

Pope Francis' "Integral Ecology" and Indigenous

Support for Ontario's Basic Income Pilot

Jeremy Seth Geddert

Assumption College

Canadian Political Science Association

June 1, 2018, 1:30pm, University of Regina, Classroom Building 316

Abstract

Ontario has recently opened a pilot project for a basic income (BI). The project lists seven aims, including improved mental health, reduced anxiety, and higher labour market participation. Yet the prospect of guaranteeing income is politically charged, as some critics assert that it rewards people for not working.

Ontario might assuage critics by appealing to a surprising source: Pope Francis. His 2015 encyclical *Laudato Si* outlines an 'integral ecology' that endorses the aforementioned aims. It implicitly favours a basic income over an increased minimum wage through its emphasis on meaningful work over mere economic gain, which allows more people to develop their abilities, build relationships, and live out their values. It also endorses the Province's departure from a strictly-defined "basic income", through the use of a graduated threshold that encourages labour force participation. This might help to combat public opposition in Catholic areas of Ontario.

However, Pope Francis' overall ecological vision might also foster greater support for the BI among First Nations of Ontario. Indeed, *Laudato Si* quotes Canadian Bishops to argue that "nature is...a continuing revelation of the divine...[even in] the tiniest living form", and that "it is not separate from ourselves." This idea that "land is not a commodity but a gift" emphasizes participation in the sacred and creative work of nature, echoing the indigenous emphasis not on domination but on preservation of nature. This supports a BI that both incentivizes creative employment and provides support for creativity outside formal employment.

Ontario's Basic Income Pilot Project

In April 2017, the Government of Ontario announced a pilot project for a Basic Income (BI) in several Ontario communities. Simultaneously, the Province announced plans for a “separate, parallel First Nations Basic Income Pilot, co-created and designed with First Nations partners” (Ontario Office of the Premier, 2017). This new program, sometimes styled as “Universal Basic Income” (UBI) or “Guaranteed Annual Income”, marks a potential wide-ranging change in Canadian social policy. The policy directly deposits \$17,000 per year into the bank accounts of its selected trial subjects. Families will receive an additional \$7,000, and those with disabilities \$6,000. The benefit is graduated, as the amount will decrease by \$0.50 for each dollar that its recipient earns from employment.

This policy reflects recent partisan policy resolutions. In 2016, several NDP riding associations brought to the Edmonton convention a resolution to debate a guaranteed annual income. That same year, the Liberal party went further, resolving at its convention to develop, “in consultation with the provinces, ... a poverty reduction strategy aimed at providing a minimum guaranteed income.” (Liberal Party of Canada, 2016). The policy also follows increasing momentum among policy circles, including experts from both sides of the political spectrum. Andy Stern, described in 2010 as the United States “most politically influential union president” (Greenhouse 2010), has recently written *Raising the Floor*: a defense of the BI. In this quest, he is joined by noted libertarian Charles Murray, who argues that “a UBI is our only hope to deal with a coming labor market unlike any in human history,” and that it “would present the most disadvantaged among us with an open road to the middle class” (2016). Silicon Valley leaders like Mark Zuckerberg and Elon Musk, representing a generally hybrid class of the social left and economic right, have also endorsed the policy, with one of their own – Andrew Yang – already declared for the 2020 US Presidential election. The policy experiment has also recently been tried in several jurisdictions around the world: Utrecht, Netherlands; Oakland, California; Finland; and Kenya.

Yet while the policy has gained increasing traction in policy circles, the same is not necessarily true among the general public. Policymakers encounter several potential difficulties in winning public support. First, the pros and cons of the policy remain incompletely understood. Second, the BI also brings a change to the status quo. This adds another challenge for governments, who well know that electors are more apt to vote “no” in any public referendum. Third, the BI is also politically tied to the unpopular governing Ontario Liberals, which makes it more difficult to sell. While the current election campaign has seen Ontario PCs pledge to continue the trial, there is no guarantee that they would implement as policy an idea from their rivals (Monsebraaten 2018).

