



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Gender-Based Analysis Plus (GBA+) of Two Policy Alternatives: Basic Income and Basic Services

Cameron, Anna and Tedds, Lindsay M.

School of Public Policy, University of Calgary, Department of
Economics, University of Calgary

December 2020

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/105939/>
MPRA Paper No. 105939, posted 12 Feb 2021 07:12 UTC

**Gender-Based Analysis Plus (GBA+) of Two Policy Alternatives:
Basic Income and Basic Services**

Anna Cameron and Lindsay M. Tedds
School of Public Policy, University of Calgary

Date: December 2020

Author Note

The authors can be contacted at anna.cameron2@ucalgary.ca and lindsay.tedds1@ucalgary.ca.

Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia. We gratefully acknowledge funding from the Government of British Columbia (spsc46008190052 and spsc46008190046) that helped support this research. All inferences, opinions, and conclusions drawn in this paper are those of the authors, and do not reflect the opinions or policies of the Data Innovation Program or the Province of British Columbia.

Abstract

In this paper, we apply GBA+ to two potentially transformative policy approaches—basic income and basic services—to consider their promise in the context of B.C.’s poverty reduction strategy. The core of our analysis is centred on evaluating how each proposal might address poverty in B.C. along intersectional lines, and according to the key dimensions or principles of poverty mitigation and prevention outlined by the B.C. government in its poverty reduction strategy: affordability, opportunity, reconciliation, and social. We also draw on insights regarding the systemic barriers that contribute to greater risk and prevalence of poverty for people whose identities are situated at various axes of difference. We not only consider how the proposals may produce “tangible” outcomes, but also focus on the various ways in which they could transform experiences within and beyond the system of programs, or erect barriers that are not immediately obvious or that may not exist for a “neutral” subject. We demonstrate that the basic income and basic services approaches both have immediate practical value, as well as exhibiting transformative potential, though such impacts largely hinge on how the policies are envisioned and implemented. The most important takeaways from this work are that intersectional groups need access to high-quality public services and, relatedly, that any policy approach that “trades off” services for income will have potentially devastating impacts—particularly for already vulnerable groups.

Introduction

The Government of British Columbia's poverty reduction plan, *TogetherBC* (Government of British Columbia, 2019), included a commitment to applying GBA+ across all poverty reduction efforts. The Expert Panel on Basic Income was struck as part of the B.C. government's poverty reduction work, as the panel was asked not only to assess the feasibility of a basic income, but also to consider how the principles of a basic income might be used to improve the existing income and social support system. Putting these two pieces together, it can be implied that it is also necessary for the expert panel to consider how both a basic income and the alternatives to a basic income are viewed through the lens of a GBA+ analysis.

This paper is one of three research papers commissioned by the panel in which a GBA+ lens is applied. Cameron and Tedds (2020) provided background on gender and intersectional analysis and used an intersectional lens to outline what poverty looks like in B.C. and consider the degree to which the poverty reduction strategy is aligned with those facts. Petit and Tedds (2020a) examined B.C.'s current system of income supports and services from a GBA+ perspective. In this paper, we apply GBA+ to two potentially transformative policy approaches—basic income and basic services—to consider their promise in the context of B.C.'s poverty reduction strategy.

The core of our analysis is centred on evaluating how each proposal might address poverty in B.C. along intersectional lines, and according to the key dimensions or principles of poverty mitigation and prevention outlined by the B.C. government in its poverty reduction strategy: affordability, opportunity, reconciliation, and social inclusion (Government of B.C., 2019b). Throughout the analysis, we also draw on insights from Cameron and Tedds (2020) and Petit and Tedds (2020b) regarding the systemic barriers that contribute to greater risk and prevalence of poverty for people whose identities are situated at various axes of difference. In addition, we not only consider how the proposals may produce “tangible” outcomes, but also focus on the various ways in which they could transform experiences within and beyond the system of programs, or erect barriers that are not immediately obvious or that may not exist for a “neutral” subject.

Our analysis centres on two questions:

1. What would the poverty reduction impacts be for not just women but also people with various and intersecting identities, were B.C. to proceed with a basic income or basic services model?
2. Which *aspects* or *elements* of basic income and basic services models have the most to offer diverse groups of people, and which aspects are, or could be, detrimental?

There are two important facts to note. First, B.C.'s existing system of social supports already contains elements that reflect aspects of the basic income and basic services approaches. Petit and Tedds (2020b) categorize income supports and services in B.C. according to method of delivery, demonstrating how the system is composed of programs and services that span several forms, each of which can be considered more broadly as constituting either a cash or an in-kind benefit (i.e., a service). Accordingly, the choice between cash

transfers and services should be considered neither binary nor exclusive: optimal provision in the context of poverty reduction is instead about finding the correct “policy mix” (Kesselman & Mendelson, 2020). This suggests that the actual question is not whether a universal basic services or basic income model is superior to the other, but instead which *aspects* of the basic income and basic services approaches have the most to offer diverse groups of people.

Second, though we do touch on various aspects of Indigenous experience (particularly as it intersects other aspects of identity) throughout our analysis, we do not consider, on its own, the principle of reconciliation. It is our view that providing economic security through a basic income can, at best, be considered a rudimentary first step in what will necessarily be a generations-long process of atonement and reconciliation. Basic services models perhaps offer greater potential, but only if designed and delivered by or in partnership with Indigenous communities. In general, without a decolonization of systems, processes, and relationships, it is unclear to what extent basic income and basic services on their own would have much more to offer Indigenous populations. That is not to say that Indigenous persons should be excluded from change within the existing system, but only that the realities of inter-generational trauma, cultural genocide, and colonialism require much deeper consideration than is possible through the study and application of different forms of social provision.

As we will demonstrate, the basic income and basic services approaches both have immediate practical value, as well as exhibiting transformative potential, though such impacts largely hinge on how the policies are envisioned and implemented. Throughout the paper we illuminate the ways in which the basic income and basic services approaches come up against and might attend to structural barriers (e.g., gender inequality, institutional and systemic discrimination), thereby reducing risk of poverty for diverse groups and promoting longer-term transformational change. The most important takeaways from this work are that intersectional groups need access to high-quality public services and, relatedly, that any policy approach that “trades off” services for income will have potentially devastating impacts—particularly for already vulnerable groups. This underscores the importance of designing, implementing, and evaluating public services with intersectionality in mind.

The paper proceeds as follows. First we offer a brief overview of the GBA+ framework and outline key lessons from Cameron and Tedds (2020) that are relevant for the current analysis. Second, we provide an overview of the basic income and basic services approaches, outline their purported benefits in the context of poverty reduction, and summarize historical and current support for the policies from a gender and intersectional perspective. We also revisit the second step of the GBA+ framework to understand how the problem of poverty and its gendered and intersectional elements are framed in the proposals.

Background on the GBA+ Framework

Gender-based analysis plus (GBA+) is a framework for assessing the potential impacts of policies, programs, and initiatives on diverse groups of women, men, and non-binary people. In particular, the framework is based on the understanding that multiple factors—race,

Indigeneity, class, ability, geography, gender, and others—intersect to shape one’s identity and experience, both of the world and of public policies. Though Status of Women Canada (2017) has developed a GBA+ tool, Cameron and Tedds (2020) detailed its limitations, setting out an adapted GBA+ framework (see appendix). Applying the adapted framework to the “problem” of poverty in B.C., they detail the following insights, which set the stage for our analysis:

- Poverty is not simply a lack of income but is also the result of several overlapping forces that impact material circumstances, access to opportunity, and community involvement.
- Systemic and identity-based factors, including discrimination, hinder affordability, opportunity, and inclusion for diverse people.
- The entire system—not just individual programs—matters, not simply for its direct impact on access to support or poverty outcomes, but also for how it constructs and reinforces narratives about benefit recipients, and in turn perpetuates the two previous points.

