



## OJEN'S CHARTER CHALLENGE

### CASE SCENARIO

FALL 2025

# Sandock v. Ontario (Ministry of Northern Development)

*This OJEN Charter Challenge Case Scenario has been adapted from the **Wilson Moot**. The Wilson Moot was conceived to honour the outstanding contribution to Canadian law made by **the late Honourable Justice Bertha Wilson** and, in the spirit of this contribution, to promote justice for those disempowered within the legal system. The goal of The Wilson Moot is to **explore legal issues concerning women and minorities**, and thereby promote the education of students and the legal profession in these areas of pressing concern. OJEN would like to thank the organizers of the Wilson Moot, **Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP**, for letting it adapt this law school resource for a high school audience.*

L'éducation et le dialogue pour une société civile  
A civil society through education and dialogue



## 2025 Charter Challenge Problem

*Sandock v. Ontario (Ministry of Northern Development)*

Drue Sandock (pronouns: he/him) is a 26-year-old resident of Boniface, a rural town in Dauphin Lake District, a census district in northern Ontario.

Following the COVID-19 pandemic and facing pronounced poverty, unemployment, and decline in Dauphin Lake District and the surrounding districts and regions, the Government of Ontario enacted the *Investing in Ontarians Act* (the “Act”). The Act empowers the province to make investment and policies for improvements in economic growth, infrastructure, healthcare, internet access, tourism, and social benefits for designated districts in northern Ontario. Excerpts of the Act and *MIB Regulations* discussed herein are contained as **Schedule “A”**. The Province decided to implement the Act incrementally, starting first with Dauphin Lake District.

In January 2021, the Province announced its policies for Dauphin Lake District, which included significant infrastructure investments and a social welfare scheme for Minimum Income benefits (the “MIB”, as defined below) starting in March 2021. Under the MIB scheme, all residents of Dauphin Lake District with an annual income of less than \$33,000, including Drue, would receive unconditional direct monthly payments.

In October 2022, a new provincial government was elected and decided to amend the Minimum Income scheme regulations, substantially reducing the amount of the monthly payments, reducing the income threshold to qualify for the program, and requiring that recipients under the age of 30 participate in certain entrepreneurial and work-training activities to be entitled to payments (the “New MIB Regulations”).

In November 2022, Drue brought an application for judicial review to the Ontario Divisional Court, seeking:

- (a) a declaration that the New MIB Regulations infringe his rights to life, liberty and security of the person under section 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the “Charter”);
- (b) a declaration that the New MIB Regulations infringe his equality rights under section 15 of the *Charter*;
- (c) a declaration that the infringements of sections 7 and 15 of the *Charter* do not represent reasonable limitations on these rights; and
- (d) a declaration that the New MIB Regulations are of no force and effect.

For the purposes of the Charter Challenge, participants are to assume that the Minister was acting within the bounds of his delegated jurisdiction and the application for judicial review was properly made to the Divisional Court of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.

The application was heard by a panel of three judges of the Divisional Court. The Court accepted the following facts:

L'éducation et le dialogue pour une société civile  
A civil society through education and dialogue



