

**The Ethics of Poverty in Ontario:
A Moral Defense for a Universal Basic Income**

Marthaline T. Barlay

Major research paper submitted to
the Faculty of Human Sciences and Philosophy,
School of Ethics, Social Justice and Public Service, Saint Paul University,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Public Ethics

Ottawa, Canada
January 2021

© Marthaline Barlay, Ottawa, Canada, 2021

Introduction

Due to the current coronavirus pandemic, the rate of unemployment has drastically increased. The economic downfall attached to this pandemic has caused one of the worst economic disasters since the great depression in 2008. The news reported that the number of unemployed Canadians in April of this year was two million. On top of the one million that was written in March of 2020 (D'Amore). Fast-tracked to the introduction of Canadian Emergency Response Benefit, CERB, which was introduced to help those who fell victim to the pandemic; the author's concern that while this project ended in September to be transitioned to the unemployment benefits, only 1.4 million of the 4.2 million will be eligible under standard rules for the Employment Insurance Benefit (EI). The big question is, what happens to the rest of those who are not qualified? Before the pandemic, the number of food bank users had increased drastically (Brown). The concern is what happens to the number of individuals that the pandemic has affected? This means that, beyond curtailing the virus and regulating the poverty issue, there is a high demand from the government for the right policy that could safeguard this problem. While making use of this argument for the institution of the basic income for all citizens, David McDonald pointed out that "there is no doubt that many people will fall below the poverty line" (D'Amore).

Additionally, according to the Feed Ontario report, 2019, more than 1.57 million people live in poverty in Ontario, Canada. Moreover, social welfare systems continue to put measures in place to combat the many challenges faced. With the rate at which extreme poverty and social exclusion continue to skyrocket, people are left stuck in a vicious cycle of poverty. Although Canada's government has created a poverty-free Canada plan by 2030, unknown such as the

Covid-19 pandemic have crept in, leaving more individuals close to going below the poverty line or just psychologically depressed based on their bills and other necessities.

The purpose of this paper is to propose a safety net such as a Universal Basic Income, an unconditional amount given by the government to meet its citizens' basic or primary needs (Parijs). A primary income that could play an essential role in giving poor individuals their basic respect, dignity, and freedom to choose more deserving lives. It could also be a state of entitlement to citizens who cannot afford their basic needs. Not only could this idea alleviate poverty, but it could also improve psychological health for millions in honor of their fundamental human right. Individual right to choose lives they deserve is essential, and it is the duty of an adequate government to give its citizens that basic right without conditions. I argue that although the idea of a basic income may not completely eradicate poverty, it has the potential to give individuals the freedom to choose the lives they deserve, human dignity, and positive psychological health, and the motivation necessary to escape poverty in the long term. The body of this paper is divided into four sections.

Section one summarizes data on the case of poverty in Ontario and how the vulnerable condition of these individuals can be degrading and humiliating. I then include the circumstances faced during the current covid-19 pandemic that have created an economic disaster and put individuals in worse states than they already were before the pandemic.

Section two explores basic arguments for a universal basic income as an anti-poverty policy that could provide citizens the bare minimum that could enable them to live a more fulfilling life. These arguments include freedom of choice, respect of human dignity, and psychological well-being. Given that this idea has been part of political discussions for years, I draw on the concept of other advocates with different dimensions of the idea and further assess

the pilot programs introduced in Ontario and other countries, which could help build a strong case. This section also draws on Kant's deontology theory as the methodology to support my recommendation for a universal basic income.

Section three explores counterarguments against the policy regarding the basic income. Arguments about an individual dropping out of the workforce, the program being expensive for the government to maintain each year, and other relevant factors that I think could be controversial.

Section four concludes that implementing the universal basic income as a policy could give poor individuals a safety net to fall back on when things got rough. The pandemic is an actual situation that clearly defines the meaning of things falling apart unexpectedly. I then state a case that connects the government's moral obligations to an economic factor in helping unfortunate individuals live well-deserving lives.

To clearly illustrate the use of terms, I adopt Jonathan Wolff's definition of 'economic poverty' as lacking the financial resources to meet a set of basic needs (Wolff 217). His description states my case of individuals who face human rights deficits due to the effects of poverty such as curtailing their choices, lacking basic respect and dignity, leaving them stressed while constantly juggling multiple unstable jobs. The kind of Poverty referred to in this paper is 'Relative Poverty' in a developed country. Also, I use the Cambridge dictionary definition of "unconditional" as "complete and not limited in any way" to distinguish between this program and other welfare programs related to poverty relief. The name of the proposed policy, Universal Basic Income, hereinafter is referred to as 'UBI'.

Ethical Challenges of Poverty and the Effects of Covid-19 in Ontario

The Canadian labor market seems to be struggling with the rate of poverty assumed to expand radically. Not only has the pandemic disproportionately affected the poor people in Ontario, it has also affected people who once lived above the poverty line in Ontario and the entire world. The idea of more critical business open and other low wages jobs closed; for instance, restaurants inconsistencies with indoor dining and limited capacity, all have negative influences on the working poor even more. Unlike the non-poor communities that could work from home, they are likely to have services, purchase sanitary supplies, and stack up on food and medications. For instance, a low-income individual has constraints as to his needs and wants. Instead of a disinfectant, his focus might be on the next meal or a transport fare to find a new or essential job. During winter months or emergency lock down measures, children have virtual classes at home, and their parents may need to run the heat for longer hours than would have with regular school and work sessions. The challenges that the pandemic brings more severe risks and hardships than was anticipated.

Poverty causes hunger and suffering for many people, including low life expectancy, malnutrition, addiction, dehumanization, depression, massive stress, social isolation, and other socioeconomic issues. In Ontario, the number of working poor and unattached singles who live in poverty has continued to increase or remain in the vicious circle of poverty despite federal, territorial, and provincial government interventions. In 2019, Feed Ontario reported that the number of food bank users have increased by 24 percent in the last 3years. Among the millions who are affected by poverty, some of these individuals are hard workers who have multiple unstable jobs, work long hours, limited health insurance, and unpredictable work hours, while housing and other necessities continue to rise (Brown 10). According to the 2020 table of Low-

Income Cut-Off Canada (LICO), the poverty line per person in Ontario is 25, 920 cad per person a year; approximately 72 cad per day.

The various consequences associated with living in poverty makes one powerless and defenseless in many ways. It remains a situation people want to escape and should not be understood in physical needs alone. There are other mental and emotional considerations, as well. Poverty aggravates the impact of a disaster, like the pandemic that we are currently facing now, for those living in poverty, and they remain at extreme risk. It makes individuals vulnerable to harm, humiliation, hopelessness, violates equal respect and fundamental human values. It also can play a significant role in crime rates and lack of personal security in environments (Lotter 95). For some settings, escaping the wrath of poverty seems like a never-ending circle. A just society entails that everyone ought to be treated with equal respect and have necessities as a human right. The spread and fight against this issue is a structural problem based on political, social, and economic factors. Other fundamental ethical issues associated with poverty include poor governance, corruption, social injustice, inequality. "Morally, all people share a common humanity, and are entitled to live a fully human life, yet poverty is in some sense dehumanizing" (Wolff 218)(see also Jones 1990). One loses his/her self-respect from his family or community based on the inability to provide basic needs.

