



Research Report

## THE COST OF POVERTY

AUGUST 2011

Prepared by:  
Jane Robson,  
The Research Shop

## About Guelph & Wellington Task Force for Poverty Elimination

The Guelph & Wellington Task Force for Poverty Elimination is a community initiative composed of concerned and affected residents, organizations, businesses, all levels of government, the research community and others working together to move poverty reduction issues forward. The Poverty Task Force (PTF) works toward the elimination of poverty by supporting, coordinating and inspiring sustainable change and supporting the building of individual resilience through collective action.

### Contact Information:

Phone: 519-821-0571 x. 29 E-mail: [gwpoverty@gmail.com](mailto:gwpoverty@gmail.com) Mail: Guelph & Wellington Task Force for Poverty Elimination, c/o United Way of Guelph & Wellington, 85 Westmount Road, Guelph, ON N1H 5J2

## About The Research Shop

The Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship (ICES) fosters collaborative and mutually beneficial community-university research partnerships. ICES draws on strong traditions of community engagement and socially responsive research within the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences (CSAHS) at the University of Guelph. The Research Shop serves as a portal between community and university research needs. Faculty and students work with community organizations and individuals to identify and address social problems, and develop policies for positive change. Currently, the Research Shop focuses on working with collaborations in Guelph and Wellington by developing community-based research, placing students for service learning, and knowledge mobilization.

### Contact Information:

Phone: 519-824-4120 ext. 53109 E-mail: [ICES@uoguelph.ca](mailto:ICES@uoguelph.ca) Mail: Institute for Community-Engaged Scholarship/Research Shop, College of Social & Applied Human Sciences, University of Guelph OR 17 University Ave, Guelph, ON N1G 2W1

## Citation

Robson, J. (2011 August). "Intersection of Health, Transportation & Poverty." Retrieved from: [www.gwpoverty.ca](http://www.gwpoverty.ca)

## Introduction

### Background

In Canada, there has been considerable effort made to address the issue of poverty, particularly in Ontario with the release of its Poverty Reduction Strategy in 2010. Much of this effort has been directed at understanding the impact of poverty on the health and well-being of individual Canadians. While this is certainly an important component of the discussion it is also important to understand the economic costs of poverty. The cost of poverty extends well beyond the individual. Indeed recently, these costs have been estimated to be between \$32 and \$38 billion annually (Laurie, 2009).

Poverty is frequently accompanied by escalating health care costs, a rise in crime rates, diminished school success and increasing demands on community and social services. As society grapples with the consequences of poverty, health care costs climb, policing and crime related costs grow and there is burgeoning reliance on social services. There are also costs associated with reduced economic activity and/or economic production (Ivanova, 2011). The Centre for Health and Policy Studies reports that “poverty also imposes costs on members of society beyond those deemed ‘poor’ (Sheill, Allan, & Zhang, 2004), having wide ranging and far reaching implications for society.

Laure 2008 reports that the Ontario government is losing approximately \$10.4 billion-\$13.1 billion annually due to poverty. This is equivalent to between 10.8%-16.6% of the provincial budget and 5.5% -6.6% of the provincial gross domestic product. This deficit surfaces in extra costs to health care, the loss of tax revenue that accompanies low earnings, the costs of crime and social assistance.

Approximately 8.7% of the population of Wellington County, including the city of Guelph, is living in poverty with 55% more households in Wellington County having registered to receive Ontario Works benefits between August

2008 and July 2011 (United Way of Guelph and Wellington County, 2010). This would suggest that more and more people living in Guelph are on one form or another of assistance, limiting the amount of disposal income available and as a result, the amount of capital re-invested in the local economy.

Within the literature there are certain themes evident in terms of addressing the broader impact of poverty and although this is not an exhaustive list, it reflects some of the social costs of poverty. The first prominent social/economic cost of poverty is health care. This is not surprising considering individuals living in low income are more likely to live in less desirable conditions, have limited access to health care and generally appear to have long term health issues (Robson, 2011). The Ontario Physicians' Poverty Working group published numerous articles on health and poverty in 2008. These articles stressed the importance of the immediate implementation of an organizational policy addressing poverty as a risk factor for poor health outcomes (Ontario Medical Review, 2008). This policy would, according to the working group, help to eradicate some of the poverty related health risks, allowing the provincial government to reduce costs and in the long run, generate a positive return.