1. Drue was born in January 1998 and grew up in a nearby township in Dauphin Lake District, where Drue's parents continue to reside. He is a cisgender white man.
2. As of the most recent census, Dauphin Lake District had a population of around 41,000 residents geographically spread out across a few small towns, a dozen townships, and a First Nations reserve. Boniface has a population of approximately 4,600 residents.
3. Drue did not graduate high school, dropping out in Grade 12. Drue continued to live at home for a few years before his parents eventually demanded that he leave. Since then, Drue has lived with various friends and partners on a temporary basis, sharing the rent among a number of people. At times Drue has stayed at the homeless shelter in Boniface. Drue has been on the waitlist for subsidized housing for a few years now.
4. Drue has worked a series of low-paying jobs, including as a bartender, a maintenance worker at a bed and breakfast in Boniface, and as a labourer on a nearby farm. Drue has occasionally received financial support from his family. Drue has nonetheless found it difficult to maintain a steady income and is struggling to make ends meet.
5. Drue lives on persistent low income, below Canada's Official Poverty Line, as measured by reference to the market basket measure, which is roughly \$22,000 for individuals living in rural Ontario and small Ontario towns like Boniface. For the past three years, Drue has earned just under \$21,000 per year. Drue faces regular food insecurity and unmet health needs. Drue regularly relies on the local food bank and donation stores for food and clothing.
6. Over the past decade, Dauphin Lake District has experienced significant poverty. Dauphin Lake's income and social challenges have been both caused by, and perpetuate, the economic decline felt in the District. While the District once had a strong economy based on forestry, mining of precious metals, and manufacturing, these industries have suffered consistent decline over recent decades.
7. There is hope in the District that further investment and exploration may kickstart the mining and minerals sector and provide opportunities for environmentally sustainable mineral development. Residents of Dauphin Lake also hope to grow the District's tourism industry to take advantage of the region's natural beauty, wildlife, and provincial parks. These tourism opportunities additionally highlight Dauphin Lake and Boniface's cultural history and worldwide reputation as a mining town in the early 1900s. The District additionally has plans to build a new medical centre serving the surrounding townships to improve access to healthcare and jobs.
8. Many of Dauphin Lake's social and economic challenges were exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic. In response, the Government of Ontario enacted the *Investing in Ontarians Act*. The *Act* allows the Minister of Northern Development (the "Minister") to designate certain districts and regions, by way of regulations, for economic investment and growth. The *Act* permits the Minister to set a plan containing policies, goals, and investment relating to land use, industry, commerce, resources, infrastructure development, transportation, housing, education, and social benefits.

9. The *Act* further mandates the Minister to set, by way of regulations, a “program or scheme to provide income support and benefits for prescribed persons who are residents” of the designated districts and regions.
10. In January 2021, the Minister announced he had designated Dauphin Lake District to receive investment and intervention pursuant to the *Act*. The Minister further announced that in light of the success of direct payments made to residents of Dauphin Lake and Ontario as part of the federal government’s COVID-19 social benefits scheme, it would be implementing a Minimum Income scheme pursuant to its statutory mandate under the *Act*, to be called the Minimum Income Benefit (“MIB”).
11. Under the Minimum Income Benefit Regulations (the “MIB Regulations”), any resident of Dauphin Lake District between ages 18 and 64 whose personal annual income was less than \$33,000 per year would automatically receive \$18,000 per year in monthly Minimum Income payments. Couples with household income less than \$50,000 per year would receive \$25,000 per year. If the resident earned employment income during the year, their Minimum Income payments would be reduced by fifty cents for each dollar earned.
12. The MIB payments were unconditional in that residents were not obligated to spend their payments on specified categories of goods and services. Residents were not obligated to demonstrate that they were looking for work to receive the MIB.
13. Drue applied for the MIB as soon as it was announced. Drue began receiving MIB payments in March 2021.
14. In October 2022, a new provincial government took office, after campaigning on a platform of reduced economic spending. The new government told voters that rising inflation over 2021 and 2022 had been caused by overactive government spending and that their new government would be cutting back on expenditures across the province.
15. In the days after taking office, the new government announced it would be amending the regulations to the *Act* to modify the Minimum Income scheme for Dauphin Lake District. These changes were promulgated through the New MIB Regulations.
16. Pursuant to the New MIB Regulations, starting November 2022, Minimum Income payments would be cut by 50%. Additionally, the threshold for individuals to qualify for the Minimum Income was cut from \$33,000 to \$25,000. The Province also put new conditions on the Minimum Income payments for residents under the age of 30. To continue receiving the Minimum Income, younger residents of Dauphin Lake District were required to participate in a variety of entrepreneurial, remedial education, or work training programs. Residents could enrol in remedial education courses or training at the local technical college, or on-the-job training in qualified professions and industries, including skilled trades. These programs would provide skills training and career development, including in knowledge economy industries like business and finance, technology, and computer science. The New MIB Regulations provided that any resident who was younger than 30-years-old and not enrolled in a qualified program by December 31, 2022, was ineligible to receive the MIB.