Indeed, surveys indicate some public hesitation around BI. Granted, the public is broadly supportive of the impulse. This might be expected for a program that promises free money – indeed, many potential trial candidates were slow to sign up due to disbelief. However, Ontario might treat this generalized optimism with caution. First, support for the BI (at a \$10,000 annual level) is lower in Ontario (52%) than in any other region in the country.¹ Second, across the country, many expressed concerns about the fiscal viability of a BI. Three-fifths believed it would be too expensive to implement. In fact, a majority of supporters of each of the three major national parties expressed this

¹ Even at a \$30,000 level, support was lower than all other areas except the three Western provinces.

opinion. Moreover, two-thirds expressed an unwillingness to pay additional taxes for it, which suggests that at least half of those who support the BI nonetheless view it as wishful thinking. Third, and perhaps most damagingly, even more respondents questioned the effectiveness of the program itself. Sixty-three percent agreed that “guaranteed income programs discourage people from working” (Angus Reid Institute 2016). Indeed, a Swiss referendum on BI failed after significant numbers believed it would weaken the work ethic of their fellow citizens (Economist 2016). Finland recently ended its trial, scuttling their potential plans to implement it on a permanent basis.

In the face of these challenges, how might Ontario win over public support for the BI? Perhaps by appealing to an unlikely source: Pope Francis. This current pontiff has earned worldwide publicity for his forays into social and political issues. Of course, in doing so, he simply follows in a long line of Papal commentary on politics, with popes since Leo XIII developing the tradition of Catholic Social Thought. But Francis’ opinions are much more numerous and casual than his predecessors, with frequent interviews on the Papal airplane. What is more, Pope Francis has commanded unusually large headlines *outside* the Catholic church. *Time* Magazine named the Vicar of Christ its person of the year for 2013; even more notably, so did the LGBT publication *The Advocate*. Rolling Stone followed the next year with a cover appearance for the man they called the “cool Pope”.

Pope Francis’ ability to garner the public spotlight has gathered more attention to his more conventional forum of counsel: the Papal encyclical. His 2016 offering *Laudato Si* earned surprising attention for its environmental ethic. This environmental vision flows from Francis’ new concept of “integral ecology”. But the implications of integral ecology are not limited to climate change, or even to the physical environment. Rather, this “integral” vision relates to all forms of nature, including human nature in its social and political manifestation. Hence, the public use of Francis’ appeal might be helpful in winning general public support for the policy. What is more, Pope Francis’ integral ecology takes special inspiration from Indigenous approaches to work, and mandates special attention to Indigenous facets of policy implementation. Hence, Francis’ vision might especially appeal both to the Indigenous communities whose participation forms the second stage of the BI plan, and to the general public aware that the policy’s second stage might be even more beneficial than its first.

Pope Francis’ Integral Ecology

In its announcement of the BI pilot project, the Government of Ontario provided a justification that might be best described as broad but shallow. The Government committed to measuring the effect of the BI on seven outcomes: food security; stress and anxiety; mental health; health and health care usage; housing stability; education and training; and employment and labour market participation (Ontario Government, 2017). However, the Government provided little public hypothesis as to the reasons why the BI might or might not achieve those goals. Slightly more deep – albeit less broad – was a report it commissioned by former Senator Hugh Segal. Segal pointed out that Ontario’s introduction of the Guaranteed Annual Income Supplement during the 1970s effectively reduced poverty for seniors, and was soon adopted by the federal government. Segal also offered research design suggestions: that the Province test several different forms of BI (including, for instance, a negative income tax), but that it not overlap BI pilots in other

countries. However, Segal listed testable objectives related more to fiscal, labour market, housing, and health/education outcomes (Ontario Government 2016). While the Province ultimately included most of these, it also conspicuously added the areas of “mental health” and “stress and anxiety”.

The Roman Catholic church has a long history in present-day Ontario. The Jesuit order established a settlement near modern Midland beginning in 1639, which the Province today operates as a museum. The Jesuits there sought to adapt Christianity to the traditions of the local people. St. Jean de Brebeuf there composed the Huron Carol so frequently sung at Christmas, referencing the “mighty Gitchi Manitou”. Several years later, he and seven others became the first Christian martyrs in Canada, with his bones still serving as relics. The seed they planted did not fail to bloom, despite the early setbacks. Today Four million Ontarians identify as Roman Catholic – a larger proportion than any other religion or Christian denomination, and almost as large as all other Christian denominations combined. The Province would thus seem to be fertile ground for an ecology of Francis’ sort. Indeed, this integral ecology might especially support the aforementioned two areas specifically added by the Ontario government.