Basic income is often advanced as an approach for reducing poverty and addressing many of the central and longstanding issues with systems of income support and social provision—issues that are particularly harmful to women and people whose identities exist at the intersection of several aspects of difference and marginalization. The universal basic services concept has been touted for similar reasons. We now proceed with applying the adapted GBA+ framework to evaluate the poverty reduction potential of, first, the basic income model and, second, the basic services approach.

Analyzing Basic Income Using the GBA+ Framework

Background and Framing Basic Income in Intersectional Perspectives

At its heart, a basic income is a system under which payments are provided to eligible individuals by the government (B.C. Poverty Reduction, 2018). As detailed in Tedds et al. (2020), basic income is not a single, uniform policy, but rather a range of policy proposals that share certain principles—namely, economic security, simplicity, respectful and dignified treatment of recipients, and the promotion of meaningful inclusion and participation in society. Importantly, a basic income is often considered an individual entitlement based on rights, and thus represents a mode of social provision distinct from both contributory social provision (i.e., Bismarckian earnings-focused insurance systems) and publicly financed, solidarity-based provision (i.e., Beveridgean systems, focused on universal and uniform access to social insurance and assistance) (De Wispelaere & Morales, 2016). As a result, a properly designed basic income may have the potential to disrupt the distinction that is made between the deserving and the undeserving poor.

While Tedds and Crisan (2020) detail the history of political proposals related to a basic income in Canada, it is also important, from a gender mainstreaming perspective, to consider the perspectives of organizations that represent diverse groups, such as women and racialized

people.¹ Collectively, basic income–type proposals have a long conceptual history, but often ignored in these histories are the feminist and Black activists, particularly those in the United States and the United Kingdom, who took up the basic income cause over the course of the 20th century. For example, during and in the aftermath of the Second World War, British activist Juliet Rhys-Williams offered an alternative (and less gendered and labour-focused) vision of welfare than the one set out in the Beveridge model (Sloman, 2016). In particular, Rhys-Williams advocated for the replacement of a system that only provided material benefits to the elderly and the unemployed—and which was rife with work disincentives, creating a poverty trap—with one that would offer the same benefits to healthy, working people (including mothers and housewives) and simplify the provision of social insurance. In addition, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the National Welfare Rights Organization demanded a guaranteed annual income of \$6,500 for all families who needed it (Withorn, 1993). At the same time, the international and intersectional Wages for Housework movement was gaining significant momentum, advancing the idea of a paid income separate from that obtained through waged labour (for an overview, see Austin et al., 2020). Further, in 1977, the British Women’s Liberation Movement passed by majority vote a resolution for a universal basic income (Yamamori, 2014). Martin Luther King, Jr., the Black Panther Party, and Black autoworker and activist James Boggs, were all additional proponents of a basic income as a solution to extensive poverty and unemployment resulting from systemic racism (Bidadanure, 2019).

By contrast, Canada’s contributions to the basic income movement are better characterized through the lens of government-led reform in the areas of poverty and social provision. For example, the 1970 Royal Commission on the Status of Women recommended that a guaranteed annual income be provided to all one-parent families with children (Hamilton & Mulvale, 2019). Soon after, in 1971, the Report of the Special Senate Committee on Poverty (the Croll Report) proposed a universal income floor (Forget, 2011). The Mincome study was then launched in 1974. However, it is clear that gender and intersectional considerations—at least, insofar as they can be distinguished from poverty concerns—did not drive the creation of Mincome, nor were they central aspects of analysis. The same is true of the Ontario Basic Income Pilot, launched in 2017. A basic income has more recently been raised in the context of reconciliation, with one of the Calls for Justice outlined in the Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (2019) being to establish a “guaranteed annual livable income.”

That said, the acceptance of a basic income has not been universal among intersectional groups. Across Canada and in B.C., advocates and key stakeholders have been

¹ This step is consistent with gender mainstreaming approaches, which recognize that women’s organizations have a key role to play in driving gender equality within and beyond the state (Paterson et al., 2016). It also aligns with critical feminist approaches, which involve an exploration of questions such as: What women’s organizations were involved in policy formulation and implementation? How does feminist scholarship inform the issue? Are women involved in the making, shaping, and implementation of the policy? (McPhail, 2003). Though support along feminist and intersectional lines does not itself mean that a policy will be successful, it can signal its *potential* or alert the analyst to key issues or unintended effects.

skeptical about the merits of a basic income. For example, Broad and Nadjiwon-Smith (2017) caution against the implementation of a basic income for First Nations groups in Ontario, highlighting the substantial differences in how First Nations communities experience poverty and need, as well as the damaging history of Canadian government-led programs in First Nations communities. In addition, the feedback provided by a First Nations group as part of the B.C. government's poverty reduction strategy consultations reflected a sense of concern about the ability of a basic income to meet the needs of the Indigenous community, including that the policy would be guided by a "paternalistic colonialist approach," while people with disabilities expressed fear that a basic income would not take into consideration the heterogeneity of experiences and need within the population of people with disabilities, and newcomers noted that a basic income would neither improve access to services and employment, nor address systemic racism (Apland et al., 2018).

An important reason why a basic income is viewed by intersectional groups as a problematic solution to poverty is its contextualization of poverty as simply a question of a lack of income, which ignores the intersections of identity and systemic factors that contribute to financial insecurity. It also does not recognize or address the extent to which poverty is linked to and amplified by systemic pathologies and power dynamics, such as racism, colonialism, and ableism. In addition, a "true" basic income—particularly one that follows the universal demogrant model—has, on the surface, a destigmatizing impact because the transfer is paid to all; however, at the same time, the ostensible "neutrality" of the policy has the effect of eliminating considerations of the complex heterogeneity of lives and need. It is for this reason that the usefulness of a basic income is often closely linked to a rich system of basic services (e.g., safe and adequate housing, clean drinking water)—that is, a base standard of living that many people in B.C. continue to be denied. In addition, though it is unlikely that most governments seeking to implement a basic income would use the policy to replace the entire system of income and social supports, it is on such a basis that some oppose the policy. These skeptics fear that by throwing political capital behind a basic income, while stalling on or ignoring other issues like poverty wages, unemployment, or discrimination, governments might produce unintended consequences, particularly for groups that are overrepresented in low-wage or precarious work or who struggle with labour market attachment.

These are all very important concerns related to the objective, design, and implementation of a basic income that need to be carefully considered. As women have some of the highest rates of poverty by family type (Petit & Tedds, 2020c), any cash transfer scheme introduced to reduce poverty would have an especially positive effect on the material circumstances of diverse women. This is because women uniquely face the economic risks of responsibility for reproductive labour as well as a gender pay gap, both of which contribute to lifelong economic insecurity and limit their ability to earn a livable income (Alstott, 2001). Economic dependence borne out of gendered power relations further limits women's choices, and in some cases renders individuals vulnerable to intimate partner violence (IPV). The intersection of gender with other aspects of identity produces additional layers of complexity, and thus Alstott's logic can be extended to various groups of women and gender non-binary

individuals, such as people with disabilities who may require more flexible and intermittent working arrangements, or racialized and LGBTQ2S+ individuals for whom workplace discrimination is not only rooted in misogyny.