17. Drue did not enroll in a qualified program and was notified by way of a letter from the Ministry dated January 2, 2023, that he was no longer eligible for the MIB and would not receive further payments.

18. In his affidavit in support of his application, Drue stated in part:

The MIB changed my life. For the first time ever, I consistently had money to buy groceries and proper winter clothes. The payments were not very much, but I didn't have to worry about whether I would have enough money to buy enough food to make it through the week.

With the MIB money, I was able to pay for some fixes to keep my car running and fill it with gas. Instead of having to rely on my friends for rides, I was able to drive to pick up some shifts at a small manufacturing plant just outside of Boniface. I do not particularly enjoy that job, but that work supplemented my income even further. I even started to look for a small apartment so that I would finally have my own place to live. I had finally saved up enough to make a deposit of first and last month's rent and had just moved into the new apartment in October 2022 when the changes were announced.

Once my MIB payments stopped, I felt like my life was over. I considered enrolling in courses at the local technical college, but many of the available programs would have involved classes in the late evening. There are certain jobs at the manufacturing plant which would have qualified under the program for continued Minimum Income payments, but they would have all involved more manual labour, which I don't feel physically able to perform. Without the MIB, I may have to sell my car and some of my things to try and make a little extra money, which will leave me with no way to get to my job. I will not be able to pay for my new apartment. I have broken my lease and moved out. I'm currently back living on a friend's couch. I definitely do not have enough money to pay for groceries, so I'm back to having to rely on the food bank to supplement my diet. I feel anxious all the time about how I am going to make ends meet.

19. On cross-examination, Drue admitted that when he received Minimum Income payments, he spent those payments on a variety of goods and services, including occasionally on dinner or trips to a casino with his friends and alcohol.

20. Renata Adder, a social worker in Boniface, also swore an affidavit in support of Drue's application. She stated in part:

The change in Boniface and the rest of Dauphin Lake District during the Minimum Income program was incredible. Almost overnight there were fewer residents living in the homeless shelter and fewer visitors to the local food bank. We were able to completely restock the food bank and start donating meals to the local elementary school.

I saw firsthand how the lives of the residents I work with improved. Many of them said they no longer felt depressed or anxious every day. Even the modest Minimum Income payments were enough so that they could feed their families healthy meals, take their children to the

local movie theatre, and buy them presents at the holidays. I saw residents spend money on things like new shoes and eyeglasses – these small changes had huge impacts.

The changes to the Minimum Income program have been devastating. Residents feel like their dignity was taken away from them. Our shelter is full again and I'm worried about the increased violence – especially for residents who identify as female, queer, or Indigenous. Frankly, the impact on some people's mental wellbeing has been so severe I'm worried for their lives.

21. Drue also tendered expert evidence from Dr. Wallis Storm of the Lakehead University Faculty of Social Studies and Humanities, who studied the impacts of the Minimum Income program in Dauphin Lake. Dr. Storm's evidence was accepted by the Court as follows:

