

Note	question number the comment refers to)
Should be at least as large as social assistance or why bother?	1
Consider aligning rates of OW and ODSP	1
Basic and conditional on disability	1
Account for cost of living as in a northern community versus an southern community or a urban or rural (or based on access to services)	1
What are we trying to do? Eliminate poverty? If so, it varies.	1
LICO varies. The poverty line should be based on local and personal need.	1
Would services be separate from cash payments? If not, how to account for work incentives?	1
Objective: administrative complexity? Will cost savings follow from being generous when more people will be incentivized to conceal income?	1
Cost savings of changing Social Assistance before turning it over to the CRA.	1
Must be manageable. If would be must more difficult to administer - have to have an asset test.	1
Beyond seniors - child benefits to middle class benefits. Need two separate programs (seniors and all other)	1
If it is going to replace CPP and OAS benefits, one must also consider the provincial programs for seniors	1
What about seniors that actually are struggling?	1
How do you administer? How do you define who gets it and distribution? Revert back to low income cut-offs established by the provinces.	1
Personal or family?	1
southern Ontario vs. Northern Ontario. Scalable based on regions within Ontario.	1

If we are looking at the immediate goal - pilot in two or three cities. We have a problem if we're selected and didn't ask for it. Who is administering this? The hope would be, there would be support and guidance from the province. Provincial scale would be easier, because everyone you can use the income tax system,	1
Those who aren't filing taxes are the lower income brackets. There are over 900,000 people on ODSP and OW. This is 10% of actual population. That is a huge chunk of the economy. Do not want to create a disincentive for those who are vulnerable.	1
Those below the poverty line, homeless. If this is a BIG. Personally or family?	1
Idea of income splitting raises an additional complexity.	1
Creates an economic incentive for individuals to live on their own (if individual model). Better off giving child support. Raise divorce rate? Not telling the province what your living arrangement actually is.	1
Maybe not even a good idea to try a pilot. Cost too much in administration to make sure everyone is doing it right.	1
if we're trying to alleviate poverty, there needs to be a measure of poverty. How do we measure poverty? LIM or LICO	1
How many other programs are staying in place? Are we going to be replacing other programs or will they be supplanted	1
There are services that you can't eliminate regardless of how big a BIG will be	1
Cost of living varies from city to city; using a food basket measure could help measure poverty in order to work towards a BIG	1
Depends on how you want to define poverty if the objective is to lift people out of poverty	1
It's complicated	1
Can't eliminate local level services	1
Long enough to get some measures and get some performance. Long enough to start tracking that progress	1
Need to get enough data and link it to a cycle of the census; at least 3-5 years	1
Would start to get results in 3-4 years; however, in the Dauphin it only took one year for indicators to change	1
Hard sell to the public, shouldn't cost more than what we currently do for social assistance. Should be incremental and introduce elements gradually. Looking at it from a cost perspective	1

It is the "right thing to do". Ended slavery because it was the right thing to do. Negate the necessity of inviting foreign workers.	1
Surprised the administration costs are not exponentially higher.	1
At what point can you be transformative? Don't necessarily want to go much higher than right now, because there's dependency. However. what a single person receives is not enough	1
Minimum wage jobs will have more workers, because people have the freedom to work	1
Receiving funding directly to housing and utilities would still need to take place.	1
Big enough to provide the necessities of life, and open people up to the opportunity to join the productive economy	1
Big enough to cover the costs of minimum wage full-time. So those willing to work can make more.	1
Should encourage equity, so that every human being is worth something, no matter what they would like to achieve	1
Thinking about other services that will be utilized	1
ultimately want a minimum income guarantee	1
issues between individual vs. family makes it difficult	1
article in the Economist: calculator, given non-health related benefits in Canada for families, total amount would be \$4000...	1
The numbers provided in Mike Moffat's presentation (maximum benefit allowance) were pretty small	1
what is considered poverty level? How much % of your income you spend? A certain income?	1
relative poverty rate is probably the more generous one	1
living wage for Toronto is somewhere around 40,000/year - median wage is around 28,000 - given these types of numbers, people would have to report things like they can only live in large groups b/c they can't afford it	1
to give everyone 15,000/year, it would cost gov't \$285 billion	1
nice to see how lean admin costs are b/c one party didn't know that	1
tax savings from RRSP, etc. could be reduced for the top 1%	1
but if you add taxes to savings programs, low-income families won't be able to "hide" anything at all from the tax system	1
pensioners are already incentivized to save b/c of how savings system/tax system is run	1
have to look at whole system; how much can we afford & how much do we need & how much will it cost?	1
even if you bring max payments up to 18,000 per year (from mike's slides), that is still below the poverty line	1
should be dependent on cost of living	1
but does that mean a family of 3 needs 3x what an individual does? Or no?	1