Poverty is a plague that violates fundamental human dignity and values, increases individual's vulnerabilities, harms people's mental well-being, physical well-being, and overall remains a threat to individuals' lives (Lotter 56-77). Not only does poverty affect those living in it, but also affects non-poor citizens as well. It leads to increasing violence levels, poor health outcomes, mainly psychological, drug addiction, social problems, and the list is endless. It could either be from a natural disaster, sudden death, being stolen from, loss of unemployment, serious

illness, but the fact remains that it is like disability (Lotter 226). This is to infer that the idea of poor people being impoverished by the fault of their own should be erased and extreme measures to solve this problem harvested. With the usual aid programs or social welfare programs, they tend to have short term solutions, and then the vicious circle begins again. Although beneficial and admirable by many, it has proven ineffective in many aspects. More reasons why there is a need for a more extreme measure.

In essence, it is argued that having less creates a mindset that is continuously distracted (Shah, Mullainathan and Shafir 682). People living poor could be susceptible to other ill behaviors that clouds their minds from the things that might seem important in getting them out of the poverty situation. These authors' arguments give a sense of acknowledgment to other non-poor in relating better to the consequences that poor individuals face daily. For example, when non-poor individuals pay attention to specific things to do, either at work or at school, they prioritize a specific aspect of their lives and sometimes forget what is required next. The same thing applies to those living in poverty. When they are hungry or psychologically ill, they would instead think of the next meal that the next rent that is due. With the Ontario Child benefit program (OCB), most families with children have gotten out of poverty. What about other poor individuals, singles, families without children? Their rates of poverty continue to increase. First and foremost, the method used that is most often used to measure the poverty line unofficially is the Statistics Canada Low Income Cut-off (LICO). According to Feed Ontario (2019), there is a deeper level of absolute poverty among those unattached individuals. Something ought to be done about the situation. "The working poor, including 'unattached' single persons, are not only the fastest-growing group of food bank users but access the food banks more often than other demographics throughout the year" (Brown 4). Even with the food bank and other programs set

in place, it is safe to say that people remain in a vicious circle of poverty. Based on the 2019 report, the cost of poverty is about \$33 billion annually. With all the amounts that have been invested in these programs, the rate of poverty for certain groups in Ontario continues to increase.

Equally, if the pandemic's economic impact continues to affect lower-income individuals, the possibility of suffering, humiliation, hunger, as well as homelessness could be very close. The number of visible homeless and invisible homeless continues to rise, especially with the impact of the current coronavirus pandemic. For many, the thought of a person working and could still fall below the poverty line could be attached to poor budgeting. Most of these poor people struggle to work all year round with hopes of avoiding the welfare stigma. However, the chances of being homeless or living below the poverty line is the result of increase rents, inadequate skill or education, underemployment, and so on. Having a job cannot always be a solution to poverty. This issue is associated with poverty and makes those affected to be more vulnerable to society's uncertainties. Sleeping outside, especially during the winter months in Ontario, could be deadly. Although most of these individuals have gotten addicted to drugs, alcohol, and other substances, there is still hope for change and for a better life.

Review of the Universal Basic Income

Debates about the idea of a basic income continue to persist. With the stigma associated with welfare programs, some authors continue to criticize the idea. Critics like Philippe Van Parijs and Yannick Vanderborght in their recent book, 2017, they condemn welfare as having many restrictions along with an “employment trap” that keeps individual in the workforce even when there are ill treatments associated with the job.

With the government's duty to alleviate poverty and the fear of the labor market taking a downward shift on employment and wages, the idea of a Basic Income has resurfaced. This idea, which was tested in 2016 by Ontario's government, came to an abrupt stop with the newly elected Ford government in 2018 (Ferosi, McDowell and Lewchuk). Although the program was canceled, Canada's government as well as the Ontario government still has a possible future for full implementation. This idea of a universal or unconditional basic income has been defended by historical activist and prominent personalities like Charles Murray from 2009 advocated the UBI as a means to replace welfare states (Murray), Thomas Payne in 1796/1797 believed that through taxation, basic income was needed by the 'young people in their 20s', Milton Friedman in 1960s, introduced the idea of a Negative Income Tax (NIT), in that those who earned more could pay taxes that were given to others below a certain income level, Martin Luther King Jr., in his final book, believed that the means of fighting poverty was to that it was necessary for a guaranteed income for all Americans; one that could guarantee every poor family a middle-class income. Including some known businessmen and politicians such as Elon Musk, Mark Zuckerberg, Andrew Yang, et cetera, to alleviate poverty.

De Wispelaere and Stirton (2004) admits that the idea that was once ignored or paid less consideration is no longer a "crackpot idea of the radical left." The authors state that Martin Luther King Jr. suggested this claim in his "A Freedom Budget for all Americans." Ram (2019) presents that in 2017, the McKinsey Global Institute estimated that up to 800 million workers globally could lose their jobs by 2030 because of robotic automation; others have warned that this will only exasperate the level of poverty levels by raising productions but hitting wages. The authors suggested from reports of the Canada trial that the primary justification of giving people money is ethical and not instrumental.

According to *Southern Ontario Basic Income Experience: Intro* (2020), in 2017, the pilot program was instituted by the Government of Ontario selected Hamilton, Brantford, Brant County as the cities to experiment with the basic income. Although the program was aborted due to the new government, Minister Lisa MacLeod said that the program failed to help individuals become "independent contributors to the economy." Instead, there were positive outcomes and testimonials from participants that the research survey uncovered. They reported how the basic income impacted key areas of participants' lives such as improvements in mental and physical health, housing stability, food security, more secure jobs, reshaping their living standards, a sense of self-worth, and the hope for a better future (Ferosi, McDowell and Lewchuk)

Further reports of the Ontario Basic Income Pilot, OBIP, suggests that the experiment was abandoned due to political reasons rather than a negative outcome (Mendelson). The results from that pilot program can help us further understand the shortcomings and benefits of the program. It was noted that the implementation of the OBIP was flawed based on issues like lacking site, testing recipient's income by tax, and enrollment (Mendelson 2). The study results found that participants compared the other active programs with the UBI, claimed that it made them feel "Human Again" (Hamilton and Mulvale). Interestingly, most participants were glad to receive the basic income and could tell the difference from other programs. The outcomes of Ontario's basic income showed that other welfare programs are more toxic than people think. For instance, a concept by Michael Foucault in the 1970s termed as "biopower", the welfare state in which the government is more concern about the benefits and multiplication of resources by its population with precise controls and regulations, while ignoring the freedom, dignity, and values of its citizens. Based on a CBC News report (2020), the project worked by recruiting low-income people and couples with a fixed amount of approximately 17,000 to individuals to 24,000 for

couples annually (Taekema). The report also confirmed that the concerns of individuals being lazy was not the case. Instead, they kept work, and besides, their health also improved.

When the program was aborted by Ontario's government, they did not consider its impact and devalued the participants who had long-term plans. All these pilot programs had expected and practical outcomes; the studies suggest that the basic income was a better option than other existing welfare programs. Better results such as mental health, housing stability, economic independence, et cetera. Those individuals that experienced it noticed the differences between the welfare programs they once had and the basic income.