- A. A disproportionate number of Dauphin Lake residents live on low income below the poverty line when compared to averages across the rest of the province and country. Median household income in Dauphin Lake District ranks in the bottom 10% of all census divisions in the province. Roughly 9% of residents of Dauphin Lake District live on social assistance, almost double the provincial average. In towns and cities across northern Ontario, and in Dauphin Lake, communities deal with higher rates of homelessness, opioid addiction, and food insecurity. Literacy rates for children and adults are lower in Dauphin Lake than the rest of the province. Labour force participation in Dauphin Lake is around 54% and has persisted below the provincial average of roughly 64% for multiple years.
- B. There are many factors that have contributed to the persistent poverty in the District, including economic decline in the region. There aren't enough well-paying jobs in the region to support the residents. For residents of Dauphin Lake living in poverty, the prospect of overcoming the economic condition of poverty can appear functionally and structurally impossible.
- C. Minimum Income payments can provide greater stability for those living at or below the poverty line. Data showed that most MIB recipients in Dauphin Lake spent their MIB on essentials like food and shelter. Residents also spent MIB on things like phone and internet plans. Providing Minimum Income can also allow individuals to bear the cost of unforeseen expenses, including recovery from medical events.
- D. Before the changes to the Minimum Income program, Dauphin Lake saw positive impacts on the community's physical and mental health. Hospital admissions decreased by 22%. Police arrests in Boniface fell by almost 35%. It has taken some time to observe unemployment effects, but the data suggests that unemployment rates fell as well. Surveys reported dramatic increases in the mental health and physical activity. A strong majority of residents reported they had reduced their substance consumption and abuse.
- E. The Minimum Income scheme especially helped those with disabilities. The residents who received the Minimum Income payments were disproportionately comprised of individuals with physical and mental disabilities. These individuals received both the Minimum Income payments and additional monthly payments to reflect their disability.
- F. The changes introduced by the New MIB Regulations have been damaging to the community. Rates of hospital visits, police arrests, community violence, and substance

abuse are all higher than before the Minimum Income program was implemented. Because of the reduction in the quantity of monthly payments and the threshold to qualify, many residents have lost access or withdrawn from the program and have returned to existing social welfare schemes. Roughly half of the residents under the age of 30 have dropped from the MIB program entirely.

- G. Young people under the age of 30 experience the highest rates of unemployment across Ontario. Youth unemployment is currently at its highest rate across Canada in the last ten years, excluding 2020 (i.e. the initial stage of the COVID-19 pandemic). Youth and young adults are more likely to work in precarious and low-wage jobs, and are accordingly most likely to lose their jobs when larger economic trends like inflation lead to a slower economy. With populations of young people increasing, competition for employment has increased as well. The poverty rate for Canadians 18 to 24 was the highest of any age group as of the most recent census, with 14% of all Canadians in that category living in poverty. Young adult residents of Dauphin Lake District have even higher rates of poverty and have disproportionately suffered the consequences of the economic decline and lack of well-paying jobs in the region.
- H. While the prior Minimum Income scheme was designed to help low-income residents whose income still exceeded the Official Poverty Line, the amended scheme would assist only individuals already living at or below the Official Poverty Line. As the average Canadian living in poverty lives significantly below that Official Poverty Line, the New MIB may be insufficient to help all recipients live at or above the poverty threshold.
- I. The low-income immobility rate, meaning the probability an individual in low-income in one year will remain in low-income in the following year, has stayed at roughly 75% in Ontario over the past two decades. A smaller percentage of individuals are persistently low-income, meaning the individual is in low-income for more than half of the years over a 5- or 10-year period.
- J. The impacts of being in poverty for multiple years differ from the impacts of temporary poverty. Living in poverty for multiple years of a defined period, or multiple years in a row, can permanently change an individual's life, and the lives of their dependents. Temporary poverty may be caused by life events or economic change. Persistent poverty is often caused by structural issues in one's life or environment.

22. On cross-examination, Dr. Storm admitted that because of the unconditional nature of the Minimum Income payments, it was difficult to track exactly how residents spent the new income. Dr. Storm further admitted that other social assistance programs which require a means-test or recipients to undertake employment-related activities can be effective to provide income support and reductions in poverty. Dr. Storm additionally admitted that not all residents surveyed had experienced positive change. For instance, some residents who had previously been looking for work reported they stopped actively pursuing new jobs when the Minimum Income payments started.