you then have to deal with the independence problem again	1
graduated clawback would re-incentivize working, rather than standard high levels	1
It should be big enough to provide a basic income to ensure that people can afford food, buy clothing, pay hydro. The low income cut off amount	1
The low income amount would have to increase, especially in this area	1
This is about income redistribution and look at how we can better support vulnerable people	1
System of dependence currently exists - what this could lead to is a system of independence	1
Too many people don't have the secure the base to make choices in what they want to do with their lives	1
BIG should be large enough to provide a secure base	1
Scale - keep the basic income pilot small	1
Free up young people to engage in the activities they are interested in. What are the multiplier effects on the economy?	1
When you're secure and safe, you can think about other things in your life. Basic income provides a safety net	1
the financial output needs to be demonstrable, not just a token amount, a lot of factors to consider - looking at a 10B amount, only returns small amount and returns to a past amount, 20B likely a more reasonable amount	1
the population of Ontario, where does North start, numbers for the 11 districts (what does it encompass)	1
It needs to be significant enough amount of money in order to reach a large amount of the population in the North.	1
Are shelter costs included in this estimate? What other costs should be factored in on top of the amount allotted (drugs, transportation, other needs)?	1
This should be a national program. Will it work implementing one province at a time? People travel, move for work or lifestyle.	1
1200\$/a month on average, needs to cover rent, food, give someone security, etc. It should absorb the cost that other social programs have to give.	1
2 test communities - one in Northern Ontario, one in Southern Ontario	1
It should be high enough for a person with no other income to live on and not be below the poverty line, e.g., at least 100% of LIM, updated every year.	1
In a perfect world you would combine them.	2
Could it even be done by one province when you consider taking EI payments?	2
Finland is a unitary state, makes it much easier to implement.	2
Difficult to create an effective program without the tax base of the federal government.	2
Could allow municipal governments to have more authority over their own communities. Using clustered formats. Possible way of taking ODSP and pushing it into more of a local level.	2
Not even mentioning the municipalities. Municipality could administer and provide supports. Locally elected individuals coming up with local solutions.	2
Where is cash going? Could be in different ways (ex. food vouchers, gift cards). Maybe pay rent directly.	2

Those with mental health, substance abuse issues, they may need assistance. If money is going in other places. They do need to become sustainable eventually. Working towards helping them use that cash in the right places.	2
Easiest way to give and claw back. But people that qualify that don't necessarily need it may get it. But you can't deny people that qualify.	2
Challenges with labour market participation - would skew by having a BIG program. 60% employed (labour market). What incentive would they have to improve their economic well being. A lot of problems with social programs.	2
How would you administer on reserve with Indigenous communities who do not filing income tax (not having taxable income - most income is non-taxable) creates another wrinkle)	2
First Nations could administer money on their own. Each community knows the needs of their people. Turns into social programming over BIG	2
Federal and provincial; can't eliminate the local services at the provincial level	2
Revising the tax system to deliver	2
Amount should be dependent on the poverty level of the geographical area	2
Increasing consumption taxes, and reducing income taxes. Put a price on carbon and let it offset the costs of environmental	2
Increasing corporate taxes	2
Sovereignty will pay - Alaskan permanent fund. Norweigen sovereign wealth fund. CPP is one of the largest in the year. If government wanted to increase the HST by 2%, might be able to cover it in that way	2
Not enough money spent on individuals on assistance. OW hasn't gone up in 20 years. With inflation, it's going down	2
probably in Canada, you would need \$25,000 per year as an individual to live	2
federal and provincial will have to be used together	2
big issue is portability - inter-provincial migrants - what does this mean for them if it's only in some provinces? Different amounts for different provinces? Currently there's no "application" to become a resident in another province	2
if nation-wide, bigger challenge in decision making, differences in living costs, etc.	2
system is not designed to be harmonized but it would have to be to work	2
A collaboration with both the Federal and provincial	2
Think ahead to federal involvement especially for the pilot	2
Federal participation in designing the provincial pilot	2
Focus on evaluation to inform the federal government on success/failure of program	2
Pilot process will identify how partnerships can be developed among levels of government	2