The second theme within the literature is the impact of the cost of crime. Although it is difficult to directly correlate crime with individuals living in poverty, it is evident within numerous studies that the greater the inequality of income in a community, the higher the incidence of crime (Ludwig, Duncan & Hirschfield, 2001). One of the reasons poverty has frequently been linked to crime is due to the fact that individuals living in poverty are vastly overrepresented in Canada's prison population and they are also more likely to be victimized by crime (Ivanova, 2011).

The third theme evident is the intergenerational cost of poverty. As indicated earlier, poverty is known to be cyclical with the cycle being perpetuated as families continue to encounter a lack of resources and/or access to resources. It has been argued that greater consideration needs to be given to the different components of

intergenerational poverty and more effort needs to be directed at developing the preventative measures necessary to remedy intergenerational poverty. The development and implementation of a strategic, well rounded, inclusive, intergenerational poverty policy would go along way towards eliminating one of the most crushing forms of poverty in Ontario.

Lastly is the theme of lost productivity and economic activity. Those living under the poverty line are more likely to be underemployed or unemployed, leading to costs for Ontario as a whole. As indicated in the Cost of Poverty in British Columbia report:

“ income that the poor might have earned from working, or that the working poor could have earned if their jobs paid better wages, can be thought of as a loss to the aggregate value of the economy or the collective wealth of our society. While this loss is not necessarily caused by poverty itself, it always accompanies poverty. Investments in reducing poverty through improving both basic education and specific skills training, better matching of workers with jobs locally,” (Ivanova, 2011).

It appears as though the resources being applied in the struggle against poverty are being utilized in an attempt to rectify the consequences of poverty rather than causes of poverty. Prevention programming would be far more beneficial as it would result in long term positive outcomes in the struggle against poverty. Identifying the root causes of poverty, developing the capacity to respond appropriately to the causes, defining a policy framework to address the root causes and then implementing the necessary programs to alleviate the root causes of poverty would offer a more realistic solution to the poverty issue. At the same time, it is important to recognize the role of community sustainability, capacity and strength in addressing poverty related issues. Reducing poverty leads to a positive economic return for a community and further, provides for a healthier, more sustainable community environment. Income generation, increasing tax revenues, declining social expenditures, increased residential longevity and greater neighbourhood cohesion are all potential outcomes of a poverty reduction strategy.

This report maintains that poverty reduction is not only about economic development but social and community development as well. While the immediate return on poverty reduction may well be increased tax revenues and reduced social expenditures, the long term return will be the improved health and well-being of the community.

### Purpose of the Study & Scope

The purpose of this research paper is to inform and support the work of the Guelph & Wellington Task Force for Poverty Elimination. The findings herein are intended to be informational and are to be disseminated through various presentations at the community level.

This report is based on a thorough but selective review of the literature available on the issue of poverty and poverty reduction. While the report has attempted to bring to the discussion the most relevant/recent thinking on the topic, because of the time sensitive nature of the project, the material cited is not an exhaustive list of poverty and poverty reduction literature. It should be noted that this is a growing field of enquiry and that it is hoped that with growth in scholarship will also come a growing willingness to address the issue of poverty reduction.

## Discussion

### Cost of Health Care

Canadians living in poverty are more likely than others to live with a disability, be hospitalized for a variety of health problems and to suffer from chronic conditions such as diabetes, arthritis and heart disease. Further to this they are twice as likely to use health care services in comparison to individuals with the highest incomes (Health Council of Canada, 2010). This is reflected in a 2010 report by the Canadian Institute for Health, where it is suggested that individuals living in areas that have been identified as low income, are more likely to be

hospitalized for conditions where hospitalization could have been avoided by taking the appropriate preventative measures such as disease management at early onset and routine medical care. This report suggests that in Canada approximately 33%-40% of all hospitalizations are associated with individuals living in low income (CIHI, 2010). This research indicates that an estimated 20% of total health care spending may be attributable to income disparities. In 2006, the social cost of health care in Canada in relation to poverty was \$7.6 billion. (Robson, 2011; Health Council of Canada, 2010).