In the absence of other policy or normative change (e.g., a more accessible maternity benefits system for low-income women, greater legal ramifications for workplace discrimination, societal shifts in the gendered division of labour), a basic income could begin to account for or offset some of the detrimental economic impacts associated with certain intersections of identity. That is, a basic income that is founded on the principle of meaningful inclusion and participation in society could create space to speak about an expanded view of societal contribution, particularly one that extends beyond paid work. This makes possible a questioning of fixations on paid employment in the income support system and society writ large. To the extent that this is not addressed, caregivers who are mostly women and who engage in unpaid reproductive labour will continue to be seen as dependants, reinforcing existing gender relations and asymmetries, thereby undermining equality (see, for example, Orloff, 1990; Robeyns, 2001; Gheaus, 2008).

To summarize, a basic income is a mechanism by which to increase financial security and eliminate other barriers for diverse groups. Any improvement of the income support system—particularly through changes to render benefits more generous and access simpler, less stigmatizing, and less invasive—would have positive impacts along intersectional lines. In particular, a basic income would:

- improve the material conditions of diverse groups by offsetting the economic consequences that are produced at the intersections of identity (e.g., femininity, motherhood, disability, Indigeneity, race);
- fill gaps in existing systems of assistance and social insurance—gaps that are more prevalent for those who do not have traditional and long-term labour force attachment (e.g., mothers, gig workers, self-employed individuals, migrant workers, sex workers);
- recast care work, reproductive labour, and other participation as valuable and deserving of recognition;
- result in a less stigmatizing and more accessible way to access a basic standard of living, with the potential to reshape subjectivities created within existing systems of adjudication and surveillance;
- absorb some of the stress related to lack of financial security and stability, thereby supporting positive health outcomes and reducing instances of IPV in particular.

However, the basic income approach is limited in its ability to solve intersectional poverty by the extent to which it is an income-focused support. Although poverty is a highly gendered and intersectional issue, a focus on intersectionality in basic income approaches is secondary: it only emerges based on a connection to key *aspects* of the problem of poverty. These include overrepresentation in low-wage work and workplace discrimination based on identity, as well as constraints on “full” participation in society related to ability, geography, and biological functions (e.g., reproduction). The positioning of women, the working class, LGBTQ2S+ persons, and

Black communities at the forefront of much of basic income activism in the past century underscores this reality. Without attending to the nuanced perspectives of these diverse groups, it is still possible to say that paid employment is for them an insufficient or untenable way by which to secure financial independence and security. However, it remains to be seen whether the choice of the basic income tool in the face of poverty would disrupt systemic pathologies, merely offset the effects of the barriers they construct and perpetuate, or have the unintended effect of obfuscating the other changes necessary to ensure equality and inclusion. Suffice it to say, from this perspective, a basic income is not a solution to a problem but rather a stop-gap policy to address the outcomes of the real problem.

Indeed, those with the greatest barriers to opportunity—particularly obstacles that are not merely financial—require a suite of supports and services beyond a monthly income transfer, as well as change that goes beyond guaranteeing economic security to address systemic pathologies like colonialism, racism, and transphobia. Moreover, income support cannot replicate the impact of strong labour laws, anti-discrimination and anti-harassment policies in the workplace, employment equity legislation, or systemic shifts in the funding and functioning of the criminal justice and legal aid systems. It is also no substitute for better workplace accommodation of care. This leads to the consideration of the second alternative to the existing income support system: one centred on the provision of basic services.

Basic Services and Poverty Reduction for Diverse Groups in B.C.

What Are Basic Services?

According to Kesselman and Mendelson (2020), services—what they term “in-kind benefits”—can be distinguished from cash benefits such as income support based on policy intent. While basic income and cash transfers allow for freedom of conversion, in-kind benefits are structured to influence spending on or use of a target item (e.g., adequate housing, medical equipment) by altering its price relative to that of other goods and services. Whether delivered as a public subsidy (e.g., a child-care subsidy), target good or service provided directly (e.g., eye exams, wheelchairs), or voucher (e.g., food stamps), in-kind benefits support access to necessities and are dependent upon consumption choices. As shown in Petit and Tedds (2020b), the B.C. government already provides a range of essential supports in the form of services and in-kind benefits, particularly to those who qualify for Income Assistance or meet other eligibility criteria.

Recent calls for the introduction of universal basic services, most notably out of the Institute for Global Prosperity at the University College London (see Portes et al., 2017), build upon notions of in-kind benefit provision. Such proposals advance the idea that the best path to poverty reduction is through a strengthening and extension to all—regardless of one’s identity, work status, or ability to pay—of essential services such as shelter, education, sustenance/food, health care, transportation, legal and democratic services, and information; some have also suggested a broadening of the model to include child care and adult social care (Coote et al., 2019). Additional groups have focused uniquely on the merits of universal basic infrastructure, a

concept that differs slightly from basic services in the sense that it focuses on the expansion of investment in both hard (i.e., rail, energy, water, broadband) and soft (i.e., education, health, care services) infrastructure (Industrial Strategy Commission, 2017).

Basic services models are commonly referred to as providing a “social wage,” which illustrates the value of replacing the individualized cost of services with public goods, free at the point of use and accessible to all by virtue of residency or citizenship (Gough, 2019). Built upon the notions of shared needs and collective responsibility, such approaches emphasize that all members of society have needs that must be satisfied to ensure well-being and enable participation in society, and that the welfare of the population is a collective endeavour (Coote et al., 2019). Basic services models also favour shared ownership and local provision—two characteristics that have the potential to render systems less stigmatizing and delivery more attuned to heterogenous needs and in line with cultural approaches.

Proponents also emphasize the relative cost-effectiveness of basic services: in contrasting the basic services and basic income approaches, Yalnizyan (2017) found that for \$15 billion—half the cost of raising all incomes above the poverty line—the Canadian government could permanently expand affordable housing, transportation, and child care, and nearly eliminate the cost of prescriptions, going to the dentist, and attending post-secondary. However, it bears repeating that though basic services have often been presented as an antithesis to a basic income in the public discourse, realistic proposals for both are built around their complementarity: proponents of universal basic services recognize that some form of income support ought to remain in place in a society with basic services, while basic income advocates assume the preservation of a range of services, such as health care, transportation, and specific in-kind benefits.

In line with Kesselman and Mendelson (2020), proponents suggest that basic services models can produce the following benefits (Kesselman & Mendelson, 2020; Portes et al., 2017):

- Redistribution: Basic services are of greater value to—and thus have a larger impact on the well-being of—those with the greatest need or those who are worse off.
- Targeting of need: Basic services can better provide for heterogenous needs, including where means-tested supports can miss specific aspects of need or deprivation.
- Cost-efficiency: As noted above, basic services constitute a more efficient use of public funds, due especially to the economies of scale that result from government procurement.
- Solidarity: Basic services have the potential to increase social cohesion and reduce stigmatization of beneficiaries, given that public services respond to shared interests, and the consumption of “merit goods” like child care have positive social externalities and “spillover effects.”
- Increased participation: Certain services, such as child care and transportation, are supportive of—or have complementarity with—societal participation (e.g., work, training, volunteering).

Support for Basic Services Along Feminist and Intersectional Lines

When held up beside the basic income concept, the universal basic services model has a relatively young history, with comprehensive proposals emerging only recently from U.K.-based institutions, as noted above. That said, the notion of basic services as a form of social provision is firmly rooted in the welfare state tradition, drawing inspiration perhaps most directly from Beveridge's idea of state-provided "national minimums," which eventually led to the creation of British institutions like the National Health Service. Canadian systems and structures, in many senses, mimic those of the British. In Britain and Canada both, arguments for increasing government provision of a range of services—from affordable housing to more extensive health care to universal child care—extend back across the last century.