the BIG pilot in a FIRst Nation community could open up an opportunity for treaty renewal	2
Treaties could be the push to get funds to the First Nation	2
1965 agreement for FN, shared federal and provincial cost-wise. In Harris government, plan introduced and some communities opted in and some didn't. Consultation of FN? Who are they going to liaise with, CRA?	2
Handing over social program to Revenue Canada?	2
Does incremental mean province by province or community by community?	2
Delivery charge of electricity in FN Communities? Options of jobs in FN communities (do they have to work underground)? Family benefits vs. individual concerns - how to support children especially in largest growing youth population	2
It should be provincial and federal. Might be Canada wide, and the amount should be the same across the country so there is no discrepancy between amounts. It discourages people from moving provinces because of people receiving more money somewhere else. It should a standard wherever you are in Canada.	2
The federal gov't should help pay for the pilot, as they did with Mincome.	2
Combined capacity of federal and provincial governments may be more feasible	2
For a guaranteed income program you want all cash transfer programs, but the problem of the benefit unit?	3
Both: Cash=federal government, services=provincial/municipal	3
Provincial/municipal governments better equipped to deal with providing emergency transfers	3
During the pilot, you could replace OW and ODSP and bypass these delivery systems to gauge the implications	3
Should not bypass the system for the trial period so that you get a full assessment	3
Would not want to replace anything else besides OW and ODSP	3
Taking away the financial burden of the OW and ODSP program	3
Deliver pilot through the tax system so that even if pilot has gone away you still educate people about filing & benefits	3
what if it was tied to EI? - EI in itself has strong implications for society, but BIG might take away from what EI actually is a little bit	3
for low-income workers, it's actually extra money in their pocket b/c they just pay less EI - would mean less that business have to pay as well, which then means they could be taxed in a higher bracket	3
EI gives \$1500 for maternity leave - the con of EI is that it's a limited time, you get harassed asking about whether or not you've gotten a job, there is very high clawback rate	3
large benefits to employees getting to keep their EI dollars	3
thought would be that BIG covers working years, 18-65, but what if someone leaves the job force early?	3
still has to be security in medications and certain other things with a program such as ODSP	3
challenge is that if you've been out of work for a year, no EI, people try OW, then case workers suggest people apply for ODSP b/c they developed mental issues while out of work - slippery slope	3
once you're on ODSP, it's incredibly difficult to get off - many still live in poverty despite having that - what does it do to self-esteem to keep having to lie to gov't	3