In *Laudato Si*, Pope Francis introduces integral ecology by stating that “everything is closely interrelated.” He brings alive this otherwise anodyne statement by observing that “time and space are not independent of one another, and not even atoms or subatomic particles can be considered in isolation.” If even the basic building blocks of life are interdependent with each other, then it stands to reason that non-human life would be interrelated with the human life-world. Hence, the “environment” is not a self-contained reality, but rather involves “a relationship...between nature and society”.

If nature is not separate from human society, then the reverse is also true: human society is part of nature. Likewise, if ecology is the study of nature, it must include therefore include “human and social dimensions.” Francis reinforces this claim by quoting his predecessor’s maxim that “the book of nature is one and indivisible.” If we are concerned to conserve nature, we will be concerned with human ecology. Hence, Pope Francis’ concept of ecology involves numerous social and political concerns; he lists examples such as “combating poverty, restoring dignity to the excluded, and at the same time protecting nature.” But Pope Francis adds more detail that relates directly to the BI pilot. Integral ecology must also consider “human, family, work-related and urban contexts.” It must even consider “how individuals relate to themselves” – or how we can protect human nature (Francis 2015: 6, 137-41)¹.

Family

The Basic Income helps to promote several elements of this integral ecology. The first of these is the family. It is no surprise that family health is central to Pope Francis’ mandate as head of the Roman Catholic Church. He describes the family as “the heart of the culture of life.” In his view, the family also has a social role as “the basic cell of society.” Indeed, the family is central to the idea of subsidiarity, one of the core planks of Catholic Social Thought (Francis 2015: 157, 213).

How can the BI promote stronger families? The most obvious method is by providing additional funds to families that struggle to make ends meet (such as those earning less than \$48,000, as in Ontario’s BI pilot.) But while regular low-income assistance programs or increases in minimum wage might also accomplish this end, the

BI adds additional elements. For one, mothers might be better able to decrease their working hours or to leave their jobs in order to care for their children. The BI would reward their unpaid domestic labour. Second, some proponents have pointed out that under a BI, fathers would be more likely to provide child support payments. Fathers would know that they could not plead financial insolvency before a judge, as the judge could simply garnish their BI cheque (Murray 2017: 4). This knowledge among fathers would reduce their likelihood of a financial windfall from exiting the household, which would reduce men's pull factors away from family.² Third, because of this financial disincentive against distancing themselves, fathers might be spurred to become more involved in the lives of their children, thus strengthening family ties. Indeed, by fostering these ties, reconciliation between mothers and fathers might be more likely. This would also benefit the children, as children are much less likely to be abused by their married fathers than by unrelated men (Sedlak 2010). Hence, the BI might also increase push factors toward family.

Rural/Regional Development

A second method in which the weight of Pope Francis' public exhortations might buttress support for the BI concerns an area rarely mentioned by its proponents: regional and rural development. This plank of the argument requires several steps. Integral ecology, as mentioned above, casts a special focus on the interplay of human and physical nature. This lens puts urbanization in stark relief. Casting his eye at large urban agglomerations, Francis notes the frequency of toxic emissions, urban chaos, visual pollution and general noise. Francis argues that "we were not meant to be inundated by cement, asphalt, glass and metal". He further argues that we should not deprive ourselves "of physical contact with nature" (44).

Yet many people today face exactly these challenges. The forces of globalization and economies of scale often cause jobs to be consolidated in major centres. Job-seekers are naturally then pulled to them. However, when these economic migrants arrive, they find that the limited green spaces in these larger centres are disproportionately accessible to the wealthy rather than the poor (Francis 2015: 45). This deprivation of access to green spaces hurts the person's sense of well-being and mental health.