More specifically when considering poverty-induced health care costs solely in Ontario, approximately \$2.9 billion is spent annually. In order to further comprehend these numbers Laurie (2008) suggested a “thought experiment”. The researcher took into consideration health care costs for those individuals with an income in the lowest quintile in relation to poverty, and “raised” their incomes to the level of those individuals living with an income in the second quintile. Nationally health expenditures would decline by \$7.6 billion per year while in Ontario the costs would be reduced by \$2.9 billion dollars. Although this experiment was hypothetical it gives merit to how detrimental social health care costs are for those living in Ontario, and how a sustainable reduction strategy would significantly aid in rectifying those costs. This is highlighted in Table 1 included below.

Table 1: Poverty and Social Costs of Health Care

Income quintiles (each quintile contains 20% of all individuals)	Share of total public health expenditures by quintiles	Estimated distribution of \$113 billion** for all of Canada in 2007	Estimated distribution of \$42.9 billion** for Ontario in 2007
1 (poorest 20%)	30.9%	\$34.9	\$13.3
2	24.2%	\$27.3	\$10.4
3 (middle 20%)	16.2%	\$18.1	\$6.9

4	14.1%	\$15.9	\$6.0
5 (richest 20%)	14.6%	\$16.5	\$6.3
If first quintile spending were reduced to second quintile spending.		\$7.6 billion (from \$34.9 billion to \$27.3 billion) 7.1 % of total Canadian health care spending.	\$2.9 billion (from \$13.3 billion to \$10.4 billion) 7.2 % of Ontario's health care budget.

\*Laurie 2008

In order to address these nationwide concerns and reduce health inequities accessibility needs to be taken into consideration as this has become a significant deterrent for low income individuals accessing appropriate health care. Individuals living in low income may not have accessibility to the appropriate resources such as transportation, shelter, food and or numerous other factors that are social determinants of health. The inequities between the community and individuals living in poverty persist even when age and sex are adjusted for. This reflects the fact that these differences are not solely demographic. There are numerous differences in use of health care and health status that continue to be evident even when smoking and exercise are accounted for (Fang, Kmetic, Millar, & Drasic, 2009).

In Guelph and Wellington County, the movement towards a more accessible transportation system may help to reduce some of the inequalities of accessing health care. The social/economic costs of health care in the community due to a lack of accessible or the availability of preventative medicine are taking a toll on both individuals within the community as well as on the community at large. As stated in Peters & Ellery's 2011 report for the Poverty Task Force,

"affordable transportation is absolutely necessary for families and individuals who already

have to be extremely careful where their limited money is spent. Knowing that there is a reliable, accessible and affordable public transit system means there is more money to save or spend elsewhere, and also means that there are more opportunities for improving one's own and family's wellbeing."

The ability to obtain appropriate and safe housing is also a factor contributing to the health of individuals living in low income in the Guelph and Wellington County, leading to further social/economic costs for the community. Wellington and Guelph Housing services reported in 2009 that the average rent cost for a single bedroom apartment is \$766, while an individual receiving Ontario Works obtains \$356 per month for shelter (United Way of Guelph and Wellington County, 2010). This disparity of resources has lead to a transient life style for many Guelph residents which in turn has lead to poorer health. The lack of resources may also lead individuals to live in less than desirable conditions, for example in the City of Toronto alone the backlog of repairs for public housing is estimated at \$300 million (Galarneau, 2005).

Lastly many individuals living in poverty have difficulty sustaining a healthy diet. The use of food banks in Wellington County and the City of Guelph has increased over the past 4 years suggesting that individuals are struggling to independently maintain a healthy diet. (Spence, 2009). This may lead to health complications, and again play into the enormous social/economic costs on the health care system (Please refer to "Hunger Count 2010 by Food Banks Canada for additional information").

### **Cost of Crime**

Throughout Canada criminal activity has increasingly become a concern especially when taking into consideration the broader impact that crime has had on the economy of the nation. In 2008, Canada spent more than \$15 billion on the criminal judicial system, policing and sustaining criminal justice programs. The cost of victims' services, stolen/damaged property, medical costs and lost wages was over \$16 billion. Further to this intangible costs such

as loss of life or suffering and pain are estimated to cost \$68 billion dollars (Zhang, 2008). Additionally, individuals who are incarcerated often lose custody of their children, lose income from employment and are faced with reduced opportunity in future labour markets due to having a criminal record (Ivanova, 2011).