CPP and OAS together is a good idea	3
Programs to disperse money could be replaced in BIG;	3
Support services that already exist may need to be reframed and retailored	3
Integration of other transfer payments like child benefit	3
Health impacts in long term - possible savings in health and mental health programs in the future	3
Can health care system be changed in order to do the same thing as BIG? Being healthy enough to work, violence decreasing as less stress associated with money. More opportunity for good food, shelter and educational opportunities.	3
EI included in the system? Good one to target as it targets individuals and does not currently include delivery of services	3
GAIs for seniors if they are included in the pilot age group.	3
Programs considered for inclusion, every program in the province.	3
Individuals involved should be 18 years or older Individuals should not be worse off participating in BIG pilot Allowances for prescription drug/health care benefits should remain	3
Ontario Works, the income support part of ODSP, the HST tax credit, Trillium benefit. In a permanent BIG, many more programs could be rolled into the BIG.	3
Lower income individuals shouldn't be taxed at a higher rate to support the benefits.	4
Taxes on higher incomes are preferable	4
Raising taxes to pay for a universal cash benefit is not politically feasible	4
Trouble believing that politicians believe that this program can be cheaper than existing programs. If (when?) it fails, they will be on the hook to undo the damage done.	4
Using the CRA to administer the benefit would be especially problematic for lower income individuals, 30% of whom do not file income taxes annually (50% for indigenous people)	4
Another possible goal could be to put upward pressure on wages, either expanding the tax base or causing inflation.	4
Economy cannot absorb more tax shocks. Creative tax deductions. Some funding could come from higher earning resident and by closing tax loopholes.	4
Gaps exist between funding for health and social programs.	4
Experiencing demographic shift in Northern Ontario. Less tax payers. DDR. Need more tax revenue!	4
Social costs of not managing high risk clients. If you're missing 2% of the population not filing taxes. End up paying it on the back end.	4
We don't have anymore money. How best to allocate what we have.	4
How do we get trust of younger generations who have no trust in government. They are underemployed, out of work.	4

re-emphasizes having employment Ontario/EDCs (municipally operated) align with social services and put under municipalities	4
Could a pilot be deficit financed? People will find other ways to hide income. More complexities - higher income bracket hire accountants to distribute their income as they need it.	4
So many other programs other than ODSP/ontario works...social housing. Unless you have a simplified tax code, this won't work.	4
Distribution of government funds would not go to social housing...it is going to a BIG. Some will have access to a system. Transition plan to wean ppl off the other supports. Would be a huge shift.	4
No pilot should be deficit financed - this is a sure way to not get buy in	4
We seem fairly prepared to raise taxes on high income individuals	4
If federal government is to marginally raise taxes on high income individuals, this would result in less behavioural changes	4
Eliminate capital gains exemption, including stock options	4
Get rid of the redundancy of system of tax deductions and exemptions that are solely available to high income individuals	4
Take money from Hydro One to fund the pilot	4
Limiting factor to Ontario pilot would be provincial-federal tax intermingling; that could entice people to leave to other provinces	4
Majority do not want to raise taxes for the basics needs	4
Basic income guarantee might adress the stigma, and if everyone got the income, more individuals would get the benefits of a BIG	4
At what point can it be universal, and counted as income	4
Taxing the cheques would eliminate the shock at tax season	4
Changing the exemption amount to incentivize work	4
in ontario, highest tax bracket is \$220,000 - pay 50.8% - doesn't take wealth into consideration, gifts, inheritance, etc. - but maybe it should	4
if you push taxes onto the wealthy, you may get less support for BIG, and it increases the chance that people will be dishonest, hide money	4
don't like first question b/c it's framed as an assumption	4
it's interesting b/c different people argue different things, and they're almost in the same group but they don't talk to each other	4
something that a party wanted to gain from attending - being able to talk to anyone and make it relevant to them	4
Raising taxes on natural resource extraction companies in the First Nation communities	4