Recently, April 2020, a response to the coronavirus response package was introduced—Canadian Emergency Response Benefit, CERB. This proves a fraction of how the UBI would be implemented. Although the program is beneficial to most during this period, it is not available to all those who need it. A support program like this gives a clearer overview of the idea of a basic income for some who may not understand how it will be allocated and implemented.

Ethical Framework

The consequences of poverty are both social and economic conditions that causes disregard for human dignity, dehumanization, humiliation, curtails choices and psychological issues its victims. Based on the ethical effects associated with poverty, I adopt Immanuel Kant's deontology ethics to clearly state my arguments for a universal basic income, UBI. For those ethical issues, I propose an economic solution because, 'relative deprivation' is better attributed to solutions that promises socio-economic growth within a country.

The practical imperative will thus be as follows: "so act that the use of humanity, in your person as well as in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means" (Kant, Groundwork 41; 4:429). Kantian deontology also supports the respect of the other

individual and to treat that person not as a means but as an 'end in itself.' With this account, we have to show respect and consideration for others, especially those in need. Kant clearly states, as one of his versions of the categorical imperative, that everyone should be considered as a rational being that is willing and capable of choosing valuable ends in themselves. It is not to be coerced by someone based on their motive or become disrespectful just because they lack certain aspects of their livelihood. Therefore, it is inferred from Kant's position that we have a moral obligation to help those in poor situations. As humans, we ought to have moral bindings that make us help those living in extreme poverty. For Kant, all humans must be inherently worthy of respect and dignity. The majority of people living in poverty are taken advantage of and often blamed for their situations. Kant's deontological *duty of virtue*, the rights, respect, dignity, and autonomy, gives a defense for those in poverty. He points out that it is the government's duty to help its citizens increase their potential to become better versions of themselves and meet their basic needs. He also builds an argument where the wealthy ought to be coerced for the poor's sake (Kant, Gregor and Sullivan 468). As Kant emphasizes on the concept of the duty of the state to coerce the wealthy for the sake of those in need. He states:

For reasons of the state, the government is therefore authorized to constrain the wealthy to provide the means of sustenance to those who are unable to provide for even their most necessary natural needs. The wealthy have acquired an obligation to the commonwealth since they owe their existence to an act of submitting to its protection and care, which they need to live; on this obligation, the state now bases its right to contribute what is theirs to maintaining their fellow citizens (Kant, Gregor and Sullivan 468).

Valuing a person end as much as they do, in a way, gives them a sense of belonging and a substance to take their lives to higher levels. It is evident that the needs of those in need should

be a paramount concern for the government in making sure that its citizens have better lives. Contributing to others' ends is an ingredient that offers fulfillment and a duty for the state and other non-poor to value that 'an end in itself.' Therefore, with limited resources and lack of such duty to their ends, a person might do what they do not want, merely for the sake of survival based on their circumstances. It is an obligation for the government to help each citizen with pure practical reasons to support their cause. To be emphasized, all humans, regardless of their situation in life, have an intrinsic and moral value that ought to be a fundamental right. Not only will the UBI make lives better, but it will also sustain the cost of the UBI in the long term.

Freedom to Choose Better Lives

Poverty curtails our choices as rational human beings. It makes humans prisoners in their own existence. One cannot fully participate in activities that could benefit his end based on the limitations of what one can and cannot do because of their situation. Amartya Sen (1999) suggested that it is necessary that people could choose lives that have value and can motivate their capabilities (Sen 56). While it may be true that individuals tend to do the unthinkable based on their absolute means for survival, it also proves effective that enabling one's capacity gives can harvest more productive outcomes. Living in the frame of mind of knowing that there is yet freedom to do what they can with whatever they had without instructions gives one a sense of will power. Knowing that one can have a wide range of choices can have a positive effect. This positive control is necessary to the self-determination and degree to access other options.

Based on Sen's "capability set," a person has an alternative for a better life. Freedom of choice makes it possible for individuals to have some control level and actively have lives with more options. Sen also points out that the result of a deprived life is from the "inadequate income" (Sen 87). Situations like a trip to the store do not have to trade-off on certain

commodities for needy individuals. The everyday trips that non-poor individuals take for granted can be mind-battling cases for people living in poverty. Income is as essential to happiness as the freedom of choice. Such satisfaction promotes positive outcomes and gives one a sense of autonomy. With deepening interactions as an ethical justice, those living in poverty can balance life and existence.

Sen's argument further states that necessary freedom should be allocated to those who need it the most. Restrictions and norms only have the capacity to limit us as humans from entirely making the best out of who we are and what we are meant to be. Freedom, first and foremost, is a basic human right that we ought to have no matter where and how others perceive it to who we are. Sen's argument is solely focused on the idea that freedom should be that sense of self-identity that allows us to be determined, not always to follow the conventional method or the mediocrity that aligns the power of getting to where one wants to be. He also describes the development as a means of the poor expanding real freedoms, they have the right to enjoy.

In like manner, Kant's view of freedom suggests that, we as rational beings owe it to ourselves and others to make decisions or make choices that determine our effects on society (Kant, Groundwork xxix). He also points out that freedom and morality are connected. He further argues that the state respects the freedom and equality of its citizens (Holtman 96). That is to say that with the help of the state imposing taxation of the wealthy, there is the possibility of individuals living better lives and having access to other valuable parts of their existence. The freedom then generates a positive aspect that feeds off on those impoverished citizens to have free will as choices. He further argues on the element of pure reason that an individual right to freedom of choice is free from every aspect of adverse external factors.

Regarding some welfare programs, say food banks or food stamps, those kinds of programs limit an individual's choice. It is restrictive and conditional in a way that specific individuals might not qualify based on some factors. Again, Kant acknowledges that as a rational being, one must be given the fundamental right to choose the kind of life or the best choice, explicitly developing more extensive life plans. We understand that food supplies serve to eradicate hunger, but what happens next? The person then must wait for the next available meal? How does it more extensively develop a person's independence, as Kant puts it?

Hennie P.P. Lotter also argues that as humans, one ought to be given fundamental freedom to live one's life free of other external factors, a life that is solely based on one's judgment (Lotter 187).

Freedom to align their choices or preferences in ways that make their time worth it. The “regularly poor” person does not have the choice capacity based on his/her that they deserve. When a person cannot provide these necessities or is at a vulnerable stage in life, the ‘possibilities of an autonomous self is limited’ (O’Neill 102). This idea is not to make everyone wealthy; it is only to give most people who have suffered all their lives the ability to choose or prioritize their livelihood freely. That level of will power gives one the avenue to access other vital aspects in their lives. Sen also points out that “being relatively poor in a rich country can be a great capability handicap, even when one's absolute income is high in terms of world standard” (Sen 89). This could also be termed as a form of social exclusion. When a person is poor in a rich country, lacking certain facilities in a country that have a certain standard causes deprivation. Within a rich country, there should be a means of giving everyone the opportunity of similar living standard. Relative poverty in a developed country stems from inequality in various

aspects. For instance, it could be either or the following inequalities: income, race, gender, and so on.

Furthermore, one's capability to maintain a fruitful life is embedded in an autonomous self. The results of poverty then curtail an individual's ability to make decisions of independence that could shape their lives. Their ability to have a sense of enablement based on the freedom of decisions gives poor people the capacity to take charge of their lives. The Kantian duty of beneficence supports the less fortunate help and the recovery of an autonomous self to enable them to promote and develop their ends (O'Neill). Regarding human rights for those living in poverty, Onara O'Neil further argues that humans' basic rights ought to be respected and prioritized. She also states that it is an obligation of humanity and beneficence that should be evaluated more when it involves people living in poverty. Kant implies that we owe it to those who find themselves in absolute or relative poverty the ability or capacity to make their own choices.