Although crime is consistently correlated in the literature with individuals living in poverty, it is also important to heed caution in this generalization. In Ludwig et al(2001) report, it was questioned as to whether or not there would be an impact on crime when families living in poverty were moved away from high poverty, high crime neighbourhoods and into other neighbourhoods. This study suggests that in giving these families the opportunity to immerse themselves in another culture or neighbourhood there was a decrease in “criminal behaviour”. Kaplan, Elsie, Lynch, Cohen, & Balfour (1996) also suggested that the greater the inequality of income in a community, the higher the incidence of crime. These studies suggest a correlation between crime and individuals living in low income.

There are few current reports reflecting crime in Ontario. Statistics Canada reports that the province with the lowest crime rate in 2006 for the third straight year was [Ontario](#) with a crime rate of 5,689 per 100,000. As stated earlier literacy is an issue that is highly correlated to crime and individuals living in poverty are more likely to have low literacy skills. The Criminal Justice Indicators 2005 report suggests that there is strong evidence linking literacy to criminality and that literacy rates tend to be lower for individuals living in poverty. In Laurie's 2008 report, he equates the literacy probabilities by calculating the reduction rate that would result from raising literacy rates for individuals living in the lowest quintile of poverty to the second income quintile. For Ontario the savings would be between \$250 million - \$550 million in societal costs of crime.

When examining the social costs of crime locally in Guelph and Wellington County, Statistics Canada (2008) rated Guelph as having the lowest crime severity index of cities in Canada that had similar populations as Guelph. The total crime rate reported in 2007 by the Guelph City Policy was 5, 516 per 10, 000. The most common type of

crime in Guelph was property crime, with a total of 2, 558 per 100, 000 (United Way of Guelph and Wellington County, 2009). Although these statistics appear to be positive it also must be noted that in the Guelph Police Services Annual Report (2009) it was reported that crime in Guelph has increased. More specifically there was an increase in domestic violence as well as robberies, both of which are said to be expensive crimes in terms of utilizing resources in the community and ensuring sustainability in terms of rehabilitation. The Government also provides numerous crime compensation programs as well as victim services that are relevant to these sorts of crimes.

There is much speculation as to what are the factors that contribute to the pattern of individuals living in poverty and crime. Poverty impacts the circumstances in which individuals learn, live and potentially thrive are shaped by poverty. Understanding the key elements that contribute to the correlation between poverty and crime is essential to an effective and sustainable poverty reduction strategy which could reduce the societal costs of crime.

### **Intergenerational Poverty**

Intergenerational poverty refers to the cyclical nature of poverty being perpetuated from parent to child (Campaign 2000, 2010). When a child is raised in a family living in poverty there is a high chance that this child will continue to live in poverty as an adult. There is a wide array of suggested reasons for this, including the inability of families to afford the basic essentials of life, the lack of opportunity and the stress of the cyclical nature of poverty. There are also numerous health determinants relevant to poverty which may contribute to the intergenerational cycle of poverty such as children living in poverty are more likely suffer from malnutrition, to have a disability, learning disabilities and behavioural problems (Campaign 2000, 2010). Although poverty is a dynamic process, this suggests a direct correlation of children being raised in poverty being more likely to continue living in poverty as an adult.

The National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth suggested that parents who are living in poverty are twice as likely as parents who have middle or upper incomes to be chronically stressed. Further to this, Chief Public Health Officer David Butler-Jones noted that “of 27 factors identified as having an impact of child development, up to 80% were seen to improve as family income increases,” (Butler-Jones, 2009). This suggests that the inaccessibility to resources and services directly impacts parents living in poverty and their parenting abilities.

There are approximately 760, 000 children under the age of 18 in Canada that were living in poverty as of 2006. In Laurie’s (2008) report on the Cost of Poverty in Ontario, he suggests that in utilizing the estimates regarding rates of intergenerational mobility there will be approximately 152, 000 out of those 760, 000 children in Canada who will be living in poverty as adults. In considering the broader economic costs in Canada, the loss of future productivity of these children who may grow up into poverty will reduce their ability to contribute to Canada’s economy. Further to this, as adults these 152, 000 children predicted to live in poverty as adults can expect average incomes of \$16, 000 a year. Therefore these Canadian children who are unable to outgrow poverty would be contributing approximately \$4 billion less to the economy per year. It is likely that as adults these individuals would also be on social assistance, contributing to economic costs for Canada.