Although gender and intersectional concerns did not drive initial welfare state investment, or even further expansion, the adaptation of social policy to better serve marginalized populations has for a long time been a central focus of advocates, among them women's organizations. For example, the development of a public child care system has been high on the agenda of the women's movement in Canada for the better part of a century. However, the relationship of gendered and intersectional movements and the state has historically been one of tension: on the one hand, advocates recognize the state—and state provision—as a source of discrimination and violence for many marginalized groups; on the other, they are central proponents of greater investments in government services—albeit in a less stigmatizing and oppressive way.

That said, recent contributions from B.C.-based advocacy organizations highlight support for a basic services approach. For example, the B.C. Poverty Reduction Coalition has recently developed and begun advocating for a universal basic services framework, spanning the areas of health care, information, education and child care, housing, democracy and legal services, and transportation (B.C. Poverty Reduction Coalition, n.d.). In addition, another organization dedicated to legal advocacy for women and gender non-binary individuals proposes that the province focus on completing several alternative reforms, such as the implementation of universal child-care programs, prior to the introduction of a basic income (West Coast Legal Education and Action Fund, 2019). Indigenous experts (Martin & Walia, 2019) have recently called for the delivery of universal public services in B.C., including a free and culturally appropriate child-care system, free and extended public transportation, free post-secondary tuition, and low-income rates for energy services, as well as several reforms to social housing provision.

Importantly, basic services approaches are built upon ideas of what members of society have in common, and by extension, of what types of services are universally necessary. Yet the universalism of basic services should not be confused with a claim to neutrality: it must still be determined which services to include, and this selection is often highly subjective, as well as a function of who is at the decision table. For example, in the universal basic services model set out by researchers at the Institute for Global Prosperity, child care is not listed among the core basic services—a choice with not only significant gendered implications, but also broader consequences for poverty reduction efforts.

Representations of Poverty in the Basic Services Model

As is the case with a basic income, poverty is a key problem to which basic services models seek to respond. However, the problem of poverty is framed in a distinct way in basic services proposals—as inadequate access to necessities. As Lombardozzi and Pitts (2019, p. 15) describe, the basic services model “focuses on the opportunities created by the right material conditions rather than the outcome of having an equal amount of money.” Such a position is rooted in capability theory, which prioritizes sufficiency in the conditions of one’s existence over one’s economic freedom.

Basic services models also differ from basic income approaches in that they are focused on what people are deserving of on a societal level, rather than what states can offer one person or household in terms of an income of last resort. In this sense, the problem of poverty is collective, and one that results from government failure in the realm of social provisioning, rather than individual shortcomings. For example, in the Institute for Global Prosperity proposal the problem is one of government’s inability to “deliver the necessary social cohesion [and...] secure the productive capacity of our full population,” with “social security structures as the nexus of these challenges” (Portes et al., 2017, 9–10). For proponents of basic services, the solution is social and rooted in the idea of participating in a shared system, both through supporting the provision of basic services by paying taxes, and by accessing such services in day-to-day life.

The basic services approach calls into question cash transfers as a viable mechanism for reducing and preventing poverty. Proponents argue that basic services are a more efficient and effective use of public funds when pursuing poverty reduction as an objective—more efficient, as it would be cheaper to implement at a sufficient level (dollar for dollar it would extend individuals greater access to basic needs), and more effective since it could more easily achieve the effect of targeting, given that public goods and services flow naturally toward those with need (e.g., public transport). Relatedly, a recognition of the increasing cost of meeting basic needs in the market, particularly for those with tight budgets,² is also embedded in the basic services model. From this, one can also interpret support for public provision as calling into question the market prices of basic goods and services, and even problematizing their commodification in the first place. These are issues that the basic income cannot confront, at least not on its own.

In the basic services approach, gender and intersectional issues are not primary concerns; however, they emerge as relevant based on the extent to which diverse groups typically access services and benefit from their redistributive effects, as well as which services are deemed essential. A key challenge confronting basic services models is how to account for nuance in both need and experience, particularly in terms of service design and access features. The language of shared or collective needs can easily be confused with universality of experience, and thus risks ignoring the differences that exist at the intersections of identity

²For example, the OECD notes that if services had to be purchased directly, individuals living in poverty would have to spend 75% of their income to meet such needs (Verbist et al., 2012).

factors, and which not only shape experiences of poverty, but also reveal different aspects of need within system design and delivery. Thus, those responsible for implementing basic services must be attuned the ways in which systems are themselves sites of power, privilege, and oppression, and, as importantly, how individual access and experience of services is situated within (and shaped by) this context.

Basic Services and the Poverty Reduction Strategy

Inherent in the basic services perspective is a recognition that poverty and risk of poverty do not simply indicate a lack of income, but are also the result of broader material deprivation. Unaffordability and inaccessibility of basic services is, for many, the greatest barrier not only to financial security and stability, but also to accessing opportunities and feeling included in community. This reality was confirmed in the B.C. government's poverty reduction strategy consultations, emerging from which was a central theme of the importance of access to basic services, notably safe and affordable transportation, justice and legal services, health care, child care, and housing (Government of B.C., 2018). For many, it is unlikely that an increase in income support rates, or even a shift to a basic income, would be sufficient to ensure access to basic services as they are currently available and priced. Accordingly, it can be reasonably assumed that if a basic income were to be introduced without further investments to expand services, the increase in income would still be insufficient to meet basic needs, whether as a result of the high cost and scarcity of child care and housing, or given a lack of basic infrastructure (e.g., transportation, digital access in remote areas). In addition, lack of affordability or access in one area can exacerbate inaccessibility in another: inadequate or unaffordable public transport can limit the extent to which other services such as child care are truly accessible, while affordable housing that is not proximate to community, supports, and viable transport—even if such services do technically exist—might be turned down as a result of inconvenience.

Limited access to basic services is a reality that is not felt equally, including among those living in poverty. Issues of both affordability and access are closely linked to identity factors and systems of power and privilege: class, gender, parental status, race, Indigeneity, ability, geography, and sexuality intersect to produce need, and thus diverse groups use and rely upon existing services to a greater extent and in different ways—for some, public services are the sole option. Analyzing the intersectional dimensions of need, use, and reliance thus becomes a central aspect of understanding both the potential impact of basic services and for whom they ought to be designed.

Building on the key priority and action areas spelled out in the poverty reduction strategy, we next examine what an expansion and improvement of housing, early childhood education and care (ECEC), and public transportation, could mean for diverse groups across the metrics of affordability, opportunity, and inclusion.

Housing

It is well understood that housing in B.C. is expensive and for many is unaffordable (Mendelson & Kesselman, 2020). To support basic access to housing in the face of these challenges, the Government of British Columbia and several municipalities (with financial support from the federal government), collaborate to offer a menu of programs and targeted financial support to individuals struggling to meet shelter needs. This approach includes rent supplements and portable housing benefits, as well as subsidized rental housing for those earning below a certain income, with rental costs calculated on a rent-geared-to-income basis (i.e., rents are set at 30% of gross income), affordable and/or below-market rental housing, and supportive, temporary modular and transition housing.