the pilot could be deficit financed	4
Need to think about how to shift the taxes for the long term, but during the pilot period it could be deficit financed	4
The Scandenavian countries tend to have higher sales/consumption taxes than in Canada	4
Yes there may be need a increase taxes enough to fund the BIG, but we need to be able to demonstrate the benefit of the increased taxes to the taxpayers	4
Part of your argument down the road to fund a BIG, is the evidence that can be collected from the BIG pilot. This can allow politicians to explain how they will fund the program, while demonstrating the benefits to the public.	4
There is a need to change attitudes in the public to combat myths and gain support to increase taxes	4
If one could demonstrate that this kind of redistribution could result in spending and economic growth, this would be valuable	4
Canada has a very low corporate tax rate. Where does the money come from? Corporations put governments in power, so they get the breaks.	4
Tax avoidance needs to be considered. There is money to be collected from those that have found loop holes or avoid paying.	4
Consumption taxes-and sin taxes-spent by working poor population. Seems counterintuitive to tax those that are receving BIG.	4
Pilot period-is everyone from the province going to participate or benefit? And how long does the pilot need to run? Point made that there needs to be a 5 year run in order to have credible data.	4
Making it one cheque over a bunch so it makes it easier to plan for money because the invidividual isn't wondering where his next payment from different programs is coming from.	4
We do not think the rich should be getting cheques. Corporate tax should be increased. Large corporations shouldn't be allowed to find all the loopholes. Banks are making too much money on our money so banks should be taxed on the profits they are making from NSF fees, other bank fees that affect the most vulnerable. It has to be targetted, 16-35 really needs the most support and needs more security, so they don't worry so much, so they can make better choices and want to get involved with new jobs, new training, new education with confidence. Maybe not until you are 21, because you can't get Ontario Works until then.	4
Yes to increased provincial sales taxes and a more progressive tax system (charge more income taxes to the wealthiest)	4
Taxes should not be raised just to pay for the pilot. The fed gov't should help pay for the pilot. Even with a permanent BIG, funding could be found in many places before we would need to raise taxes, e.g., eliminate many tax credits used mostly by higher-income earners, including RRSP deductions & TFSA's, as well as lower tax rates on capital gains and investment income. A tax on financial transactions could raise a lot of money.	4
Is there a way that it can be target AND universal in some way?	5

There are people who are eligible for OW and ODSP who do not or cannot apply for the benefit. Homeless, mental health challenges, eg. Or even people who can't access medical care in the north.	5
How to target? Assesment used to help people who need more targeted assistance.	5
Needs to be more responsive	5
Where does homelessness fit into this? Or childcare?	5
Is it the case that a basic income will be expected to eliminate administration of other types of benefits (in-kind, like housing and daycare)?	5
You can't do this without helping people. You still need someone to help recipients with file their taxes, for example.	5
Can't even get people to open bank accounts, and there are costs associated with getting a bank account, like getting your government ID in order. Another barrier to the system for many.	5
What will banks look like in the future? Will there be more cheque cashing operations that will take a higher proportion of low income individuals income to cash their cheque?	5
Challenges for people with addictions and mental health issues. Caution - an increase in cash flow...are they going to create more harm in the community and to themselves?	5
There are clients who could take responsibility in a BIG situation. The other (smaller per cent)...programs to ensure they pay their rent, hydro, buy phone. Almost like a trustee program	5
Universal or targeted? Not universal, but how do you target? Go by age - human rights?	5
If you're unemployed...do you get a larger lump sum up front that tapers off?	5
It is time limited?	5
All tax supported programs wold have to be re-assessed.	5
Administration costs in amalgamating social support programs/services. BUT, are you creating more harm for certain target population groups.	5
Should money be invested in services and supports instead of a BIG?	5
First Nation communities see potential, but have concerns about details and logistics being put in place.	5
Want them to strive for income and employment on their own at the end of the day (have the self-worth). BIG will assist, but want drive to be self-sustaininig.	5
Transportaiton subsidies, child care subsidies, etc. are based on calculation of income. If you have a BIG, anything income tested would have to be re-drawn.	5
BIG model has to be sustainable. If it's on the backs of the single tax payer, there are no tax payers left to squeeze more.	5
Only 5 per cent of people that are using these subsidies. How do you justify for the whole population.	5
Need programs for development skills - self-care , addicitons, mental health - then employment. Employment based supports would have to remain under municipal control.	5
Look at universal tax child care credit - took a decade to phase in.	5
Basic income should be targeted	5