Ontario's BI expressly seeks to improve well-being and mental health, but government messaging explains little about how an increased income would produce such an outcome. If residents are made aware of integral ecology, they could be assured that the promotion of mental health is not simply a platitude. These words might counsel their readers to consider how their mental health might benefit from remaining in rural localities or small cities better connected to green space. A BI would then help to make this decision easier by taking away the immediate pressure to move to large centres. With the security of a BI, young people could wait longer to find a job in their home community. This would help regions to retain their best and brightest university graduates – graduates who are often ineligible for low-income assistance or employment insurance. Moreover, a BI would actually add pull factors to communities of origin, because the standard monthly income would provide more purchasing power in smaller communities with a lower cost of living. Furthermore, when these young people spent their BI in their home communities, the communities themselves would gain economic benefits. These increased business profits would result in increased employment

prospects, completing the virtuous circle. In sum, a BI would promote economic security – especially relative to larger centres – and would thus incentivize people to remain in smaller communities, avoiding the potential psychological disorientation of the megalopolis.

In addition to these arguments, an integral ecology gives further support for the beneficial effects of local communities by emphasizing the interpersonal effect they have on their residents. Local communities often better facilitate the strengthening of familial and friendship networks, and thus the cultural transmission of local cultures. This allows local customs and practices to be passed on to the young: the hardiness of the fisherman, the resourcefulness of the farmer, the community investment of the local hardware retailer. But current economic forces often militate against this cultural conservation by drawing people toward globally-connected cities. When people move to new (and usually larger) cities, they often lack shared practices with their new (and usually anonymous) neighbours. Removed from their familiar networks and cultures, they may become subject to isolation. This is especially true in a province as large as Ontario. Residents of Thunder Bay may be impelled to work in Toronto or Ottawa, cities more distant to them than Regina or Saskatoon. As Francis continues, “today’s globalized economy has a levelling effect on cultures, diminishing the immense variety which is the heritage of all humanity” (144). Because a BI would better help people to remain in their communities, it would better enable them to preserve and ultimately pass on their local customs and institutions. What is more, by strengthening family relations, it would likely help to reduce stress and anxiety. Ontario’s BI professes a desire to accomplish this goal, and the language of integral ecology would help to give substance to this claim. In doing so, it would help to overcome the objections of those skeptical that government can solve problems ‘simply by throwing money at them’.

Civic Responsibility

A third way in which integral ecology might support the implementation of a BI is that as the BI helps to reduce stress and anxiety through local personal networks, it might also help to promote a civic culture of responsibility for others. When individuals in distress are surrounded by those networks, they will presumably be less inclined to look to government, which by its large nature cannot be optimally responsive. By contrast, the BI allows the government to focus on what it can do very effectively: cut cheques in the name of social welfare (Murray 2016: 3). As Niskanen’s classic study indicates, this would minimize the threat of government failure – one that forms a particular challenge when Queen’s Park is responsible for far-flung communities like Kapuskasing or Dryden. (Niskanen 1968: 293-4, 304-05). Pope Francis is alert to this challenge, pointing out that central governments can “overlook the complexities of local problems which demand the active participation of all members of the community” (Francis 2015: 144)³. The greater fiscal capacity of private networks could also ease the burden on the public purse. What is more, if the benefits of BI were less graduated or extended to those with higher incomes, it might create more of an opportunity for private charity. If the benefits were in fact universal (as in many BI proposals), there would be little ability to game the system, helping to cultivate honesty. Needless to say, Popes tend to endorse the virtues of generosity and honesty.

Entrepreneurship

Fourth, Pope Francis' integral ecology (and the broader tradition of Catholic Social Thought) harmonizes with the aim of the BI to promote entrepreneurship. A BI might do this by providing a cushion for individuals to take the risks associated with starting a new business venture (Stern 2016:190). This small but steady income stream would also render potential entrepreneurs incrementally more credit-worthy. In *Laudato Si*, Francis asserts that rural people uniquely require not only property ownership, but access to credit and insurance. (Francis 2015: 94) This follows a long line of Popes who have promoted access to productive capital as helpful for human flourishing. For instance, the first document of Catholic Social Thought – Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* – argues that proprietors need access to “things that [do not] perish in the use”, in order that they might exercise the unique human capacity of exercising foresight and imagination (Leo XIII 1891: 7). This provides a moral justification for capital that even Adam Smith does not directly provide. Pope Leo's context is not so different from our own: he is impelled to write “new things” (*Rerum Novarum*) as a priority response to the newfound “misery and wretchedness of the working class” (Leo XIII 1891: 3) Taken together, these elements of integral ecology might provide public political support for Ontario's BI pilot. The language of integral ecology might lend the weight of Pope Francis' public authority to this policy. What is more, integral ecology might help to explain to skeptical residents *why* a BI would help to attain the Province's stated goals.

