclusion

We have argued here that counting and measurement are ways the contemporary state shapes the notion of citizen and citizenship. The Canadian census is an example of an apparently rational-legal tool of management that has little to do with the more poetic and imagined notions of nation and citizenship. It appears to involve only the administration of populations and resources. Nevertheless, the very rhetoric found in the census, and Statistics Canada more generally, shows a strong reliance on the metaphor of Canada's ethnocultural mosaic. The long-form census then, when administered to all Canadians, exposes them to particular versions of Canada and the Canadian citizen. Certainly, the mandatory nature of the census itself indicated that collective planning and needs outweighed purported individual concerns with privacy. With the recent withdrawal of the long-form census, both the information used to support the mosaic and the rhetorical tool that purports its good, has been removed from the Canadian political-cultural scene. As the many ethnic, religious, and cultural groups that protested this new policy indicated, their very existence as ethnocultural "good" is at stake. Without official counting, they cannot officially exist. Since the mosaic metaphor is so highly tied in with the federal policy of multiculturalism, the census itself is a tool of mosaic — the good of identity tied to such group membership and the good of each ethnocultural piece or group in itself. That said, Stephen Fielding (2006:93) argues that multiculturalism has been put to many conflicting political uses. One, he calls:

> … Brian Mulroney's Progressive Conservative "Multiculturalism Means Business" agenda. Minority groups henceforth were viewed as repositories of nascent market potential. Their worth — insofar as material support is concerned — was assessed according to the pecuniary feasibility of participation in multi-ethnic initiatives.

Within this field of shifting and contested notions of counting, citizenship, and multiculturalism, the census rhetoric threatens this newer market conception of minority.

In our second case study we looked at the turn on the part of the Canadian state toward the legalization and monopolization of gambling.

On the face of it, census and gambling may appear to be unrelated phenomena. Their connection lies in the expansion of the neoliberal and individuated notion of the Canadian citizen. In other words, the removal of the long-form census needs to be understood in the context of a decades-long shift in the state's formulation of the citizen towards particular interests. In the case of gambling, we find an example that helps explain the removal of the long-form census. While under state monopoly, the experience of gambling on the part of the citizen is fragmented into a number of subject positions — neoliberal, risk assessing, individuated, utilitarian — making the overall place of this activity vis-à-vis citizenship hard to locate. Unlike the mosaic metaphor, however, it is easy to quantify — revenues generated, numbers of problem gamblers, dollars spent on problem gamblers, numbers of community projects supported, etc. How could the ethnocultural piece within a mythopoetic metaphor compete with such calculation of the good?

Hundreds of groups protested the removal of the census, including powerful lobbies like the Canadian Medical Association and many provincial and municipal governments. The federal government was even taken to court on more than one occasion. Nevertheless, the Conservative party was returned to power in June 2011 with its first majority government under Steven Harper's leadership. The administration of the new census occurred within days of this election, with opposition parties not willing, or perhaps not able, to make it a central election issue. Voter turn out was measured at 61.4%.

What then happened to all this organized protest and how did the mandatory long-form census not become an election issue? One preliminary answer is that the neoliberal, utilitarian, and privatized version of citizen has won out, at least for the moment. Sociological research must continue to track this changing image of the citizen in Canada, especially as it is induced by various official rhetorics of counting. If the public good is at stake in all of this, it is because the very notion of the public is being reconstituted.

References

Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. 2003. For export: Multiculturalism and globalization. In Kenneth G. Pryke and Walter C. Soderlund, eds., *Profiles of Canada*. Third edition. Toronto: CSPI.

Atlantic Lottery Corporation (ALC). 2011. http://corp.alc.ca/AboutALC.aspx?rdr=true&LangType=1033 Accessed June 12, 2011.

Angus Reid. 2010. Majority of Canadians support move to reinstate long form census. http://www.angus-reid.com/wpcontent/uploads/2010/10/2010.10.06_Census_CAN.pdf Accessed June 11, 2011.

Bannerji, Himani. 2010. *Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Racism*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.

Belanger, Yale, ed. 2011. *First Nations Gaming in Canada*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press

Bissoondath, Neil. 1994. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin.

Boyd, Monica. 2011. Nels Anderson Lecture, "Taking Leave of our Census/Senses." Canadian Sociological Association meetings, Fredericton, New Brunswick.

Bradley, Susan and Meg Luxton. 2010. Neoliberalism and everyday life. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Brym, Robert. 1999. *Canadian Society and the 1996 Census*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Canada.

Campbell, Colin. 2009. Canadian gambling policies. Pp. 69–90 in James F. Cosgrave and Thomas Klassen, eds., *Casino State: Legalized Gambling in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Canadian Legal Information Institute, Department of Justice, Canada. 2004. http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/charter_digest/s-23-3.html Accessed June 11, 2011

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 2010. Census change challenge heads to federal court. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2010/09/26/census-court-challenge.html. Accessed, June 2, 2011

Canadian Sociological Association. 2010. Research Advisory Committee Executive Committee. July 21. CSA letter to Tony Clement. Accessed June 3, 2011. http://www.csa-scs.ca/blog/long-from-census.

Cohen, Masha and Paul C. Hebert. 2010. Ideology trumps evidence with new voluntary survey. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 182(12).

Cosgrave, James F. 2010. Embedded addiction: The social production of gambling knowledge and the development of gambling markets. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 35(1):113–134.

Curtis, Bruce. 2002. *The Politics of Population: State Formation, Statistics, and the Census of Canada, 1840–1875*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Day, Richard. 1998. Constructing the official Canadian: A genealogy of the mosaic metaphor in state policy discourse. *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies* (2):42–66.