In Campaign 2000’s (2008) report on poverty in Ontario it suggests that the Ontario child poverty rate has been increasing since 2001 despite the growing economy. One in eight children in Ontario is living in a family that lives in poverty, which is 345, 000 children or 12.6% of Ontario children under the age of 18. In comparison to other provinces British Columbia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are the only three provinces that have a slightly higher child poverty rate than Ontario. As Canada’s largest province, 44% of all low income children in Canada live in Ontario. In result of these intergenerational issues the federal and provincial taxes that are associated is anywhere from \$1.3 billion - \$1.6 billion. An effective poverty reduction strategy for the province specifically would significantly decrease these costs.

There is limited research on child poverty in Guelph and Wellington County. The Canadian Federation of University Women of Guelph suggests that there are about 1,657 children birth to six years living in poverty in Guelph and Wellington.

### **Loss of Productivity**

A lack of resources and accessibility to resources contributes to the unemployment and underemployment of individuals living in poverty. As individuals living in poverty may not have the skills, training, education or technological abilities to market themselves it causes numerous barriers in obtaining a good paying job. It is quite evident that poverty imposes an incredible cost in terms of foregone earnings. Also as stated by Ivanova 2011, the income that may have been earned from individuals living in low income can be considered in terms of the loss to the collective wealth of the community and the aggregate value of the economy. This loss should not be considered as a cause of poverty, but does seem to accompany poverty. There is a definite need for training and basic education, as well as ensuring that the jobs available are providing economic security to workers. These strategies should be taken into consideration as preventative measures to decrease the social/economic costs of a loss of productivity.

In Canada the federal and provincial governments lose between \$8.6 billion and \$13 billion in income tax revenue to poverty every year (Laurie, 2008). The 2010 report card from Campaign 2000 reported that 1 in 3 low-income children have a parent who works full time throughout the year, and there are almost 400,000 full-time adult workers who earn less than \$10 an hour. In addition, they reported that in 2008, 35% of jobs were part-time, temporary, contract or involved self-employment. The lack of well-paying jobs which provide sufficient hours and benefits is making it difficult for families and individuals to live above the poverty line (Cabal Graces, 2011). In light of this families are forced to rely on social assistance costing more to the government and more general societal costs.

In the case of Ontario 904, 845 individuals find themselves in the lowest income quintile. Although the loss of productivity is evidently a cost that is borne by individuals and families living in poverty there are also societal costs that are quite large as well. For example in Ontario, Ottawa and Queen's Park lose a combined \$4 billion-\$6.1 billion due to a lack of productivity (Laurie, 2008). Similar to previous "thought experiments" Laurie (2008) follows the same approach by "raising" the after tax income of poor households to the average income for individuals in the second quintile. This provides an additional \$21, 154 per household which could be redistributed into the economy and utilized in other forms decreasing societal costs of a loss of productivity.

In Guelph and the County of Wellington many individuals are struggling with unemployment as a result of the economic downturn. Between January 2008 and May 2009 the number of individuals claiming Employment Insurance for the City of Guelph increased by 261.1% and for the rest of Wellington County there was an increase of 166.5%. In tandem to this the unemployment rates for the City of Guelph have increased from 5.2% in April of 2008, to 8.1% in April of 2009 (United Way of Guelph and Wellington County, 2009).

## **Policy & Programs**

Within Canada it is evident that a combination of policies and programs are necessary to strategically alleviate poverty and contribute to income security for Canadians. These policies and programs should target the core issues of poverty, which have been summarized based on the literature as health, crime, intergenerational poverty and loss of productivity. Different policies and programs are included below that are currently attempting to rectify these issues and generate a return. These policies are not exhaustive and exemplify federal and provincial levels based on their relevance.

### **Policy & Programs: Health**

In 2008 the Ontario government came forward with the Ontario Poverty Reduction Strategy. The government's vision of this strategy is that "every person has the opportunity to achieve his or her full potential, and contribute to and participate in a prosperous and healthy". Numerous programs stemmed from this strategy relevant to an attempt to improve health and generate revenue reducing societal costs that stem from the correlation of poverty and health care.