Integral Ecology and Indigenous Support for the Basic Income

One of the first impacts of the BI pilot's success or failure will be on the planned First Nations Basic Income project. Public opposition to the BI pilot could spell doom for this subsequent planned project (to say nothing of extending the BI across the entire province or country). Hence, the initial pilot is likely to have a long-lasting effect on the 300,000 Aboriginal people residing in Ontario – over one-fifth of the Canadian Aboriginal population. Here is where a discourse of integral ecology might buy time for such a second phase of the pilot even in the event of a lukewarm reception to the initial phase. Indeed, twenty-five per cent of Aboriginal peoples in Canada are Roman Catholic, and might be particularly receptive to Francis' exhortations. What is more, Pope Francis' appeal to Catholics and non-Catholics, Indigenous or otherwise, is strengthened through a key concept taken from Canadian Catholic bishops.

Francis carries on the tradition of Catholic Social Thought in his belief that nature is a seamless garment, and that ecology must address both physical and human nature. But he adds to that tradition by quoting the Canadian bishops' 2003 pastoral letter *You Love All that Exists... All Things are Yours, God, Lover of Life*. This pastoral letter begins by re-emphasizing that non-human nature bears the imprint of the sacred. But it goes even further, suggesting that nature is not simply “a constant source of wonder and awe”, but even “a continuing revelation of the divine” (Francis 2015: 85)⁴. In other words, physical nature is not simply a static sign of the original Revelation of Creation, but a continuing revelation; it is not simply something that we encounter, but something that encounters us in an ever-new interaction.

Pope Francis mentions one kind of community particularly alert to this concept of nature: indigenous communities. As he writes, “For them, land is not a commodity but rather a gift from God and from their ancestors who rest there.” They are historically and

culturally predisposed to recognize the land as “a sacred space”. For this reason, is it essential for them to interact with nature “if they are to maintain their identity and values.” Hence, if people might benefit from a BI that permits them to live near nature, in their communities of origin, this would be doubly true for Aboriginal peoples. For this reason, Pope Francis argues that it is especially imperative to “show special care for indigenous communities and their cultural traditions” as “not merely one minority among others” (Francis 2015: 146). These statements about the sacredness of nature call to mind indigenous concepts of sovereignty as stewardship. Indigenous political and economic approaches particularly emphasize the need to work with nature, rather than on dominating it (Geddert 2017: 4; Turner 2001: 327-29; Keal 2008: 329).

Overall, *Laudato Si* devotes special attention to the place of work in a fulfilling human life. In this way, it differs from a common economic narrative that spans the political spectrum: that labour is a disutility, to be minimized until it can be eliminated. In contrast, the Pope argues that work is “a path to growth, human development, and personal fulfillment.” He fleshes out this concept by listing several distinct human activities that work promotes: “creativity, planning for the future, developing our talents, living out our values, relating to others, giving glory to God.” He further cites the work of his predecessor, Saint John Paul II, who emphasized the creativity of work by describing “the nobility of the human vocation to participate responsibly in God’s creative action” (Francis 2015: 127-28, 131). This seems to harmonize with an indigenous approach to work predisposed to working with (rather than against) nature. An approach of integral ecology would further emphasize that such work also involves human nature. Indeed, if physical nature itself is an active revelation of Creation, integral ecology would seem to recommend that human work be creative in revealing human nature.