Dean, Mitchell. 1999. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

Delic, Zijad. 2010. For Canadian Muslims, long-form census is 'reliable data.' *Canadian Islamic Congress Friday Magazine* 13(35) (www.canadian-islamiccongress.com/fb/friday_bulletin.php?fbdate=2010-08- 27#1)

Della Sala, Vincent. 2004. Les jeux sont fait? The state and legalized gambling. School of International Studies, University of Trento, Working Paper 02/2004.

Ditchburn, Jennifer. 2010. Native groups take feds to court over scrapping of mandatory long-form census. The Canadian Press, Accessed December 30, 2011 http://www.mria-arim.ca/NEWS/NativeGroups-longFormCensus.asp.

Durkheim, Emile. 1965. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Trans. J.W. Swain. New York: The Free Press.
——— 1982. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Trans. W.D. Halls. Ed. Steven Lukes. New York: The Free Press.
——— 1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Trans. John A. Spaulding. Ed. George Simpson. New York: The Free Press.

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1965. *The Souls of Black Folk in Three Negro Classics*. New York: Avon Books.

Fielding, Stephen. 2006. Liberal governance, multiculturalism, and the making of ethnocultural identities in Canada. Paper presented at Simon Fraser University Harbour Centre, November 9.

Foucault, Michael. 1991. In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibbon, John Murray. 1939. *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

Government of Canada. 1971. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Helmes-Hayes, Rick and James Curtis. 1998. Introduction. In *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Henderson, Stuart. 2005. "While there is still time...": J. Murray Gibbon and the spectacle of difference in three CPR folk festivals, 1928-1931. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 39(1):139–174.

Luxton, Meg and Leah F. Vosko. 1998. Where women's efforts count: The 1996 census campaign and "family politics" in Canada. *Studies in Political Economy* 56:49–81.

MacDonald, Michael. 2010. Census changes unconstitutional, native groups argue. http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/census/article/906183--census-changes-unconstitutional-native-groups-argue Accessed June 3, 2011.

Mason, W. Dale. 2000. *Indian Gaming: Tribal Sovereignty and American Politics*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Mackey, Eva. 1999. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. New York: Routledge

McKay, Ian and Robin Bates. 2010. *The Province of History: The Making of the Public Past in Twentieth-century Nova Scotia*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Nicoll, Fiona. 2010. Subjects in a state: Cultural economies of gambling. Pp. 211–233 in Sytze Kingma, ed., *Global Gambling: Cultural Perspectives on Gambling Organizations*. London: Routledge.

Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation (OLG). 2011. http://www.olg.ca/about/economic_benefits/index.jsp

Porter, John. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Quinty, Serge. 2011. Elimination of the mandatory long form for the 2011 Census: FCFA asks provincial and territorial premiers to intervene. Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada. Accessed June 11, 2011. http://www.fcfa.ca/fr/Press_Release_26/Elimination_Of_The_Mandatory_Long_Form_For_The_2011_Census_Fcfa_Asks_Provincial_And_Territorial_Premiers_ToIntervene_48.

Seiler, Tamara Palmer. 2003. Model of virtue or candidate for censure? Assessing Canada's treatment of ethnic minorities. In Kenneth G. Pryke and Walter C. Soderlund, eds., *Profiles of Canada*. Third edition. Toronto: CSPI.

Simmel, Georg. 1971. The poor. In Donald N. Levine, ed., *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Statistics Canada. 2005. History of the Census of Canada. http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/Info/history.cfm.
——— 2010. Canada's ethno-cultural mosaic. http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-562/p1-eng.cfm.
——— 2011. 2011 Census consultation. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/consultation/index-eng.cfm.

Storey, Mags. 2010. Religious groups concerned about census reform. http://www.christianweek.org/stories.php?id=1028 Accessed June 2, 2011.

Thompson, Debra. 2010. The politics of the census: Lessons from abroad. *Canadian Public Policy* 36(3):377–382.

Weber, Max. 1946. Science as a vocation. Pp. 129–156 in H.H. Gerth and C.Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Robert, Jurgen Rehm, and Rhys Stephens. 2011. *The Social and Economic Impacts of Gambling*. Final Report Prepared for the Canadian Consortium For Gambling Research (March 3).

Patricia Cormack is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at St. Francis Xavier University. Her research interests include nation and national

identity, state culture industries, and media. Recent publications include "'True Stories' of Canada: Tim Hortons and the Branding of National Identity" in *Cultural Sociology*, and with James F. Cosgrave, "Disenchanted Wonder: Collecting Canadian Identity through the CBC 'Seven Wonders of Canada' Project" in *Topia*. Her forthcoming book, with Cosgrave, is called *Desiring Canada: CBC Contests, Hockey Violence, and Other Stately Pleasures*.

James F. Cosgrave is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at Trent University. His research interests include examination of the state's role in gambling markets, state/culture dynamics and Canadian cultural identity, and the sociology of money and financial markets. Recent publications include "Embedded Addiction: The Social Production of Gambling Knowledge and the Development of Gambling Markets," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 2010, 35(1):113–134, and with Patricia Cormack, *Desiring Canada: CBC Contests, Hockey Violence, and Other Stately Pleasures*, forthcoming at University of Toronto Press.

L. Lynda Harling Stalker is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at St. Francis Xavier University. Her research interests include Atlantic Canada, work, and narrative methodologies. Recent publications include *Surveillance, Privacy and the Globalisation of Personal Information: International Comparisons* (co-editor, MQUP), "Good to be Alberta Bound?": Out-Migration, In-Migration and the Strait Region of Nova Scotia, 2001–2006 (co-authored with John Phyne), and "Tale of two narratives: Ontological and epistemological narrative" (*Narrative Inquiry)*.