Additionally, the enhanced income could be an essential means to a deserving life, as it can motivate a person's ability to pursue greater earning possibility. For instance, a person might decide that the length of time it takes for higher education and securing a higher paying job is not directly proportionate to a better life. With the idea of a safety net, that individual then has the time and availability of pursuing a more remarkable skill or a higher education for better-paying jobs.

Respect and Human Dignity

The dignity of a person living in poverty is essential. Kant supports the idea of respect for others with the duty of beneficence in the form of a duty of respect. He admonishes us not to "exalt ourselves above others" (Kant, Groundwork). We ought to respect the dignity of our

fellows, whether the situation is of one's fault or not. Kant further admonishes us that all humans have an "intrinsic worth" that makes us regarded as valuable and not on animals' same levels (Rachels 114-17). Some poor individuals are blamed for the cause of their circumstances and, as such, are treated poorly based on these assumptions.

Respect for a fellow human being should be considered a right. One who cannot afford or lack the capability to afford, should not be a breeding ground to be disrespected by others. James Rachels argues that Kant builds a strong case on humans' dignity when he values humans as "above all price" in a way that they are not seen as mere means only. He further states that a human's value is paramount in their decisions and having goals that determine an end for themselves. As worthy humans, despite any circumstance, should not be tricked, manipulated, or using their vulnerability as a 'mere means to oneself', but ought to be respected valued. An individual's dignity could thrive when they have total control over how their lives apply.

As a result of the moral harms that poverty causes, poor individuals cannot fully participate in aspects of their lives that express whom they identify. This lack of care adds another blow to their dignity, as they are not shown the consideration proper to humans in similar degrading circumstances (Lotter). Everyone ought to freely participate and express themselves without the fear of being looked down upon or being considered unfit based on their circumstances or predicament. Many of these individuals lack the basic right to the necessities required to maintain a life worth living. As Lotter argues, "equal respect is a part of our normative foundations of fundamentals of contemporary constitutional democracies" (Lotter 190). This implies that a just society entails that its citizens are fully and equally respected regardless of their situation. It gives a whole new meaning to respect as an essential duty by every member

of society. With such a worthy purpose of this right, a poor person is protected from being taken advantage of or used merely as a means by non-poor persons.

Most participants of welfare programs feel some shame about going to food banks and always asking for things they need. With the UBI's automated service, individuals do not have to wait in line or risk being disrespected and trying to shield the shame. People have the right to life, integrity and not being subjected to humiliation and degradation. As humans, a person's choice of life and their decisions ought to be primarily their own. Interference from external sources should not coerce a rational person's decision. They are made to believe that they are a project rather than actively a part of the process.

Therefore, many people living in poverty are humiliated because of their conditions. Society has assumed that earning more results from hard work and dedication while making less or living poor results from laziness or fault of their own. People living destitute should not be blamed or humiliated for their current predicament. "We call something inhuman when a condition or an act implies that human beings are treated in some or other ways as being of significantly lesser value or worth than their fellows or live-in conditions that devalue their status as human beings in meaningless ways" (Lotter 161). When a person is continuously humiliated, the term to be internally stuck because they may not find a way out. With other welfare programs, poor individuals can be meant to feel like they are entirely dependent. Dependency on the government could be considered a moral right; reliance on others for survival or forced to be a slave-based on the situation violates human dignity and right. When there is a sense of entitlement, the poor then sees the means not as a dependency but as an obligation of the government that could give them that drive to push further to entirely break that circle of violation by giving individuals the power of their stance in life.

When poor individuals are often humiliated based on their conditions, they become lost and remain isolated. The need for a good or better life is a wish of every individual. No one can say that they do not value a good life. As such, people living in poverty should not be treated negatively or devalued based on their situations. Sometimes, the position could only be temporarily based on unknown circumstances.

Every human desire the need to be given respect and dignity. The basic respect of a person should be done both physically and emotionally. Lotter further argues that every human ought to be given the basic equal respect to ultimately value their claims and determination (Lotter 189). When this happens, it does not only provide them with the level of motivation needed to succeed or push towards a well-deserving life, it also gives them the identity required to survive. To have a basic right that is solely deserved, one should understand that poverty's darkness brings nothing but harm and suffering to its victims. Equal respect for those living in poverty implies that it strengthens their thoughts of a better life and gives some sense of fulfillment. Without it, one starts to have doubts about the future, and they might give up their fundamental rights, start shifting blames on other, stress, and regrets, which makes matters worse.

The dignity of an individual is vital to create an avenue for self-determination and positive well-being. As Lotter clearly states, "the requirement to equal respect as a duty" is for the non-poor not to blame them for their poverty or the humiliation and seeing them as less worthy (Lotter 192). With her examples of bodily harm to poor women who are at greater risk of violence or assaults, it goes to prove that poverty is much deeper than that could be perceived by those who have not experienced it. 'Equal respect' is a need that should be given to poor agents. Being ashamed that they must ask for help, standing in long queues, and wishing that it is over soon can be degrading and unfair.

As James Nickel (2005) argues: 'we respect a person's dignity when we protect their life and agency when we prevent others from imposing treatments that are severely degrading and unfair' (394). The dignity of every life, poor or not, ought to be upheld and safeguarded. They do not need to be continuously reminded of their hopelessness and separation from the public sphere. Citizens of every environment 'ought' to be given equal rights and opportunities to uphold their worthiness. Every human being is worthy of respect as a basic right for the singular purpose of being a human, regardless of their circumstances.

Kant also admonishes us to respect others and continuously think that they are considered rational beings (Kant, Groundwork xxv). Respect for one's decision about what he/she wants to do, requires that we as external factions relieve unwanted judgments and disrespect of a person's end. An individual's right to respect should not, in any way, be taken for granted. Every human feels there need that they should be given some level of respect regardless of their circumstances.

Psychological Well-being

There are psychological aspects associated with poverty. Research has confirmed that mental illness is associated with poverty. "Psychological research has shown that the experience of poverty significantly influences the way we think, feel, and act" (Hewstone 3). The challenges of poverty are disasters that strain the human mind and divide society against making their lives worth living. This is to imply that the issue of poverty shadows the minds of its victims (Morton). Those negative ideas associated with extreme stress levels are a hazard not only to the poor individual but also to society. This effect is dangerous to society. Poverty affects people's decision-making abilities as much as one's 'cognitive bandwidth' while merely trying to cope with the challenges of poverty" (Mani et al., 2013) (Wolff 224). Wolff discusses the effects of

poverty and the human mind as the cognitive attention needed to plan, strategize, adapt, and freely have options for mere life could be misplaced due to the individuals' unfavorable circumstances. Poverty is simultaneously associated with homelessness and mental vulnerability in that economically, an individual's low wage affects their housing—especially in big cities (Stapleton, Murphy and Xing, Who they are). For instance, a low wage individual living in poverty must choose between the rent for the next month or the utility bill for that month. Now doing the pandemic, many people must stay more extended hours in their homes with increased utilities.