It can vary in any shape or form (especially through the tax system), could have it individualized through	5
You can target households (separation is an issue) vs individuals (maintains access to the account of who the individual is)	5
If shelters were better equipped then that would eliminate some of the issues with individualized targeting	5
Clawback should be as progressive as possible	5
The thing you are trying to overcome is the welfare wall. The goal is to incentivize people to work	5
Cost of the program is very sensitive to the extent of the clawback	5
Consider First Nations, where income is not taxable, it should be taxable	5
First Nations should have access to basic income, especially in the far north reserves	5
Consumption tax	5
Individuals living in poverty cannot leverage the purchasing power of those living above it. The universal system would pool funding to purchase food. If everyone had a guaranteed income, they know their basic needs will be taken care of and increase entrepreneurship.	5
If they do this basic income, where will their benefits come from for health care.	5
universal makes it much more palatable, and eliminates stigma, extra admin work due to loss of job, etc.	5
only way you can guarantee on it being taxable is that the tax credits are comparatively what the levels of basic income is	5
basic amount would have to be increased to guarantee it's taxability	5
pro of universal: ease of administration, no need for people to go to your home, reduction of stigma	5
universal provides a level of security to fall back on if there is ever a drastic change in income	5
if it wasn't universal, age should provide limits - not to children, BUT in Ont you can leave the education system at age 16, but we wouldn't want people to leave the system at 16 - OW does kick in at 16, or if you have a child at 16 you can get benefits	5
in Dr. Forget's study, when labour market participation was reduced, people were staying in education system longer	5
most feel that it's not the basic income itself that would be taxed, but over that amount would - you will still be able to tax higher income earners but at much higher than we are right now	5
leave the exemption to the point it's at but raise taxes for top-tier earners	5
lifestyle, number of dependents plays a factor in how far your income goes	5
more people in a family unit, and if each adult in the house got the same amount, would increase incentive to have lots of kids - get lots of adults to live with you, you'd all get that same amount, e.g. your parents come to live with you	5
so BIG itself shouldn't be taxable, but the higher-level incomes should be... would then have to look at all tax systems though	5
other way to do tax levels is to have a graduated clawback	5

if it was based on a family level, clawback would help discomfort of a bunch of adults living together - roommates, students who happen to be married, all situations need to be taken into account	5
goal of a clawback shouldn't be to reduce incentives e.g. to get married, participate in labour force	5
what defines "work" when we're talking about work incentives? Artists, athletes, etc.? Olympic athletes in Canada, where they train very hard and then if they don't get an award, get all their funding pulled	5
some things aren't recognized as valuable work yet are required for society to continue functioning	5
Universal doesn't make a lot of sense	5
Have to define the segment that you'd like to support	5
Targeted individually - easier to change your family status. Allows people to leave abusive relationships	5
There is a need that is not yet met. Look at the existing programs and see if this need can be met with existing programs and if not, there may be a need for a new program.	5
Overcoming negative connotations of being on welfare - so it may be more important to create a new program and come at it from a different approach	5
Need to do a lot of changes to existing programs (ODSP/OW) to achieve the goals of BIG	5
Higher the clawback, the bigger you can make the cheques	5
If you have a clawback any higher than 50%, you can start to trap people in the system	5
The clawback rate should try to ensure that the wealthy don't benefit from this program	5
Need for some sort of method to allow people to report changes in their income	5
Losing money by getting married is a challenge with the family unit method	5
If it is solely based on individual income, this can lead to funding families who may not need it	5
Universal-program tends to be harder to eliminate with change of government. Targeted programs are easier to eliminate or chop up and create qualification criteria for. For example, the CPP is paid into for by everyone so it is easier to justify as everyone benefits to some extent. EI was picked at and chopped up and some people no longer qualify.	5
Universal program, does that mean that certain people don't qualify? Could say the same thing about the health care.	5
Targeted may cost too much to administer. If you administer a claw back system, then the higher earners would end up paying back into the system.	5
What does clawback entail? Would someone eventually reach zero for BIG?	5
FOR ODSP, when the person makes money, the money is clawed back. Does the working person also have to return money?	5
Cheques are used as tool to ensure that people comply with programs (addictions, etc.). The average working program cannot be forced to comply with program attendance to get their paycheque.	5
To access support programs currently, there is not one system and the issuance of a cheque without related supports would be detrimental.	5