23. Yasir Siddiqui, who was appointed Minister of Northern Development in October 2022 following the election of the new provincial government, provided evidence that:

- A. The goal for the *Act* was to promote balanced and rational economic growth in northern Ontario, build stronger local communities, and invest in effective and environmentally-friendly infrastructure projects. The direct and specific social assistance scheme is just one part of the *Act*. The purpose of the *Act* is to provide a plan for long-term growth, not short-term fixes.
- B. The prior government selected Dauphin Lake District as the first district to be subject to the *Act* because of the District's acute struggles with poverty. The MIB was just one part of the Province's plans for the District – which included investment to build a new medical centre, facilities to promote tourism to the District's extensive lakes and provincial parks, and renovation of critical bridges and highway infrastructure.
- C. The prior government's MIB scheme was substantially more expensive than originally projected and when compared to other social assistance programs. As a result of economic inflation experienced by the province in 2022 and 2023, the Province had to cut services to other programs and funding, both in both in northern Ontario and in the province's growing urban regions. The province's stability through the current economic climate is dependent on the government making sensible and prudent economic decisions.
- D. The prior government's plans to build a new medical centre and renovate critical highway infrastructure in Dauphin Lake District have been delayed because of budgetary pressure. As a result of the changes to the MIB, the Province will be able to rededicate funding to these plans to follow through on the prior government's commitments. These investments will have transformative economic potential and lead to hundreds of jobs. The current provincial government is also considering expanding coverage of the *Act* to other nearby northern districts, although this may require further changes to the social welfare schemes implemented by regulations under the *Act*.
- E. The Province is able to provide effective social assistance with targeted and specific programs for prescribed individuals and groups such as youth, seniors, those who are unemployed, and those living with disabilities. The current government had identified some instances of MIB fraud, with residents from other Districts attempting to claim entitlement to MIB payments in Dauphin Lake. Some residents may have misreported their income to qualify for the program.
- F. The current provincial government has identified young people as a key demographic for creating economic growth and change. The government wants to ensure that young people are given support, but are also learning skills and taking steps to become self-sufficient and begin productive careers. By making receipt of MIB conditional on participation in these types of programs, particularly programs providing training in the knowledge economy, the government hopes to encourage this individual and long-term growth and development.

24. On cross-examination, Minister Siddiqui admitted that the MIB had significantly decreased the bureaucratic costs associated with implementing other social assistance programs in the District. Minister Siddiqui accepted that prior to the enactment of the New MIB Regulations, the MIB had resulted in decreased healthcare costs in the District, and notable increases in tourism to the region over the 2021 and 2022 summers (as compared to pre-pandemic levels of tourism).

25. Minister Siddiqui further admitted on cross-examination that the Province was unable to guarantee that there were available spots in the youth remedial education, work training, and qualified industry programs to accommodate all MIB recipients under the age of 30. Although some residents voluntarily chose not to participate in these entrepreneurial programs, the demand for jobs and apprenticeships in certain industries accredited under the new program exceeded the number of opportunities available, while other programs experienced almost no enrollment. Minister Siddiqui testified the Province was looking to develop its own job training and remedial education programs, but that there was no fixed timeline for those new programs in Dauphin Lake District.

The Divisional Court heard Drue's application in September 2023 and granted it in January 2024.

Writing for the majority, Justice Leia Stahl held, in part:

The guarantee of "security of the person" under the *Charter* must protect the right to secure and stable shelter, food security, and income to support a life outside of poverty. The rights protected by the *Charter* require a guarantee of these basic and fundamental human necessities. In this context, the rights protected by section 7 require certain basic levels of health and safety. The change to the Minimum Income scheme has infringed this basic level of rights. The fact that the Province provides existing social assistance and investment to other industries in Dauphin Lake does not save the New MIB Regulations. The evidence demonstrates the changes to the Minimum Income scheme have been devastating to the health and wellbeing of residents of Dauphin Lake, including Mr. Sandock, who has experienced firsthand the consequences of poverty.

New MIB Regulations do not fulfill the statutory mandate under the *Act* to implement a social benefit scheme. First, the evidence before me suggests the changes to the Minimum Income scheme have decreased the economic strength of Dauphin Lake and are likely to exacerbate poverty in the region and reverse the gains the District was making in unemployment. Second, I am concerned the New MIB Regulations will cause greater harm, violence, and challenge in communities like Boniface, where Minimum Income payments had resulted in demonstrated community improvement.

I find the New MIB Regulations are not saved by section 1 of the *Charter* and must be declared to be of no force and effect. I appreciate the Province is trying to manage a number of competing interests and priorities, and that the need to ensure long-term economic development in our most vulnerable regions is a pressing and substantial objective.