The effects of poverty can cause mental sufferings and puts a strain on the entire population. "The experiences of poverty significantly increase one's risk of suffering from several severe psychological disorders" (Hewstone). Furthermore, the authors reported that most people living below the poverty line suffer from depression, suicidal thoughts, cardiovascular diseases, and other things that could lead to more significant problems in every aspect of their lives (Hewstone 5). In collaboration with policymakers, the government owes it to its citizens to offer the best life possible. Citizens are entitled to a fully participatory life that could alter other prominent growth and stability in everyone's personal lives. For example, homelessness is troubling for people who endure it and others who pass by or see them every day. Living without a roof over their heads and knowing that they may be unsafe and insecure can be worrisome. The outcome of this worry could lead to other illnesses.

Jennifer Morton argues for the moral psychology of poverty as a "resource-neutral theory" that involves belief, desires, and deliberation of human beings and how "all agents are subject to the weakness of will and variety of lapses in rationality" (Morton 1). The idea that those living in poverty are less intelligent or should be blamed for their poverty is immoral. She

further states that poverty affects our mental state in that our minds can be occupied when faced with scarcity on basic needs; the mind drifts into a position to solve that problem. For instance, most of Sub-Saharan Africa is faced with poverty-related issues. The majority of the dwellers are faced with providing for their immediate families rather than focusing on a case like environmental issues.

Morton's argument extends to make known that scarcity leads to 'narrower ends of practical reasoning' (Morton 8-9). Her views support that a lack of individual components in our lives corrupts the mind's space. Poverty has a massive effect on our moral capacity as a rational being. Even in everyday activities, we have set priorities and deadlines that need to be met. If an individual has an urgent need such as necessities to be met, then he becomes occupied by that factor until they find a solution. This specifies where severe stress comes in; it becomes impossible for the individual to have a significant set of an end goal and aspire to reach it. Renee Jeffery's article argues that "emotions play an important role in making moral judgments as well as help to motivate ethical actions" (Jeffery). The intuitionist sentiments of morality suggest that we are emotional beings who act per our emotions followed by rationality. That is to connect the fact that poverty can affect one's emotional state since it is a part of our sentiments. With more resources and less limited cognitive imbalances, the poor and other individuals who are victims of poverty-related issues can make better moral decisions and have life goals that benefit themselves and their generations.

Based on free will and the interactive nature of our environments, we cannot escape the fact that mood, anxiety, and depression will play a significant role in various workplaces, schools, playgrounds, *et cetera*. Mental health issues disrupt progression. A lot of our livelihood is centered around how much one can afford. The lack of money has an ill effect on the cognitive

development of the mind. One may have difficulty thinking productively or taking information about a particular task, not because the person is unwilling but mostly based on the financial strain or stress due to such circumstances.

Psychologically, those living in poverty have anger issues, stress, rage, hopelessness, decreased cognitive abilities that can prove harmful. These poverty effects rest particularly on society at large, as it remains a source of unhappiness to many individuals. Some may think that because people are poor, they have no job; they do but stay in the vicious cycle of poverty, which is difficult to escape. "Worries about income, food, school fees, violence, keeping warm during winter months and well-being of family members can negatively affect the mental state of many poor people" (Lotter 65). With an extra income such as the unconditional income, there could be less stress and little to no radical issues from those individuals.

Once the mind is at peace with a challenging productivity rate and self-perseverance becomes the ultimate game-changer. The non-poor is quick to blame the poor individuals' decisions or actions and sets a tone to imply that people do not always see the situation from the poor individual's account. The mind and emotions are an integral part of our existence. Therefore, UBI has the potential to diminish the level of stress that comes with poverty. Individuals from lower socioeconomic status and have psychological issues do not have the total capacity to deal with other problems.

Johannes Haushofer and Ernst Fehr, 2014, argued that poverty's negative implications have psychological consequences that can lead to economic behaviors that make it difficult to escape poverty (Haushofer and Fehr). The authors also argues that there is a correlation between income and psychological well-being that could impact one's decision-making abilities. Income security could lift that weight of depression and anxiety from the poor population. Experiencing

a mental illness can disrupt many aspects of one's life. They may not get a higher education, deepening their attention into negative habitual behavior, always being influenced by external parties to go about their lives. Consequently, unstable jobs become the new normal for these individuals who might not have a high skill set for professional positions.

Also, "for many of the working poor who have public-facing jobs, they are expected to have a ready smile to please customers even when they could be a paycheck always a personal financial crisis" (Stapleton, A Closer Look). With this kind of pressure, one's mental capacity goes into overdrive, and could barely focus on anything. This could be one of the causes of the instability of jobs for these individuals. This kind of psychological pressure could lead to further severe consequences.

Counter- Arguments

A basic income could discourage individuals from the workforce (Lowrey). On the one hand, this might prove that most individuals will take advantage of the policy and make bad choices that might lead them back into poverty. While these points are understandable, it is also possible that more people will make good decisions as well. As work is often considered an antidote for poverty, how do we explain that individuals who work all year round, some two or more jobs, and yet continue to live below the poverty line? We cannot at all be so sure until it is fully implemented. For now, our assumptions are mostly based on the cost-benefit analysis instead of the urgent needs of those living in poverty. An individual who has developed basic work ethics may take a break because they want to spend more time with family or other factors to improve their capabilities. What good is the job if the individual is less efficient because of their many sufferings? The fact remains that the basic income will only be enough for necessities.

Considering the working poor, these individuals work tirelessly to ensure that they do not beg or end up homeless, yet they remain poor. For example, imagine an individual serious about earning, from going to fast food take out, to an afternoon gig, to an office cleaning, security guard late nights (Stapleton, A Closer Look). Individuals who put in as many hours as a regular working-age individual and remain in poverty. These individuals cannot be considered lazy. They are the middle that are often left out when implementing anti-poverty policies. On the other hand, focusing on keeping people in the labor force does not send the right message for a state that cares about its citizens. The situation of the working poor proves that having a job is not the solution.

On the other hand, Paul Lafargue, in his book “The right to be lazy”, characterizes work as a delusion put upon humanity as a way of the capitalist civilization. His ideas claim that as humans work should not be a necessity but rather a society that all humans are free being who can be entitled to laziness at the own will (Lafargue). For Lafargue, the idea of compulsory work could be seen as the nature of slavery. A means to subdue the ‘passions and joy’ that a man should be entitle to and also linked to his freedom as an autonomous being. Therefore, the idea of the UBI individuals should not enforced work or given a condition that involves some form of work. Work in and of itself should solely be the decision of the individual. In order for humanity to thrive and become more productive in the society, one needs to have the right amount of freedom and a sense of self for empowerment.

Regarding the current pandemic, the labor market is now struggling to maintain workers or keep their companies or businesses open. This problem could take approximately a year or two to get back on track. What happens to these poor individuals before then? The number of the working poor are on the rise as well as the number of homeless individuals. According to the

Ipsos Reid poll conducted in 2016, "nearly half, about 48% of Canadians are less than \$200 away from financial insolvency". That was 2016, consider the rate at which this has drastically increased as per the coronavirus global pandemic. As predicted, the study could take an average of 8 years for the Ontarians to climb out of debt. Within four years, we are already faced with one of the worst economic depression since 2008, one in the United States. With companies permanently shutting down and individuals losing their jobs and homes, it proves as an emergency action in curtailing what could be considered the next pandemic—poverty.