More Work – and More Meaningful Work

One benefit commonly associated with the Basic Income is an increase in the employment rate relative to other approaches to social welfare. For example, many economists argue that an increase in the minimum wage causes employers to lay off staff, reduce hours, or cut benefits. To take one recent example, Tim Hortons recently responded to Ontario’s increased minimum wage by reducing benefits. Other employers may lay off staff. After all, if the marginal value of the product no longer exceeds the cost of employing the most marginal staff, the profit-motive suggests that no economic reason remains to employ the person. For this reason, some have argued that an increased minimum wage benefits those who are not laid off at the expense of the very worst off – the newly laid off. By contrast, introducing a basic income rather than increasing the minimum would create economic incentives for firms to hire employees whose abilities do not yet produce a great return for the company. However, this low wage would no longer force workers into penury, as the basic income would supplement their employment earning to permit a basic dignified standard of living. In this way, low-skill workers would more easily find jobs that might help to them to follow a “path to growth [and] human development”. The despair that often accompanies unemployment would be seriously reduced, further promoting mental health.

What is more, a BI would also give job-seekers the security they need to avoid having to accept the first job offered to them, regardless of fit or fulfillment. Rather, job-

seekers would be empowered to bargain with employers. This would help to combat the market failure represented by inequality of bargaining power, in which employees in difficult situations are unable to negotiate conditions that truly reflects the price point that a fully free market would dictate. (Examples include limits on maximum weekly hours, prohibition of voluntary servitude, and bans on price gouging during emergencies.) Furthermore, current employees could effectively threaten to leave employers who treat them poorly or who undertake profit-driven measures that debase the nature of the work. Employees would be empowered to protest measures that reduce the creativity of the work, or that transform workers into what Marx called mere “minders of machines”. Rather, workers could better advocate for – or wait for – employment that suited their nature. Artists and artisans could better afford to pursue their creative passions. This would be particularly beneficial for indigenous Ontarians, who could better avoid taking work in cities that is foreign to their heritage.

When one suggests that a BI would help to promote meaningful work, one is sometimes met with one of the strongest and most intuitive objections to a BI: wouldn't a BI, in fact, allow people *not* to work? Economic critics argue that labour is a disincentive, and that workers will not seek work if their basic needs are satisfied. Needless to say, the economy functions better when people work to provide added value. However, the “Mincome” project four decades ago in Dauphin, Manitoba suggests that such fears are unlikely to be borne out. The only groups that substantially reduced their hours were new mothers and teenagers working to support their families. The BI allowed the former to spend more time with their children during years formative for their nature. It allowed the latter to devote more time to education, presumably enabling more fulfilling and remunerative work later (Forget 2011). This thesis is further supported by the recent case of Switzerland, which considered a generous universal basic income in 2016. When put to a national referendum, the initiative failed. According to surveys, one-third of Swiss respondents believed that the measure would negatively impact the work ethic of their fellow citizens. However, only 2 per cent of respondents stated that they would actually plan to stop working (Economist 2016). In this case, it is possible that perceptions of others' vulnerability to sloth is overstated.⁵

Conclusion

Ontario's BI pilot project represents an innovative approach to testing new social welfare policy. However, all such projects face challenges in winning public support. In this way, Ontario's BI project is no different. However, in other ways, it is different, because its ability to win public support may have a larger impact on subsequent policy than do most public policy trials. The initial pilot project will impact the success (or perhaps even the basic viability) of the First Nations BI pilot. However, it may also affect the potential implementation of the BI at the federal level, recently mooted by the federal Liberals. Canada is watching Ontario.

Pope Francis has attained worldwide attention for his social thought, both within the Catholic population (including four million Ontarians) and without. His original concept of integral ecology, one central to his overall social thought, might offer support to the current BI pilot. In particular, it might provide the public with a justification for the plausibility of the project by showing how a BI might tangibly effect the results anticipated by the Province of Ontario. It might help to show how a BI would strengthen

families, promote civic engagement, and support entrepreneurship. Perhaps more surprisingly, it might identify both the effects of a BI on regional development, and to highlight the importance of such development. Finally, integral ecology might enable patience among the Ontario population to continue the trial through to its First Nations phase. Having reached that phase, it might then offer additional support to the BI by emphasizing the importance of meaningful work, and highlighting the traditional aboriginal connection to the land as a particularly natural manifestation of such work. By providing these angles of support for the Basic Income, integral ecology would help to perpetuate at least three long-standing planks of Catholic Social Thought: subsidiarity, stewardship and care for creation, and the preferential option for the poor. But Pope Francis' new twist on this tradition might lend particular support for a Basic Income as a way to achieve these aims.