As part of this strategy social assistance will be reviewed for the first time in 20 years. The social assistance rates, including Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) rates have raised 13.7% increasing income support for over 52,500 adults with a developmental disability. 2,900 more adults with a developmental disability receive supports and live close to their family and friends, a 20% increase over the past 20 years (Ontario Progress Report, 2011)

As indicated earlier housing, or the lack thereof, can play a large role in an individuals' health. The government is now moving forward with the Long Term Affordable Housing Strategy, which will enable a more efficient, accessible housing system in Ontario. There has also been a new partnership formed with Aboriginal communities leading to new rental construction, rehabilitation and off-reserve housing programs in Ontario. The programs include new rental construction, repair, acquisition and rehabilitation, and will help about 880 families (Ontario Progress Report, 2011).

#### **Policy & Programs: Crime**

As part of the Poverty Reduction Strategy, the Provincial Guns and Gangs Initiative has been introduced. This initiative is fairly self explanatory and targets numerous gangs including those in impoverished areas. Further to this the Provincial Anti-Violence Intervention Strategy (PAVIS) started in January 2011. This includes funding for specialized rapid response police teams to fight illegal gun and gang activity in 22 Ontario communities. Both of

these initiatives are put forward in the hopes that there are long term implications and reductions in crime/ the costs of crime, especially crime committed by individuals living in low income (Ontario Progress Report, 2011).

Lastly the government is attempting to “transform” the criminal justice system in order for it to be more accessible to individuals living in poverty. Currently there are large societal costs associated with inaccessibility to services for individuals living in low income. The government has launched the Justice Ontario website and hotline, which is described as a “one stop” entry point to aid individuals in navigating the justice system. The government also claims that currently supports are being put into place to ensure Ontarians may utilize the Legal Aid System regardless of their ability to pay (Ontario Progress Report, 2011)

#### **Policy & Programs: Intergenerational Poverty**

The Ontario Child Benefit is described as the cornerstone to the Poverty Reduction Strategy. The government claims that this benefit will “help put Ontario back on track,” (Ontario Progress Report 2011). The Benefit is financial support for individuals living in poverty – whether they are working or not – that helps to provide for their children. It is speculated that the Ontario Child Benefit will reach more than one million children each month. In July 2009, maximum payments increased from \$50 to almost \$92 per month for each child. That’s an increase from a maximum of \$600 per year to up to \$1,100 per year for each child (Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth Services, 2011). This benefit generates a return financially but also should be considered in terms of long term implications for creating opportunities for families to break the cycle of poverty. If there were no federal child benefits, the poverty rate for families with children would be 15% compared to just over 9% under the current benefits system (Battle, 2008). As stated by Paterson, Levasseur and Teplova (2004) “The Child Benefit can be credited with modest decreases in child poverty but the benefit itself is inadequate to reduce child poverty in Canada”.

A few other initiatives for individuals living in poverty are the Youth Opportunities Strategy in which 5,000 youth from 32 priority communities across the province had the chance to gain valuable work experience that will help them contribute to the well-being of their communities. The funding for the Community Use of Schools program has been increased to provide facilities and space for not-for-profit groups outside school hours at reduced rates or free of charge in communities that need it most. Lastly support has been increased for the Student Nutrition Program, helping to serve an estimated 600,000 elementary and secondary students nutritious breakfasts and morning snacks in 2010–11 (Ontario Progress Report 2011).

At this time there is yet to be a comprehensive assessment of the impact of programs or policies such as this to the poverty rates in Canada (Hay, 2009). Certainly cash benefits and tax credits, can reduce the incidence of poverty among Canadian families from 5%-10% points or more (Canadian Population Health Initiative, 2004).