Furthermore, many Canadians find pride in the work that they do. Their sense of work ethics will eventually keep them away from just being unproductive to the benefits of the society. This policy could be the change people want to see, not only for those in extreme poverty but also for the working poor, who are most often forgotten. Most individuals are in excessive debt or could only paycheck away from being below the poverty line. With the covid pandemic, the poverty rate has increased, and the risk of living in poverty is not so far away for most of the population. The risk of falling below the poverty line for most is alarming, especially during these difficult times. The increase of unemployment amongst most, the dangers of homelessness, the fault of illness, death of a relative, and stress of the new normal are significant concerns in considering the need for a UBI.

Although most people could argue that the policy will be taken advantage of, it is also confident that the majority will benefit. Many individuals work all through the year with two or more jobs and still struggle to live a well-defined life. No matter what, there will always be individuals who may take advantage of the policy. No matter what, the procedure's right form may or may not be fully instituted into the population. The choices made by individuals to work or not should be their decision to make. The failure of the success of the market should not be

solely based on the working force. Just because the system is designed for individuals to work until a certain amount of time to get retirement does not mean that it should always be that way.

Although the welfare programs have made some improvements in the last decades or so, it still fails at lifting individuals out of the vicious circle of poverty. A motivating factor like the proposed policy of a UBI encourages those living in poverty to pursue a better lifestyle and have more control over their lives. For instance, the case of a 'paternalist state' is not the way forward. Paternalism, in relation to public policy, is the interference of the government into one's choice without their consent or by furthering a person's perceived good (Dworkin 25-38). Most welfare programs are not only conditional, but it is also perceived by the government that it is in the best interest of those who might need it. Or further, it could be termed as the best solution to poverty without the consent of those individuals. In multiple ways, the restrictions placed on several welfare programs leave recipients stigmatized in some cases. Assistance programs have been around for decades have proven helpful to most people, but does it give people the motivation to become better versions of themselves? Although it is not entirely possible to root out the possibility of people taking advantage of a policy, it is possible to give millions their dignity and respect by creating a safety net that asks no questions about who they are. Also, some individuals take advantage of welfare programs as well. Do they have to stop any policy process just because few will always abuse or taking advantage of it?

Given that several policies are most likely implemented based on cost-benefit analysis, there is a need to assess the possibility of broader pilot programs carefully and strategically. Many individuals who live on welfare also take advantage of the situation and may never want to go to work because of what they gain from the program. With a safety net coming in every month or a year, some welfare programs could be put on hold. Individuals who have developed a

long experience and work ethic will continuously take pride in working because of other living expenses that they have to sustain.

Another argument against the UBI is the financial ability to sustain it (Vanderborcht). While it is true that the idea of the UBI is quite expensive, even though the government might save a lot of money from cutting other welfare programs, the consequences of poverty are as well dangerous to society. The cost of poverty is more expensive socially and economically (Brown). For instance, a person who has lived in poverty or has struggled to survive from an early age loses interest in the idea of having higher education if he is to take care of a sick parent or younger siblings. Instead, he could join a lousy club to make fast money, get addicted to an illegal substance, or even death. With proper education and a safety net to fall back on, this individual could have been a scientist, a doctor, an entrepreneur, a lawyer, or an ethicist in promoting social justice. The possibility of doing illegal activities for fast money could be unlikely.

The question here is, is the amount too much to tackle the social issues we face from those angry at their lives in poverty? The sense of entitlement and equality gives poor individuals the means to think that they are unfairly treated and are in such situations because of systemic discrimination or market failures. With the UBI in effect, it has the potential of giving these individuals the motivation and stance to have better and more fruitful lives. They then will understand that they are given the same start-up budget. Sustaining the cost of the UBI is crucial. This funding might cost Ontario a lot, but the cost should be nothing compared to the sufferings faced by struggling working families and unattached individuals. Not only is poverty an issue for the ones experiencing it, but it should also be a concern for the non-poor as well. "For reasons of the state the government is therefore authorized to constrain the wealthy to provide the means of

those who are unable to provide for even their most necessary natural needs" (Kant, Gregor and Sullivan 468). Kant argues this point is urging that the wealthy have a moral obligation to the commonwealth, and therefore the state is based this on their right to contribute to better fellow citizens' rights. The support of the wealthy to provide financials in sustaining this policy is fundamental. Understanding that the government could also impose the necessary tax needed for wealthy citizens who do not feel like they have a moral obligation to the poor. Living in poverty does not directly correlates to laziness or bad spending habits.

As such, the socioeconomic cost of poverty is nothing compared to the amount required. For example, if a poor person becomes a criminal for lack of hope in society, it puts a strain on other non-poor individuals who might not feel safe. That sense of mediocrity and lack of 'sense of self' can lead those poor individuals into dark spaces of unworthy feeling and blame the wealthy or the state for their impoverished circumstances. There could also be a possibility that a poor individual could end up finding a cure to cancer or, better still, solving some difficult societal issues if allowed to choose lives well-deserving or given equal respect as human beings.

Some may even argue that other benefits could stand-in for one living in poverty. The fact remains that it does not cancel the adequate need for necessity. For most, the focus is not on the struggles of those living in poverty because they imagine bad choices and laziness. For instance, most of those living in poverty are at risk of its effects, as is the working poor in Ontario and maybe Canada. "Allowing poverty to persist and grow is ultimately more expensive than continuing its alleviation" (Lee and Briggs 10).

However, the big question remains the same, will the UBI alleviate this moral problem of autonomy, respect, dignity and so on? Will the UBI give most vulnerable individuals their self-respect, dignity, freedom of choice and minimize the psychological trauma that comes with

being limited? Will they fully be able to participate in society after it is permanently implemented? The idea looks promising because apart from all other welfare programs currently active and the positive outcomes from pilot programs, the UBI seems to be a better option in a few countries, states, or cities. The issue of poverty could be addressed by the idea of a basic income. With other welfare programs, there are many conditional features attached to them. The word 'unconditional' gives every individual—regardless of status—a baseline that enables them to choose the best-suited option in their lives without conditions. With the UBI, a poor person could now afford basic aspects of his/her existence while adding value to their lives. As rational beings, an individual could have full control over choices, time, as well as pace at which he/she can fully define growth and participation into society. The idea of the UBI may give citizens the basic standard of living in order to pursue a better life.

Moral Obligations of the State and Policy

Relative poverty in a developed country deprives an individual to live a well-deserving life. The government is morally obligated to alleviate poverty and minimize the sufferers of moral issues such as poverty (Kant, Gregor and Sullivan). It ought to be a significant concern for the government and society at large. The government have to ensure that all its citizens are afforded the opportunities that promote a well-valued life in their various communities. It is also the duty of the government to solve problems efficiently and effectively with the right policies. Implementing ethical policies gives poverty a situation that requires an aggregate level that will close other gaps. Policymakers ought to provide more relevance to the ethical perspective to better understand poverty and future policies for poverty alleviation based on the principle of human rights and justice.