However, the New MIB Regulations are not rationally connected to these goals, are not minimally impairing, and have a disproportionate impact on Mr. Sandock's rights.

Considering these findings, I need not address Mr. Sandock's submissions on section 15 of the *Charter*.

Justice Sami Lenn, writing for the minority, largely adopting the reasons of Justice Stahl, added:

I agree with my learned colleague that the New MIB Regulations are an unconstitutional violation of Mr. Sandock's right to security of the person. I do not agree with the majority's characterization that Mr. Sandock is seeking a positive benefit. Rather, he is asking that the Province's measures taken under its voluntarily-enacted social benefit scheme for northern Ontario be constitutionally compliant.

More importantly, in my view the time has come to reconsider earlier precedents and recognize section 7 places at least a minimum positive obligation on the state to ensure that each person enjoys life, liberty, or security of the person. I accept there has been a change in circumstances and evidence that fundamentally shifts the parameters of the debate. I accept that positive rights have been recognized in constitutions elsewhere around the world and the academic support necessary for a change and adoption to positive rights has been established. The recognition of the positive element of section 7 reflects the positive element shared and protected by a number of *Charter* rights, and provides necessary affirmations of dignity which are the very foundation of the *Charter*.

Similarly, I would find the New MIB Regulations infringe section 15 of the *Charter* by creating a discriminatory distinction on the basis of "low income or poverty". It is also time for courts to recognize this quality and characteristic as an analogous ground. Analogous grounds of discrimination serve as the basis for perpetuating improper distinctions not based on merit, but on personal characteristics that are immutable or changeable only at unacceptable cost. The evidence before me confirms the income status of residents of Dauphin Lake cannot be changed except over an extended period of time, with significant state assistance. The section 15 analysis must, in any event, consider intersections of multiple enumerated or analogous grounds. For the reasons given by the lower court, I agree that these infringements of sections 7 and 15 of the *Charter* are not saved by section 1.

Writing for the dissent, Justice Joy Taylor held in part:

With respect, I cannot agree with my learned colleagues that the New MIB Regulations violate Mr. Sandock's right to security of the person under section 7 of the *Charter*.

Mr. Sandock is seeking a claim to a positive benefit and corresponding obligation on the government to provide a certain level of income. Section 7 does not provide for positive entitlements – it protects the right against deprivations of life, liberty, and security of the person, except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Mr. Sandock has not established such a deprivation. He is not entitled to a continuation of certain

government policies. Residents affected by the New MIB Regulations are still able to rely on existing social assistance programs, even if those programs may provide less support.

The New MIB Regulations also do not violate section 15 of the *Charter*. The Court accepts the government's purpose in modifying the Minimum Income program to require residents under 30 to participate in certain programs was to encourage the personal growth and engagement of young people. Mr. Sandock has failed to prove the new restrictions on access to Minimum Income created or exacerbated a disproportionate impact on young people. We also do not agree with our colleague that the ground of "low income or poverty" should be accepted as an analogous ground under section 15 of the *Charter*.

Further, in any event, we find the program's purpose was to improve or ameliorate the conditions of young people and create long-term self-sufficiency, and accordingly satisfies the requirements of section 15(2) of the *Charter*.

The Ministry has been granted leave to appeal the judgment to the Ontario Court of Appeal on the following issues:

- A. Do the New MIB Regulations infringe Drue Sandock's rights to life, liberty and security of the person under section 7 of the *Charter*?
- B. Do the New MIB Regulations infringe Drue Sandock's equality rights under section 15(1) of the *Charter*?
- C. Are the New MIB Regulations an ameliorative program under section 15(2) of the *Charter*?
- D. If the answer to either of the questions A or B is "yes", is the infringement a reasonable limitation on those rights that is demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society?