However, housing insecurity is a highly intersectional issue: it is higher among single-adult households, single-parent households, households of people with disabilities, Indigenous households both on- and off-reserve, racialized households, and youth-led households. Ultimately, existing housing strategies may not attend to the needs and experiences of such groups and may be ineffective and productive of unintended housing insecurity and additional vulnerabilities as a result. This is because housing insecurity is not just a matter of income, but is also related to discrimination, systemic barriers, heterogeneous needs beyond household size, and limited supply. Given this analysis, it can be assumed *prima facie* that, in terms of affordability and access, women and other marginalized populations have much to gain from shifts in policy and investment that render housing markets more affordable and accessible. Moreover, the intersectional face of housing need in B.C. underscores the extent to which, to be effective, housing interventions must also address bias, limit the extent to which identity-based discrimination is a factor in access, and reflect a broader range of housing needs—from number of rooms to accessibility to proximity to services. As a result, the policy question becomes not simply how to improve affordability, but also how to ensure that affordability is accompanied by accessibility and inclusivity.

Universal basic services approaches focus squarely on adding significantly to the existing stock of social housing, rather than on boosting income and rent supplement programs to reduce the cost of housing in the private rental market. Thus, affordability and access are achieved through large-scale investments in social/non-market housing, which prospective tenants can access at subsidized rates. In B.C.'s housing market, which is characterized by high costs and limited access for those with diverse needs and tight budgets, this is perhaps the best model for addressing intersectional core housing need among those living in poverty and at risk of poverty. Within such contexts, access to social housing in which rent is geared to income provides tenants with a sense of security, both spatial and financial. For example, Gurstein and Vilches (2010) found that British Columbian women who are lone mothers and living on low incomes appreciate that social housing (compared to shelter supplements) provides them with stability, adequate living space, access to basic appliances, and safety and community for their children.

In addition to rendering adequate and appropriate housing more accessible for diverse groups, basic services approaches to housing also show poverty reduction promise when considering the principles of opportunity and social inclusion. That is, by providing housing

directly, governments can improve opportunity and social inclusion along intersectional lines. Research indicates that effective housing policy is a key determinant of the success of social policy writ large, as adequate housing plays both a stabilizing and facilitative role throughout the life course (Carter & Polevychok, 2004), serving as a platform that can both enable the pursuit of opportunity and independence, and foster social inclusion and community involvement. This is particularly true for families escaping domestic and intimate partner violence.

It merits mention that this narrowing of scope to an expansion of the social/non-market housing stock ought not be taken as a diminishment or negation of the importance of other aspects of housing policy, nor should it be seen as a challenge to the perspective that housing needs exist along a continuum. Indeed, the housing issues confronting B.C. constitute an intricate and complex web, the disentangling of which will require a holistic strategy that attends to both the private market and the social/non-market sector in a variety of ways, including by incentivizing construction of purpose-built rentals, revisiting zoning, strengthening protections for renters, and addressing speculation, among many other approaches.

Early Childhood Education and Care

Access to ECEC is a persistent issue both in British Columbia and across Canada more broadly. ECEC remains unaffordable and inaccessible for many, complicating both short-term budgets and financial security in the longer term. Not only does this reality affect access for diverse groups—in some cases impacting child development outcomes and undermining financial security of parents—it also limits participation in labour markets, education, and training (often along gender lines); can hamper women's efforts to leave abusive contexts; and has broader impacts on discourses of value and societal contribution, which in turn produce significant intersectional implications.

A lack of accessible and affordable ECEC constitutes a significant barrier to financial security for families, particularly when taking into consideration class and gender. Van Lancker and Ghysels (2016) note that in situations where child care is not universally available—whether because of cost, limited supply, or a combination of these—availability shows a tendency to decline disproportionately in lower-income areas. In addition, persistent gendered disadvantages, such as the gendered division of labour and the gender wage gap, mean that it is most often a mother who is forced to take on formal caregiving responsibilities in the face of limited or unaffordable ECEC—often to the detriment of engagement in paid work. As Petit and Tedds (2020b) note, the labour force participation dynamics that result from an inadequate system of care have long-term implications for a woman's earning and career advancement potential throughout the life course, a reality which renders women more vulnerable and dependent upon the earnings and retirement savings of her partner. In many cases, this has a direct impact on power dynamics, the gendered division of labour within the household, and prevalence of IPV and abuse. In addition, it has to date contributed to higher rates of poverty among single senior women (Ivanova, 2017).

The COVID-19 pandemic is a case study in the effects of reduced ECEC availability. In April 2020, at the outset of the public health crisis, women's labour market participation sank to

55%, the lowest it has been since the mid-1980s. This drop—which is attended by a higher likelihood of “falling out” of the labour force—is linked to both the particular demands of motherhood and continued uncertainty regarding the availability of child-care options (Desjardins et al., 2020). In addition, Qian and Fuller (2020) find that not only did the pandemic exacerbate gender inequalities among parents, but the effects were particularly pronounced along class lines—that is, for those women without a university education. Several months into the pandemic, inequalities persist. It remains to be seen whether such work—and wages—will be regained.

While the Government of British Columbia has in recent years taken a multi-pronged approach to improving affordability of and access to ECEC, the province has largely delegated responsibility for ECEC delivery to private and non-profit providers, despite widespread agreement among child-care experts that reliance on private models of care does not constitute an adequate system, and that the quality of care purchased in private markets is often inadequate. Further, cash transfers neither account for a paucity of available high-quality care spaces nor are sufficiently generous to address the high cost of care without further regulation. A basic services approach, on the other hand, is centred on the development of a high-quality, universal, and public model of care in which all families are guaranteed an affordable space and providers of care are well compensated. What would a movement toward a basic services model of access mean for diverse groups of people? How do approaches centered on parent subsidies or refundable tax credits for non-profit and private ECEC versus a basic income support choice between purchasing care or providing it in the home?

First, the basic services approach to ECEC is focused on public provision, given evidence that a reliance on market-focused approaches to ECEC—in which governments exercise limited management, planning, and funding functions—is a central factor in the relative weakness of Canadian ECEC schemes (Anderson et al., 2016). Second, the basic services model attends to the fact that the gendered and intersectional implications of ECEC policy extend beyond those who access ECEC, affecting professionals in the highly feminized and racialized caregiving sector as well. Despite the high cost of accessing ECEC, providers of care are undercompensated: wages are not competitive with comparable occupations, and median hourly wages are just 69% of average wages (Anderson et al., 2020). Third, basic services approaches consider dimensions of geography and location; time (i.e., availability during evenings and on weekends); proximity to other services, such as public transportation; and inclusive design (e.g., culturally and community-focused delivery for Indigenous persons, specialized care for children with health- and ability-related needs). Finally, a basic services model of ECEC would ensure that culturally appropriate ECEC is both funded and delivered within diverse communities (Anderson et al., 2016).

In comparing the basic income model with investment in public ECEC services, Bergmann (2008) posits that access to basic services would likely encourage labour market participation among women to a greater extent than would a basic income or cash transfer. Indeed, dynamics of female labour force exit are present, even in contexts characterized by a robust system of care and a legal entitlement to access. In Finland, which offers both a home

care allowance and a public, rights-based system of care, levels of inequality in ECEC use are high, while maternal employment levels are low, particularly among low-skilled mothers (Ellingsaeter, 2012, in Van Lancker & Ghysels, 2016).