Kant supports the necessity of welfare policies for the respect of human dignity, although not directly stated in his arguments (Faggion). It is interesting to take on Kant's conception of beneficence in that the state has a moral obligation to better its citizens. Holtman points out that relief programs need to focus more on the ethical concerns of citizens. It is a moral duty and obligation of the state to ensure that its citizens' needs are met and not considered a charity case (Holtman 99-100). With other programs and efforts to curtail poverty, it keeps escaping and forming new ways to develop and lead individuals into a state of no return. Lowrey also suggested that aid does not assist people in the ways and means they should. Most aid givers prefer to donate goods, but with the cash, these individuals can get whatever they might need, like more warmth during the winter months, better nutritious meals, learning a new skill, and so on. One cannot give a hungry person a box of shoes or some other thing. As Lotter (2011) also points out, to misinterpret the person's urgent need constitutes a humiliation to the victim, and that aid based on the wrong diagnosis can humiliate people.

Additionally, Singer argues that "If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without sacrificing anything of comparable moral value, we ought morally to do so" (Singer 231). Giving poor individuals a safety net could enable poor individuals to invest more in their competencies for better lives or a setting better priority.

Moreover, Sarah Holtman argues on Kant's foundation that "on account of justice, the state is responsible for promoting individual citizen independence" (Holtman 88). By not considering the needs of poor citizens, the state then implicitly assumes that not all citizens' matter. Poverty has different dimensions and, as such, should first and foremost be handled from a broader spectrum before taking on the mini aspects. She further claims that the state's moral obligation in handling poverty relief is that it be thought of as a "share of joint assets and not as a

handout to subordinates" and preferably a design that promotes self-respect. She then broadens Kant's perspective of the 'general will' of the state to justify every citizen's equality, respect, and independence, especially for those in most need (Holtman 88-89). Not only does it broaden Kant's moral obligation to the state, but it also gives a sense of justice as an entitlement to a citizen.

When poor individuals have lost their self-respect, they become hopeless and lost their ability for independence. That level of freedom remains a wish that could never become a reality for many—not participating in social gatherings. Often, the sign of poverty can be seen in people and can make them think less of themselves. There is a need to give a person living in poverty the pride and respect they deserve. Regarding moral justice, it is due to have an equal distribution of resources, which the government plays a significant part. As per Lotter's argument (2011), "issues such as safety and security of the body and mind, one's human dignity, freedom to live one's life according to one's judgment, access to income, are proper kinds of stuff to be addressed in a theory of justice" (Lotter 187). Justice requires not that human beings be deprived of opportunities to develop a decent life, but that one has the motivation to take control of choices in living one's best possible life. Most of these people who thoroughly understand the importance of self-respect, their work ethics, participation in society, even in their poor conditions, could always have the confidence and drive to push themselves to improve their lives. With such freedom and dignity, they can take full control and responsibility for their own lives and feel the motivation to have an end that promotes adequate living conditions.

Additionally, "by not distinguishing between cases, such policies avoid stigma, and they yield one clue about how to think about sensitive social issues" (Wolff and de-Shalit 10:3). Although it aims to encourage individuals to become better versions of themselves and make a

positive impact to society it could appear costly, the community also has a responsibility to encourage their citizens to acquire good principle. As extreme as poverty issues are in society, it requires excessive solutions. The basic income is possible with the right principles of right and duties of virtue that would encourage or provoke positive changes. Because of its unconditional nature, it provides dignity for the poor, promotes the freedom to choose a well-deserving life, and improves people's psychological health conditions due to poverty. The issue with public policy is that no matter what, there will always be negative realities that may obstruct any policy or process.

This "unconditional" idea is dignifying and could be a better option than the welfare programs that require specific conditions. Regarding its unconditional nature, the UBI can give individuals that sense of self. As per the Utilitarian principle, implementing the UBI takes into consideration the greater good for humanity. The worse-off are the ones who need it the most and could make better decisions with the unconditional cash transfer than those who might only consider it as an extra. As some may take advantage and decide to be idle, others benefit and even create better lives for their families. Just because more people are concerned about individuals taking advantage of the policy does not mean it cannot be implemented for the sake of others who may use it wisely. Based on the sense that such an approach is considered bizarre, it seems like a way forward since this issue of poverty continues to creep in on us. Absolute and relative poverty is a challenge in our everyday lives. If it persists, the chances that other non-poor individuals could be at risk of the effect is probable.

With the UBI, there is a chance for a more defined and proactive lifestyle for those in poverty. This freedom will enable them to manage their time, have the edge over specific bills, take a break from all the heartaches if need be, and most importantly, could have some time for

family matters. For example, a person on a welfare program or food stamp cannot fix a broken window or a plumbing problem. With the UBI, that person has the freedom to fix the plumbing, get a new window, pay for adequate heat during winter months, get a warm et cetera. This favorable policy could enhance the change we want to see. Although this idea might not have substantial benefits to everyone, it could be a kind of freedom for those who need it the most. Hence, this act of freedom associated with the UBI implies that it could be a source of motivation for disadvantaged individuals. It could also be a substantial change that enables the maximization of success and a baseline that puts the power in the hands of the disadvantaged and the relatively poor.

This policy could be partially and ethically designed to meet the citizens' needs and, when the individual is capable and willing to stand on his own, can, therefore, let go of the UBI. When a person has achieved some level of success, they could abort the process at will. The idea should be the person's choice in deciding to use or not to use the unconditional program to enable more funds for other citizens who need it the most. Again, this will be the decision of the individual. These choices are to be made by the individuals and not the government. This policy's utmost concern to support my arguments is to give individuals the freedom, respect, and dignity to pursue healthier and improved lives.

Conclusion

Based on the circumstances associated with the coronavirus pandemic, the rate of poverty is on the rise as lots of people are facing unemployment and difficult times. Poverty is an alarming situation that creates challenges which deprives individuals of their basic rights. Based on its relative nature in a developed country, the government should ensure that everyone is afforded an opportunity that promotes their standard of living needed for a decent life. All

citizens deserve equally distributive resources that can help with their essential minimum. Due to the effects of poverty, an individual is denying the kind of lives that expresses humanity and forces them into lifestyles that are not worthy of their species (Lotter).

The UBI's goal is to save lives, alleviate suffering, provide peace of mind, rethink human dignity, and self-respect attached. The rate at which the achievement for eradicating poverty is moving means that we need to rethink those strategies and plans that have been implemented to find better moral solutions. A UBI policy is a social and economic solution that is backed by an ethical framework, Kantian deontological theory, gives it much more edge in dealing with negative effects of poverty. This policy could be an extreme route, but ethically, the alleviation of the social ills associated with poverty. Instead of just treating those living in poverty only 'as a means to an end' or as a 'project', each government should ensure that their citizens have their basic human rights and sustenance. When one lacks self-esteem, it undermines the confidence needed to change the status quo (Lotter 200). When this happens, it affects not only their capacity for change but also their level of happiness.

We need to get rid of the dire consequences and negative realities caused by poverty. Another ethical and ideal justification of the UBI is written by Lotter, "for moral values to protect any specific individual, they must be applied consistently and equally to everyone" (Lotter 163). In agreement with Lotter, an implementation of a 'basic income' policy to all citizens should be applied consistently and equally. It may become like a dignified agent of their development. Most individuals who experienced welfare programs and the basic income pilot in Ontario could attest that the basic income gives them a sense of belonging and freedom and made them feel "human again" (Hamilton and Mulvale). They do not have the luxury of getting with other programs based on their negative realities and their conditions that humiliate poor

individuals. Therefore, it is a human rights issue as it is a moral obligation of the government to shape and enforce that their citizens are allocated the bare minimum in alleviating poverty.