#### Policy & Programs: Loss of Productivity

As part of the Poverty Reduction strategy, the Ontario government has indicated that they will “continue to invest in people and by working together” to create job opportunities and reduce the societal costs of poverty created by a loss of productivity. The Ontario Sales Tax Credit is an attempt to address this issue by helping low to moderate income Ontario families and single people with the sales tax they pay, providing up to \$260 for each eligible adult and child in low-to-middle income Ontario families and single people. Another tax benefit that has been put into place to help is the Ontario Sales Tax Transition Benefit which consists of three payments of up to \$300 for single people and \$1,000 for families and single parents. Lastly the Ontario Energy and Property Tax Credit which is for low to moderate income property owners or renters with their principal residence in Ontario who are paid up to \$900 for 2010 to help with property taxes and the sales tax on energy (Ontario Progress Report, 2011)

The Working Income Tax Benefit (WITB) was introduced in the 2007 federal government budget as a supplement for low income earners and an incentive to employment (Hay, 2009). The WITB provides working Canadians up to \$510 an individuals and \$1,019 for families in 2008 as a refundable tax credit (Battle, 2009). Individuals or families must have at least \$3,000 in earned income to be eligible to receive the WITB. The benefit is calculated at 20% of earned income up to the maximum benefit level and payments are reduced by 15% of the amount of income above certain thresholds (Hay, 2009).

## Conclusion

The broader social and economic costs of poverty are a continuous cause for concern. The major themes of health, crime, intergenerational poverty and loss of productivity appear to be consistently utilized in the literature to represent the core social and economic costs of poverty on a broader level. Although numerous policies that generate revenue also accompanied these themes, federal, provincial and municipal levels of government need to implement policies and or strategies to help further reduce poverty. In order to diminish some of these costs, the core systemic causes of poverty need to be examined, rather than focusing on the symptoms of poverty. Implementing poverty reduction initiatives will alleviate some of these systemic causes and generate income for the community that can be reintegrated into further poverty reduction strategies.

## References

- Battle, K. (2008). A Bigger and Better Child Benefit: A \$5,000 Canada Child Tax Benefit. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Battle, K. (2009). Beneath the Budget of 2009: Taxes and Benefits. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Butler-Jones, D. (2009). The Chief Public Health Officer's Report on the State of Public Health in Canada: Growing Up Well — Priorities for a Healthy Future. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada. Retrieved from [www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/cphorsphc-respcacsp/2009/fr-rc/index-eng.php](http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/cphorsphc-respcacsp/2009/fr-rc/index-eng.php)
- Cabal Garces, M. (2011). Living Wage: An Introduction. Retrieved from  
<http://gwpoverty.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Living-Wage-June-2011.pdf>
- Canadian Institute for Health Information. (2010). Hospitalization Disparities by Socio-Economic Status for Males and Females
- Canadian Federation of University Women of Guelph. Retrieved from  
<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:PK3XWZvkvS8J:www.cfuwguelph.on.ca/1103%2520Child%2520Care%2520Brief.rtf+Child+poverty+in+Guelph&cd=4&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&source=www.google.ca>
- Campaign 2000 (2010). 2010 Report Card on Children and Family Poverty in Canada. Retrieved from  
<http://www.campaign2000.ca/reportCards/national/2010EnglishC2000NationalReportCard.pdf>
- Campaign 2000 and the Income Security Advocacy Centre. (2008). Ending Poverty Project. Retrieved from  
[www.campagin2000.ca/Ontario/EndingPovertyReport.pdf](http://www.campagin2000.ca/Ontario/EndingPovertyReport.pdf)
- Canadian Population Health Initiative. (2004). Retrieved from <http://www.cihi.ca/CIHI-ext-portal/internet/en/document/factors+influencing+health/environmental/cphi>

Criminal Justice Indicators. (2005). Statistics Canada. Retrieved from  
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-227-x/85-227-x2002000-eng.pdf>

Fang, R., Kmetic, A., Millar, J., & Drasic, J. (2009). Disparities in Chronic Disease Among Canada's Low-Income Populations. *Preventing Chronic Disease: Public Health Research, Practice and Policy*. Vol. 6(4). Retrieved from [www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2009/oct/08-0254.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2009/oct/08-0254.htm)

Galarneau, D. (2005). Education and Income of Lone Parents. Perspectives on Labour and Income. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Guelph Police Services (2009). Annual Report. Retrieved from  
[http://www.guelphpolice.com/assets/Site\\_PDFs/2009GPSAnnualReport.pdf](http://www.guelphpolice.com/assets/Site_PDFs/2009GPSAnnualReport.pdf)

Hay, D. (2009). Poverty Reduction Policies and Programs. Canadian Council on Social Development. Retrieved from [http://www.ccsd.ca/Reports/Canada\\_Report\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ccsd.ca/Reports/Canada_Report_FINAL.pdf)