References

- Angus Reid Institute. 2016. "Basic Income? Basically unaffordable, say most Canadians." <http://angusreid.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2016.08.10-guaranteed-income.pdf> and http://angusreid.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/2016.08.10_Basic_Income_PressReleaseTables.pdf (May 15, 2018).
- Economist Editorial Staff. 2016. "Universal basic incomes: sighing for paradise", June 4. <https://www.economist.com/briefing/2016/06/04/sighing-for-paradise-to-come> (May 15, 2018).
- Forget, Evelyn 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.
- Francis, Pope. 2015. *Laudato Si*. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html
- Geddert, Jeremy. 2017. "Sovereignty and the (Expanded) Responsibility to Protect". Canadian Political Science Association Annual Conference Paper.
- Greenhouse, Steven. 2010. "Andy Stern to Step Down as Chief of Politically Active Union." *New York Times*, April 13. <https://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/14/us/14union.html> (May 15, 2018).
- Keal, Paul. "Indigenous Sovereignty." In *Re-envisioning Sovereignty: The End of Westphalia?*, ed. Trudy Jacobsen et. al. Ashgate, Burlington, Vermont.
- Leo XIII, Pope. 1891. *Rerum Novarum*. Papal Encyclical. http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.html
- Liberal Party of Canada. 2016. "Poverty Reduction: Minimum Income" <https://winnipeg2016.liberal.ca/policy/poverty-reduction-minimum-income/>
- Monsebraaten, Laurie. 2018. "Ontario's basic income experiment would continue under Doug Ford." *Toronto Star*, April 28. <https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2018/04/24/ontarios-basic-income-experiment-would-continue-under-doug-ford.html> (May 15, 2018).
- Murray, Charles. 2016. "A Guaranteed Income for Every American." *Wall Street Journal*, June 3. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/a-guaranteed-income-for-every-american-1464969586> (May 15, 2018).
- Niskanen, William A. 1968. "The Peculiar Economics of Bureaucracy" *The American Economic Review*. 58 (2): 293-305.
- Ontario Government. 2016. "Finding a Better Way: A Basic Income Pilot Project for Ontario: A discussion paper by Hugh D Segal." <https://www.ontario.ca/page/finding-better-way-basic-income-pilot-project-ontario>
- Ontario Government. 2017. "Ontario's Basic Income Pilot." <https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-basic-income-pilot>

- Ontario Office of the Premier. 2017. “Giving More People an Opportunity to Get Ahead and Stay Ahead”, April 24. <https://news.ontario.ca/opo/en/2017/04/giving-more-people-an-opportunity-to-get-ahead-and-stay-ahead.html> (May 15, 2018)
- Sedlak, A.J., Mettenburg, J., Basena, M., Petta, I., McPherson, K., Greene, A., and Li, S. 2010. *Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4): Report to Congress, Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.
- Stern, Andy. 2016. *Raising the Floor: How a Universal Basic Income can Renew our Economy and Rebuild the American Dream*. With Lee Kravitz. Public Affairs, New York.
- Turner, Dale. 2001. “Vision: Toward an Understanding of Aboriginal Sovereignty.” In *Canadian Political Philosophy*, ed. Ronald Beiner and Wayne Norman. Oxford University Press, Toronto.

¹ Note that reference numbers for *Laudato Si* indicate section numbers rather than page numbers.

² Ironically, Ontario’s special provision of an extra \$7,000 for families (to an annual income of \$24,000) actually works against families. If the two parents were considered as individuals rather than a family unit, each would be given \$17,000, for a total of \$34,000.

³ One could argue that the BI is a centralized solution in the first place. But while the funding provided by a BI is centralized, the delivery is not.

⁴ Here Pope Francis situates this statement within a long-standing Catholic tradition, quoting St. Thomas Aquinas: “Nature is nothing other than a certain kind of art, namely God’s art, impressed upon things, whereby those things are moved to a determinate end. It is as if a shipbuilder were able to give timbers the wherewithal to move themselves to take the form of a ship”.

⁵ Alternative explanations are that respondents are insufficiently attuned to their own sloth, or that indeed 35 per cent would work less, even if only two per cent would cease to work entirely.