Canada should adopt the idea of a universal basic income and the government needs to take this action for a better and more income secured environment for all Canadians.

Works Cited

- Brown, Desmond. *The Cost of Poverty in Ontario*. Toronto: CBC News, 2019. Web. 8 December 2020. <<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ontario-poverty-costs-billion-annually-report-1.5302882>>.
- D'Amore, Rachael. "Poverty in Canada was Bad Pre-Coronavirus: Experts worry what could come next." *Global News* (2020). Web. 20 October 2020. <<https://globalnews.ca/news/7328686/canada-coronavirus-poverty-impacts/>>.
- Dworkin, Gerald. "Defining Paternalism." *Paternalism: Theory and Practice* (2013): 25-38. Web. 10 January 2021. <<https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/core/books/paternalism/defining-paternalism/AA06F9378282F7872DC5CFD0E81E9E1A>>.
- Faggion, Andrea. "Kantian Right and Poverty Relief." *International Journal of Moral Philosophy* 13 (2014): 283-302. Web. 5 November 2020. <<https://doi.org/10.5007/1677-2954.2014v13n2p283>>.
- Ferosi, Mohammed, et al. "Southern Ontario Basic Income Experience." 2020. Web. 24 October 2020. <<https://labourstudies.mcmaster.ca/documents/southern-ontarios-basic-income-experience.pdf>>.
- Hamilton, Leah and James P. Mulvale. "'Human Again': (an unrealized) promise of the Basic Income in Ontario." *Journal of Poverty* (2019): 576-599. Web. 05 December 2020. <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10875549.2019.1616242>>.

Haushofer, Johannes and Ernst Fehr. "On the Psychology of Poverty." *Science* 344.6186 (2014): 862-867. Web. 20 October 2020.

<<https://science.sciencemag.org/content/344/6186/862>>.

Hewstone, Ben Fell and Miles. *Psychological Perspective on Poverty*. U.K.: Joseph Rountree Foundation, 2015. Web. 08 December 2020.

<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/files-research/psychological-perspectives-poverty-full_0.pdf>.

Holtman, Sarah Williams. "Kantian Justice and Poverty Relief." *De Gruyter* 95.1 (2004): 86-106. Web. 20 November 2020. <[https://doi-](https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1515/kant.2004.008)

[org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1515/kant.2004.008](https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1515/kant.2004.008)>.

Jeffery, Renee. "Reason, Emotion, and the problem of World Poverty: Moral sentiments theory and international ethics." *International Theory* (2011): 143-178. Web. 08 December 2020. <<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1752971910000321>>.

Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.

—. *The Metaphysics of Morals In: Mary J. Gregor, ed and Roger J. Sullivan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Web. 08 December 2020.

<<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813306>>.

Lafargue, Paul. *The Right To Be Lazy*. 1883. Web. 10 January 2021.

<<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lafargue/1883/lazy/ch01.htm>>.

- Lee, Celia R. and Alexa Briggs. "The Cost of Poverty in Ontario: 10 years Later." *Feed Ontario* (2019): 4-25. Web. 08 December 2020. <<https://feedontario.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Feed-Ontario-Cost-of-Poverty-2019.pdf>>.
- Lotter, Hennie P. P. *Poverty, Ethics and Justice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2011. Print.
- Lowrey, Annie. *Give People Money: How a Universal Basic Income would end poverty, Revolutionize work and Remake the World*. New York: Crown, 2018. Print.
- Mendelson, Michael. *Lessons from Ontario Basic Income Pilot*. Toronto: Maytree, 2019. Web. 08 December 2020. <<https://maytree.com/publications/lessons-from-ontarios-basic-income-pilot/>>.
- Morton, Jennifer M. "A Moral Psychology of Poverty- Draft." *The Oxford Handbook of Moral Psychology* (n.d.): 1-20. Web. 20 November 2020. <<http://jennifermorton.com/mortonmoralpsychofpovertyfinal.pdf>>.
- Murray, Charles. *In Our Hands: A Plan to Replace The Welfare State*. Washington: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016. Web. 08 December 2020. <<https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc242a.pdf>>.
- Nickel, James W. "Poverty and Rights." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 55 (2005): 385-402. Web. 15 October 2020. <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3543094>>.
- O'Neill, Onara. "Rights, Obligation and World Hunger." *In Justice across Boundaries: whose Obligation?* (2016): 29-42. Web. 20 October 2020. <<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/justice-across-boundaries/rights-obligations-and-world-hunger/18AF186082C83C43ED94BFAC41872376>>.

Parijs, Phillippe Van. "Basic Income: A Simple and Powerful Idea for the Twenty-First Century."

Politics and Society (2004): 17-39. Web. 08 December 2020.

<<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0032329203261095>>.

Rachels, James. "Kantian Theory: The Idea of Human Dignity." *The Elements of Moral*

Philosophy (1986): 114-17; 122-23. Web. 10 November 2020.

<https://public.callutheran.edu/~chenxi/phil345_022.pdf>.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.

Shah, Anuj K., Sendhil Mullainathan and Eldar Shafir. "Some Consequences of Having Too

Little." *Science* 338 (2012): 682-685. Web. 25 October 2020.

<<https://science.sciencemag.org/content/338/6107/682>>.

Singer, Peter. "Famine, Affluence and Morality." *Philosophy and Public Affairs Vol.1* (1972):

229-243. Web. 08 December 2020.

<https://personal.lse.ac.uk/robert49/teaching/mm/articles/Singer_1972Famine.pdf>.

Stapleton, John. *The Working Poor in the Toronto Region: A closer look at the increasing*

numbers. Toronto: Metcalf Foundation, 2019. Web. 08 December 2020.

<<https://metcalffoundation.com/publication/the-working-poor-in-the-toronto-region-a-closer-look-at-the-increasing-numbers/>>.

Stapleton, John, Brian Murphy and Yue Xing. *The "Working Poor" in the Toronto Region: Who*

they are, where they live, and how trends are changing. Toronto: MetCalf Foundation,

2012. Web. 15 November 2020. <[https://metcalffoundation.com/publication/the-](https://metcalffoundation.com/publication/the-working-poor-in-the-toronto-region-who-they-are-where-they-live-and-how-trends-are-changing/)

[working-poor-in-the-toronto-region-who-they-are-where-they-live-and-how-trends-are-changing/](https://metcalffoundation.com/publication/the-working-poor-in-the-toronto-region-who-they-are-where-they-live-and-how-trends-are-changing/)>.

Taekema, Dan. *People Kept Working, Became Healthier, While on Basic Income: report*. News. Hamilton: CBC News, 2020. Web. 20 July 2020.

<<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/basic-income-mcmaster-report-1.5485729>>.

Vanderborght, Phillippe Van Parijs & Yannick. *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*. London, England: Harvard University Press, 2017. Print.

Wolff, Johnathan and Avner de-Shalit. *Disadvantaged*. Oxford University Press, 2007. Web. 08 December 2020. <<https://oxford-universitypressscholarship-com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199278268.001.0001/acprof-9780199278268>>.

Wolff, Johnathan. *Ethics and Public Policy*. New York: Routledge, 2020. Print.