Health Council of Canada. (2010). Stepping It Up: Moving the Focus from Health Care in Canada to a Healthier Canada. Retrieved from  
<http://www.healthcouncilcanada.ca/docs/rpts/2010/promo/HCCpromoDec2010.pdf>

Ivanova, I. (2011). The Cost of Poverty in BC. Retrieved from  
[http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/BC%20Office/2011/07/CCPA\\_BC\\_cost\\_of\\_poverty\\_full\\_report.pdf](http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/BC%20Office/2011/07/CCPA_BC_cost_of_poverty_full_report.pdf)

Kaplan, G., Elsie R, Lynch, J., Cohen, R., & Balfour, J. (1996). Inequality in income and mortality in the United States: analysis of mortality and potential pathways. *BMJ* 312 (999-1003).

Laurie, N. (2008). The Cost of Poverty: An Analysis of the Economic Cost of Poverty in Ontario. Ontario Association of Food Banks. Toronto. Retrieved from [www.oafb.ca/assets/pdfs/CostofPoverty.pdf](http://www.oafb.ca/assets/pdfs/CostofPoverty.pdf)

Laurie, N. (2009). Fighting Poverty, The Best Way to Beat the Recession. Ontario Association of

Food Banks. Toronto. Retrieved from <http://www.oafb.ca/assets/pdfs/FightingPoverty.pdf>

Ludwig, J., Duncan, G., & Hirschfield, P. (2001). Urban Poverty and Juvenile Crime: Evidence from a Randomized Housing-Mobility Experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116 (2001), 655-679.

National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth. (2008-2009). Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=4450&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2>

Ontario Association of Foodbanks Annual Survey results. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.oafb.ca/assets/pdfs/SpecialReport.pdf>

Ontario Medical Review. (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.healthprovidersagainstpoverty.ca/node/95>

Ontario Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.children.gov.on.ca/htdocs/English/topics/financialhelp/ocb/what.aspx>

Ontario Progress Report. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.ontario.ca/en/initiatives/progressreport2011/index.htm>

Paterson, S., Levasseur, K. & Teplova, T. (2004). "I spy with My Little Eye ... Canada's National Child Benefit." In G.B. Doern (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends 2004-2005*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 131-50.

Peters, A & Ellery, R. (2011). The Impact of Public Transit Fees on Low Income Families and Individuals in Guelph. Retrieved from [http://gwpoverty.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2011/02/Transit\\_Research\\_Feb\\_2011.pdf](http://gwpoverty.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2011/02/Transit_Research_Feb_2011.pdf)

Robson, J. (2011). Intersection of Health, Transportation and Poverty. (Currently being revised)

Sheill, Allan and Zhang, J. (2004) The External Costs of Poverty: A Conservative Assessment. Centre for Health and Policy Studies, University of Calgary and Institute of Health Economics.

Spence, A. (2009). Ontario Hunger Report 2009: Living With Hunger. Retrieved from  
<http://www.oafb.ca/assets/pdfs/OHR2009Red.pdf>

Statistics Canada. (2006). Crime Statistics. Retrieved from  
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/070718/dq070718b-eng.htm>

Statistics Canada. (2008). Retrieved from  
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/090721/dq090721a-eng.htm>

United Way of Guelph and Wellington County (2009). Income Security in Guelph and Wellington. Retrieved from  
<http://unitedwayguelph.com/cms/documents/pdfs/21/IncomeSecurity2009.pdf>

United Way of Guelph and Wellington County (2010). Poverty in Guelph and Wellington County. Retrieved from  
[http://unitedwayguelph.com/cms/documents/pdfs/49/Poverty\\_Fact\\_Sheet - Updated\\_April\\_2010.pdf](http://unitedwayguelph.com/cms/documents/pdfs/49/Poverty_Fact_Sheet - Updated_April_2010.pdf).

United Way of Guelph and Wellington County (2009). Creating a safe and caring community in Guelph and Wellington County. Retrieved from  
<http://unitedwayguelph.com/cms/documents/pdfs/24/SafeandCaringCommunity2009.pdf>

Zhang, Ting. (2008). Cost of Crime in Canada. Department of Justice Canada. Retrieved from  
[www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2011/rr10\\_5/index.html](http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2011/rr10_5/index.html)