It is possible that a basic income could have a similar impact among lower-income mothers—especially those who experience labour market barriers, such as workplace discrimination, low levels of education, limited opportunities as a result of geographic location, and legal issues—particularly if a context of unaffordability and limited access persists. As Kershaw (2004) argues, when introduced in social systems shaped by patriarchal norms regarding the gendered division of labour, allowances for caregiving—and by extension, benefits like a basic income that can be framed as compensatory of unpaid reproductive work—can result in gendered withdrawal from the labour force, particularly in broader contexts of unaffordability and inaccessibility of ECEC options. Similarly, when considering care allowances and tax deductions alongside class structures, such measures may not enable choice among all caregivers—that is, they “facilitate choice for the privileged at the expense of the less fortunate” (Kershaw, 2004, p. 947).

Public Transportation

While accessing public transportation puts much less strain on the monthly budgets of most people in B.C than does housing or ECEC,³ it still constitutes a publicly provided service that has significant implications along intersectional lines. It merits mention that this service covers areas in which cash transfers are unlikely to provide sufficient support in terms of access. For example, bridging transportation gaps in rural and remote areas for diverse groups of people requires an expansion of infrastructure in the form of bus and ferry routes, which cannot be achieved simply through a basic income approach.

Various factors shape one’s mobility, and by extension, one’s patterns of public transportation use. For example, women are more dependent upon and thus greater users of public transportation than men; in addition, both their transportation needs and their patterns of use are more complex, often reflecting trip chaining and engagement in a range of “household sustaining” activities, such as running errands and taking children to school or child care, frequently during off-peak times (see Duchène, 2011). Purchasing a monthly transit pass is one way to economize on the cost of frequent travel; however, the upfront price is prohibitive for some—\$98 per month for 1-zone travel with Vancouver’s TransLink, as one example. In addition, fee support is accessible to a narrow segment of the population: for the working poor and those receiving Temporary Assistance, no programs exist to support reduced fares, as subsidized travel is only available for seniors and Disability Assistance recipients through the BC Bus Pass Program. Age renders some of the broader population (i.e., children and seniors)

³ See Ivanova and Saugstad (2019) for a full breakdown of a bare-bones, living-wage budget in the B.C. context.

eligible for reduced fares. In such a context, a sliding scale fare structure⁴ for both BC Transit and TransLink would have a direct impact on affordability, and by extension, mobility, with considerable implications for women.

In general, public transportation facilitates access to a broader range of opportunities and services, such as employment and training and increased choice among child-care providers for those without a vehicle. In remote and rural areas, the impact of a lack of public transportation options is especially pronounced, resulting in immobility and isolation for low-income families without access to a car, those who do not drive, and people with disabilities in particular. Increasing the number of affordable transportation options in rural areas—and between rural communities—also has a harm reduction element. For years, a lack of public transportation in rural and remote areas, particularly along Highway 16—the Highway of Tears—contributed to a reliance on hitchhiking, the result of which was the disappearance of many Indigenous women and girls. Indeed, the implementation of a basic services approach to public transportation is inadequate without continued support for initiatives to extend and enhance public transportation infrastructure along Highway 16 and other rural routes.⁵ This is precisely why the Province of British Columbia partnered with the Government of Canada to co-fund BC Bus North which launched on June 4, 2018. BC Bus North provides schedule service to 39 communities across Northern B.C. (BC Bus North, 2020).

Further complicating access is the fact that transit systems have traditionally been designed and delivered without factoring in the particular needs of groups who rely on it for mobility; as a result, the mere existence of transit options does not mean that they are available to many (Duchène, 2011). For example, transit stations as well as buses and trains were designed around the needs of the male commuter, and thus do not meet the accessibility needs of persons with disabilities who cannot easily use stairs or navigate close quarters, as well as women who often travel with laundry, groceries, and/or a stroller. Further, safety and security measures are often absent; this is a barrier for women and LGBTQ2S+ individuals who face higher instances of violence and abuse on public transportation. Finally, despite the diversity of the B.C. population, as well as immigration flows, most public transportation options only provide information and signage in English, constructing another barrier for those outside the dominant paradigm. Accordingly, delivering public transportation through a basic services approach necessitates an adaptation and expansion of services, taking into account heterogeneity of experience and need.

Summary

It is clear from the above that expanding access to basic services such as housing, ECEC, and public transportation is vital, not just to support those living in poverty but also to

⁴ The City of Calgary's sliding scale fare structure enables access to a low-income transit pass for those with earnings below a certain amount. For those in the deepest need, the cost of a monthly bus pass is reduced to \$5.08 under the program.

⁵ This is especially important given the cessation of bus services by Greyhound Canada, which served for a long time as the only means of accessible city-to-city transportation in many areas of the province.

mitigate risk of poverty among various groups. Table 1 summarizes these points, comparing existing policies in B.C. with those that align with the basic services model. Basic services approaches to poverty reduction and inclusion are particularly important for diverse groups both because they make life more affordable by decommodifying or significantly reducing the cost of access to the basics (thereby ensuring that incomes can be stretched farther), and because they are productive of a range of additional benefits, such as increased participation options and social inclusion, which are not so easily realized through an income transfer. From an intersectional perspective, basic services can:

- better address root causes of poverty and need for diverse groups—public service provision is rooted in an understanding that needs are a direct product of structural and systemic inequality and oppression, meaning that they do not merely arise as a result of lack of money, poor financial management, or individual failure; as such, they are inherently intersectional;
- reduce gender-based barriers—no child-care options, lack of a driver’s licence, limited access to legal support—to engaging in a range of participation options;
- increase chances of sustained exit and recovery from abusive situations for diverse groups of women—for certain women, the context of high rents, low vacancy rates, and limited public supply is an immediate health risk that is not easily solved through an income transfer;
- enable access to a basic standard in service quality, regardless of income, such that disadvantaged populations are not further marginalized through sub-standard services;
- promote solidarity and engagement in community across several aspects of identity.

There are, however, key considerations and tensions that must be addressed when implementing a basic services approach. These are service design and delivery, institutions as sites of power and oppression, adjudication of need and eligibility, and the limitations of services.

Service Design and Delivery

Basic services are as effective—and as exclusive—as the design and delivery processes that shape them. For example, public infrastructure must reflect the diverse needs of the populations it serves. Otherwise, accessibility cannot be ensured, even if supply exists. This means bringing an intersectional lens to planning, design, delivery, and funding. It also involves mirroring the diversity of our society in the workforce that is hired to both deliver services (e.g., ECEC professionals, transit staff) and administer access to them (e.g., caseworkers). The success of public housing delivery also hinges on reshaping discourse, attending to building location and design features (e.g., safety, accessibility, proximity to other services), and maintaining units.