Discussion about navigators and how the services are delivered if just a cheque is issued or if BIG is "tax refunded".	5
Also shouldn't penalize people who are 65+	5
We need to make it easier for people to file taxes and realize who is eligible for benefits. BIG must be a cheque, it cannot be direct deposit. Reloadable payment card like ODSP.	5
Universal but with claw back to those who make more income than the set rate	5
It should be targeted, but there are different ways to achieve targeting. One way is to give the benefit only to people with low incomes and reduce the benefit when people have other sources of income. Another way is to pay the BIG to everyone and recover it in some other part of the overall system, most likely through a reformed income tax scheme. The net benefit to individuals and the net cost to Canada could be the same.	5
The gov't could pay the same benefit level everywhere and regions with higher-than-average cost of living could top it up as required.	6
Yes and it should be re-evaluated annually and indexed to inflation	7
Costs for housing, utilities, Nutritious Food Basket, out of pocket health care costs, insurance, telephone, internet access, transportation, clothing, and an amount to cover unexpected "budget shocks"	7
The living wage movement already has sample household budgets they use to calculate the living wage for a community. The same budgets could be used for basic income. The sample budgets illustrate the cost of a modest but decent standard of living that will keep people healthy and let them have their dignity.	7
in UK, it's not means-tested but when it is talked about it was theoretically means tested; it was actually universal, which ends up making the social safety net bigger - in the UK, the benefit is that it ISN'T means-tested	1, 5
we would have to have a much more taxation system - but even the top 1% would still get some BIG (if universal) - more palatable	1, 5
if universal, no other type of BIG works as well as that in terms of getting people attracted to it	1, 5
In an economy in transition, automation opens up interesting philosophical questions. The optimism concerning technology does not appear to translate into a widespread benefit.	Other
What happens to the individual at the end of this program?	Other
In principal it sounds like a good idea, but the design has to match the implementation.	Other
The objective of the program has to be clearly articulated.	Other
It would be preferable to have 10,000 people randomly selected across the province rather than taking a community.	Other
An alternative would be to simplify the social assistance program and raise the rates.	Other
An Aboriginal community should be selected because the needs and demographics of the communities are drastically different from non-Aboriginal communities.	Other
On the north shore there are 500 clients of OW and ODSP who are unemployable	Other
Potential for administrative savings. However, there is a concern that program supports disappear (largest costs)	Other

Where do students fit in? (social housing is not counted with OSAP)	Other
Be very specific about what you are trying to achieve	Other
If you implement through tax system, doesn't that change the goal of the pilot? You don't have to run a pilot if you revamp the tax system	Other
To get income tax system to the position so that you could implement the pilot will take a long time	Other
Do they have an alternative delivery system other than tax system?	Other
Will it reach the poverty line? At least... (green party proposed \$21K for the inflation in 2014)	Other
the more you make, the more you are taxed...	Other
Are you asking the sorts of questions that will help to create the belief that BIG is possible and could actually happen if enough people believe it could happen or are you asking the same old sorts of questions asked by those who assume that the idea of basic income for all is impossible?	Other

Questions - Discussion topic 1 (for reference)

1.How BIG should a b.i.g be?

2.In assessing our ability to pay for a b.i.g, do we use only the fiscal capacity of the Ontario government? Or do we consider the combined capacity of the federal and provincial governments together?

3.What, if any, provincial, federal or municipal programs should be considered for "inclusion" in or replacement by a guaranteed income during the pilot period? This choice, as with the discussion from item 2 above, will have important impacts on the size and cost of any provincial pilot.

4.Assuming we will need more tax revenue than currently collected to pay for a b.i.g.; how high are we prepared to raise taxes? Which taxes should we consider? Does this analysis apply to a pilot period, or could a pilot be deficit financed?

5.Should a basic income be universal or targeted? If not universal, how do we target it? By age? Income? Should the benefit be taxable? Is there a preferred or ideal claw back level or rate? What goals should that claw back be attempting to achieve?

mean, for pilot purposes, calculating province wide regional rates and applying the one that fits the model community(ies)).

7.If we base the targeted income floor on a calculation of essential or reasonable human needs. How do we estimate that? Low Income Cut Off? Basket of Goods? Other approaches? If by income, should we target a basic Individual or family income? Or perhaps a basic individual income and a clawback tied to family income? Something else?

8.What other questions do you have about what model of income guarantee Ontario should test?

(NOTE – these questions, and the answers, will be posted on the BIG2016 website for the next 30 days. So you will have further opportunity to explore and comment on them.)