Table 1

Comparison of Existing Policies and Basic Services Approaches in Five Key Areas

Existing policy interventions	Focus of basic services
Housing	
<p>Rent supplements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RAP for low-income families, SAFER for elderly renters ● Shelter component of income support ● Portable benefits: Homeless Prevention, Canada Housing Benefit <p>Affordable and subsidized rental housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Affordable/below-market rentals (income-tested) ● Subsidized (income-tested, rent at 30% of income) <p>Context-specific housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Temporary modular housing, supportive and transition housing ● Units through Independent Living BC ● Indigenous Housing Providers (off-reserve housing) 	<p>Expanding stock of social housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improving the condition of current social and non-profit housing stock ● Building new affordable, and subsidized/non-market, housing in urban, rural, on-reserve settings ● Could include specific investment in functionally targeted housing (e.g., modular, transition, supportive) ● Social housing models often involve setting rents at a fixed level, such as a percentage of income (15%–30%)
Early childhood education and care	
<p>Affordability policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Affordable Child Care Benefit (income-tested) ● Child Care Fee Reduction Initiative: funding to licensed group, family facilities to reduce fees for those under 26 months, 3-K ● \$10/day Universal Prototype sites: 2,500 spots/53 sites <p>Access policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Operating Funding, New Spaces Fund, Start-Up Grants <p>ECEC workforce</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recruitment and Retention Strategy, ECE Wage Enhancement 	<p>Building a universal, public model of care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Development of a universal, publicly funded and supported system, in which if fees exist, they affordable to all ● Right to access to a care space, regardless of employment status ● Government regulation and support for training and remuneration of care professionals
Public transportation	
<p>Fare reduction initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BC Bus Pass for low-income seniors and PWD: annual fee of \$45 ● Transportation supplement for people on DA: \$52/month ● Reduced fares for seniors, youth 5-18, HandyCard holders <p>Notable rural service expansion projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Highway 16 Transportation Action Plan; BC Bus North 	<p>Introducing free/sliding scale fares for BC Transit, other services</p> <p>Extending options in remote, rural areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BC Bus North, Highway 16, etc. ● Extension of free/sliding scale fares

State Institutions as Sites of Power and Oppression

The state and its institutions—including the justice, educational, and income and social support systems—are sites where relations of power, oppression, and privilege play out. For example, key public institutions that have benefited many Canadians at the same time represent historic sites of oppression for some (e.g., the public education system for Indigenous peoples in Canada). As the composite structures and policies of the state were/are not only crafted according to particular logics and understandings of experience and need—reflecting and institutionalizing deeply rooted pathologies (patriarchy, heteronormativity, colonialism, classism, ableism, racism, etc.) as a result—they can, in turn, have the effect of shaping, disciplining, punishing, and rendering invisible those who encounter them. To be effective, basic services models (as is the case with all systems) must be designed with an inherent understanding that those whose identities create for them a complicated and fraught relationship with the state, its policies, and its services are also those who have the most to gain by accessing them.

Adjudicating Need and Eligibility for Access

Processes of need adjudication—applications for public housing, for example—should be designed to reduce the discrimination and additional barriers that are present for diverse people in private markets. In the case of public housing, a comparison of existing application and eligibility determination processes alongside understandings of barriers and discrimination in private markets, followed by an amendment of processes to be more inclusive, would have a significant impact from an intersectional perspective. In addition, a broadening (or removal) of eligibility criteria, to the extent that it is feasible, would further reduce stigma within systems.

Where Are Basic Services Insufficient?

The basic services approach is not the answer for all needs. While basic services proposals are often positioned in contrast to basic income, they do not entirely ignore insights about appropriate policy mix between services and income supports. In fact, some incorporate the complementarity of the basic income and basic services models, given the premise that personal needs exist for which some distribution in monetary form is necessary to preserve autonomy (Portes et al. 2017). Sustenance is one area in which a basic income or cash-focused approach is preferred over basic service models that include food banks and school food programs.

There is also work that basic services approaches cannot do. As is the case with the basic income model, basic services approaches do not address discrimination in the workplace, labour law (e.g., minimum wage), police brutality against Black and Indigenous persons, and a number of other systemic issues that require legislative and policy attention and that impact the livelihoods—economic and otherwise—of diverse groups of people in B.C.

Summary, Policy Recommendations, and Conclusions

The analysis undertaken in this paper reveals the extent to which an adequate and low-barrier income transfer as well as affordable and accessible services fulfill distinct but

complementary roles in broader social provision schemes. From an intersectional perspective, an unconditional cash transfer offers recipients simplicity of access and freedom of conversion, thus avoiding the paternalism, complexity, and invasive eligibility determination often present within systems; at the same time, basic services approaches reduce the barriers that diverse groups of women face given significant problems of affordability and low supply in areas like housing and ECEC, and can weaken discrimination and other issues diverse groups face in markets. In Table 2, we provide a summary of differences between the basic income and basic services models.

Our analysis suggests that if the policy choice is between a basic income and a robust system of targeted income support and public services, allocating resources toward a more fully developed state—that is, through greater investment in ensuring broader access to certain basic services, as well as providing targeted cash payments for those with the lowest incomes—should be given priority over a basic income for all, particularly given the potentially devastating impact of a reduction in public services for intersectional groups. However, this does not imply that it is one over the other; rather, this analysis shows that any income support must be combined with a robust system of public services, and that one cannot achieve inclusivity without the other also being present.

Table 2*Summary Comparison of the Basic Income and Basic Services Models*

	Basic income	Basic services
Poverty representations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poverty is individual, characterized by lack of income ▪ Gender and diversity emerge in relation to the problem, especially given the extent to which intersection of identity factors is productive of poverty and need ▪ Problematization of existing modes of provision, to the extent that income support processes are adjudicatory, invasive, punitive, and stigmatizing ▪ Challenges productivist ethic at core of existing systems of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poverty is a collective problem, characterized by lack of access to the basics and a failure in social provision ▪ Problematization of the market price and commodification of basic services, such as housing, ECEC, and legal services ▪ Challenges systems of adjudication at core of existing systems, through a logic of “free at the point of use”
Intersectional support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long history of intersectional support, including among women and racialized communities; however, skepticism among key groups in Canada as well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current support from provincial organizations and advocates focused on poverty reduction, gender justice, and reconciliation with Indigenous communities
Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduces the economic consequences of engaging in unwaged care and reproductive work, as well as low-wage work ▪ Emphasizes freedom of conversion, allowing recipients to guide their own access to basic needs ▪ Less easily accounts for heterogeneity of need, particularly along gender lines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Separates access to basics from the existence of an adequate income ▪ More likely to support affordability (through decommodification) given the high cost of meeting basic needs, particularly in the areas of ECEC, housing, and legal services ▪ Given issues of supply in various markets, more likely to extend access to those in need ▪ More control over the features of supply (to meet heterogenous needs)
Opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expands participation options through a disentanglement of a basic level of income from engagement in paid work ▪ The gendered impacts of this are inconclusive: in some contexts, it could contribute to recasting the gendered balance of power toward a more equal distribution of paid and unpaid work; in others, it could undermine attempts to move beyond traditional gender roles in the division of labour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitative of expanded opportunity, including access to paid employment and training, particularly for women (given barriers associated with performance of unpaid and reproductive labour, mobility issues, etc.) ▪ Housing is a significant factor in providing the foundation for a viable exit for those facing intimate partner violence ▪ Removes barriers to opportunity that cannot easily be solved through an income transfer, such as access to legal representation, basic infrastructure (e.g., broadband, mobility)

<p><i>Social inclusion</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential to reduce stigmatization of benefit recipients that is present in means-tested income support systems, including potential revictimization within the system to prove eligibility ▪ Expands dignity and simplicity of access, alleviating some of the burden of time poverty ▪ Reduces subjectification effects of beneficiaries, as receipt is connected to citizenship or residency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rooted in shared access, carries the promise of increased solidarity and integration ▪ Emphasis on delivery at the local level and in partnership with communities has the potential to produce more inclusive and culturally appropriate services ▪ Greater community-building and inclusion potential (e.g., public housing, mobility, digital connection) ▪ Potential to perpetuate existing issues of public provision: surveillance, retrenchment, stigma, and ghettoization of services
---------------------------------------	---	--

References

- Alstott, A. (2001). Good for women. In P. Van Parijs (Ed.), *What's Wrong with a Free Lunch?* (pp. 75–79). . Beacon Press.
- Anderson, L., Ballantyne, M., & Friendly, M. (2016). *Child care for all of us: Universal child care for Canadians by 2020*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2016/12/Child_Care_AFB2017_technical_paper.pdf
- Anderson, L., Sing, M., & Haber, R. (2020). *A competitive, publicly funded provincial wage grid is the solution to BC's ECE shortage*. Coalition of Child Care Advocates of BC and Early Childhood Educators of BC.
https://www.ecebc.ca/application/files/4915/9553/5275/CCCABC_ECEBC_Wage_Grid_Report_June_2020_web.pdf
- Apland, J., Manoe, M., & Mikesh, H. (2018). *Report on the Proceedings of the Symposium on Basic Income, Social Security and Poverty Reduction*. University of British Columbia, School of Social Work. <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/initiatives-plans-strategies/poverty-reduction-strategy/submissions/basic-income-social-security-and-poverty-reduction-report-on-the-symposium-proceedings.pdf>
- Austin, A., Capper, B., & Deutsch, T. (2020). Wages for housework and social reproduction: A microsyllabus. <https://www.radicalhistoryreview.org/abusablepast/wages-for-housework-and-social-reproduction-a-microsyllabus/>
- BC Bus North. (2020). *About Us*. <https://bcbus.ca/about/>
- B.C. Poverty Reduction. (2018). *Researchers explore the potential of a basic income in B.C.* <https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2018SDPR0048-001317>
- B.C. Poverty Reduction Coalition. (n.d.). Universal basic services.
<https://www.bcpovertyreduction.ca/full-blueprint/universal-basic-services>
- Bergmann, B. R. (2008). Basic income grants or the welfare state: Which better promotes gender equality? *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1932-0183.1128>
- Bidadanure, J. U. (2019). The political theory of universal basic income. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 481–501.
- Broad, G., & Nadjiwon-Smith, J. (2017). B.I.G. and First Nations: Cautions for implementation. *Basic Income Guarantee Series*. Northern Policy Institute.
- Cameron, A., & Tedds, L. M. (2020). *Gender-based analysis plus and intersectionality: Overview, an enhanced framework, and a British Columbia case study*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia
- Carter, T., & Polevychok, C. (2004). *Housing is good social policy*. Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Coote, A., Kasliwal, P., & Percy, A. (2019). Universal basic services: theory and practice—A literature review. *IGP Working Paper Series*. Institute for Global Prosperity, University College London.

- De Wispelaere, J., & Morales, L. (2016). Is there (or should there be) a right to basic income? *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 42(9), 920–936.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453715625439>
- Duchène, C. (2011). Gender and transport. *International Transport Forum*.
- Forget, E. L. (2011). The town with no poverty: The health effects of a Canadian guaranteed annual income field experiment. *Canadian Public Policy*, 37(3), 283–305.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.37.3.283>
- Gheaus, A. (2008). Basic income, gender justice and the costs of gender-symmetrical lifestyles. *Basic Income Studies*, 3(3), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1932-0183.1134>
- Gough, I. (2019). Universal basic services: A theoretical and moral framework. *Political Quarterly*, 90(3), 534–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12706>
- Government of British Columbia. (2018). What we heard about poverty in B.C.
https://engage.gov.bc.ca/app/uploads/sites/121/2018/07/WWH_Report-PovertyReductionStrategy_FINAL.pdf
- Government of British Columbia. (2019). *TogetherBC: British Columbia's poverty reduction strategy*. <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/initiatives-plans-strategies/poverty-reduction-strategy/togetherbc.pdf>
- Gurstein, P., & Vilches, S. (2010). The just city for whom? Re-conceiving active citizenship for lone mothers in Canada. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 17(4), 421–436.
- Hamilton, L., & Mulvale, J. P. (2019). “Human again”: The (unrealized) promise of basic income in Ontario. *Journal of Poverty*, 23(7), 576–599.
- Industrial Strategy Commission. (2017). *The Final Report of the Industrial Strategy Commission*. <http://industrialstrategycommission.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/The-Final-Report-of-the-Industrial-Strategy-Commission.pdf>
- Ivanova, I. (2017). *Poverty and inequality among British Columbia's seniors*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/SeniorsInequality>
- Ivanova, I., & Saugstad, L. (2019). *Working for a living wage: Making paid work meet basic family needs in Metro Vancouver (2019 update)*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives—BC Office, Living Wage for Families Campaign, and First Call BC Child and Youth Advocacy Coalition.
- Kershaw, P. (2004). “Choice” discourse in BC child care: Distancing policy from research. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 37(4), 927–950.
- Kesselman, J. R., & Mendelson, M. (2020). *In-kind versus cash benefits in social programs: Choices, structures, and operations*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.
- Lombardozi, L., & Pitts, F. H. (2019). Social form, social reproduction and social policy: Basic income, basic services, basic infrastructure. *Capital and Class*, 1–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0309816819873323>
- Mendelson, M., & Kesselman, J. R. (2020). *Applying a basic income lens to British Columbia's demand-side housing programs*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.

- Orloff, A. S. (1990). Comment on Ann Withorn, “Is One Man’s Ceiling Another Woman’s Floor? Women and BIG.” Paper presented at Basic Income Guarantees: A New Welfare Strategy? conference, University of Wisconsin–Madison, April 6–8, 1990.
- Paterson, S., Marier, P., & Chu, F. (2016). Technocracy or transformation? Mapping women’s policy agencies and orienting gender (in)equality in the Canadian provinces. *Canadian Public Administration*, 59(3), 405–424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12178>
- Petit, G., & Tedds, L. M. (2020a). *Gender-based analysis plus (GBA+) of the current system of income and social supports in British Columbia*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.
- Petit, G., & Tedds, L. M. (2020b). *Overview of the system of income and social support programs in British Columbia*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.
- Petit, G., & Tedds, L. M. (2020c). *Poverty in British Columbia: Income thresholds, trends, rates, and depths of poverty*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.
- Portes, J., Reed, H., & Percy, A. (2017). *Social prosperity for the future: A proposal for universal basic services*. Institute for Global Prosperity, University College London.
- Qian, Y., & Fuller, S. (2020). COVID-19 and the gender employment gap among parents of young children. *Canadian Public Policy*, 46(S2), S89–S101. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2020-077>
- Robeyns, I. (2001). Will a basic income do justice to women? *Analyse and Kritik*, 23(1), 88–105. <https://doi.org/10.1515/aug-2001-0108>
- Sloman, P. (2016). Beveridge’s rival: Juliet Rhys-Williams and the campaign for basic income, 1942–55. *Contemporary British History*, 30(2), 203–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2015.1077443>
- Tedds, L. M., & Crisan, D. (2020). *Recent political manifesto commitments to basic income in Canada*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.
- Tedds, L. M., Crisan, D., & Petit, G. (2020). *Basic income in Canada: Principles and design features*. Research paper commissioned by the Expert Panel on Basic Income, British Columbia.
- Verbist, G., Förster, M., & Vaalavuo, M. (2012). *The impact of publicly provided services on the distribution of resources: Review of new results and methods*. OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers.
- Withorn, A. (1993). Women and basic income in the US: Is one man’s ceiling another woman’s floor? *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 4(1), 29–43.
- Yalnizyan, A. (2017). Redistribution through a basic income. *The Monitor* 23(5), 30–31. https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2017/01/Monitor_Jan-Feb2017.pdf
- Yamamori, T. (2014). A feminist way to unconditional basic income: Claimants unions and women’s liberation movements in 1970s Britain. *Basic Income Studies*, 9(1-2), 1–24.