## Schedule “A”

### *Investing in Ontarians Act* (excerpts)

#### 1. Purpose

The purposes of this Act are,

- (a) To promote balanced and rational economic growth in northern Ontario that builds stronger local communities and invests in effective and environmentally-friendly infrastructure projects;
- (b) To provide income supports to eligible persons, promote social well-being, and effectively serve residents of northern Ontario who need assistance; and
- (c) To ensure long-term vision and goals direct a holistic approach to growth in northern Ontario

#### 2. Definitions

“**development plan area**” means an area of land designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council by regulation under this Act.

#### 3. Development Plan

- (1) The Minister shall prepare a proposed development plan for all or part of a designated development plan area.
- (2) A development plan may contain.
  - (a) an assessment and identification of priority growth areas, emerging growth areas and future growth areas, over specified time periods;
  - (b) growth strategies for all or part of the growth plan area;
  - (c) policies, goals, dedicated investment and criteria in relation to:
    - I. intensification and density,
    - II. land supply for residential, employment and other uses,
    - III. industry and commerce,
    - IV. the protection of sensitive and significant lands, including agricultural lands, and water resources,
    - V. non-renewable resources,
    - VI. the conservation of energy,
    - VII. infrastructure development and the location of infrastructure and institutions,
    - VIII. transportation planning,
    - IX. municipal waste management planning,

- X. the co-ordination of planning and development among municipalities,
- XI. growth-related capital spending and financing,
- XII. affordable housing,
- XIII. community design,
- XIV. specified actions to be taken by municipalities to implement or achieve the policies or goals;
- XV. such other policies, goals or matters that the Minister considers advisable.

#### 4. Social Assistance Plan

(1) The Minister shall implement, by regulation, a program or scheme to provide income support and benefits for persons who are residents of a designated development plan area.

(2) Income support shall be provided in accordance with the regulations to all persons who satisfy all conditions of eligibility under this *Act* and the regulations.

(3) The amount of income support to be provided and the time and manner of providing that support shall be determined in accordance with the regulations.

#### ***MIB Regulations*** (excerpts)

##### 1. Definitions

“**low-income household**” means a couple with an annual household income of less than \$50,000 per year.

“**low-income individual**” means an individual with an annual income of less than \$33,000 per year.

##### 2. Eligibility

(1) For the purposes of subsection 3(2) of the *Act*, no person is eligible for income support unless,

- (a) The person is a resident in the Dauphin Lake census district;
- (b) The person has been resident in the Dauphin Lake census district for the prior 12 months or longer;
- (c) The person is aged 18-64; and
- (d) The person is living as a low-income individual or as a member of a low-income household.

##### 3. Minimum Income Benefits

(1) Each low-income individual eligible under the *Act* and subsection 2(1) of these regulations shall receive \$18,000 per year.

(2) Each low-income household, where both members of the household are eligible under the Act and subsection 2(1) of these regulations, shall receive \$25,000 per year. - 16 -

#### 4. Receipt of Income

(1) Minimum Income Benefits under section 3 shall be reduced by 50 cents for every dollar of income earned by the low income individual or a member of the low-income household through employment. For greater certainty, income earned pursuant to an existing social benefit program or scheme shall not reduce the Minimum Income Benefits under section 3.

### ***New MIB Regulations*** (excerpts)

#### 1. Definitions

“**low-income household**” means a couple with an annual household income of less than \$33,000 per year.

“**low-income individual**” means an individual with an annual income of less than \$25,000 per year.

#### 2. Eligibility

(1) For the purposes of subsection 3(2) of the Act, no person is eligible for income support unless,

- (a) The person is a resident in the Dauphin Lake census district;
- (b) The person has been resident in the Dauphin Lake census district for the prior 12 months or longer;
- (c) The person is aged 18-64; and
- (d) The person is living as a low-income individual or as a member of a low-income household.

(2) For persons aged 29 years old and younger, no person is eligible for income support unless,

- (a) The person provides proof of enrollment in specified workfare programs.

#### 3. Minimum Income Benefits

(1) Each low-income individual eligible under the Act and subsection 2(1) of these regulations shall receive \$9,000 per year.

(2) Each low-income household, where both members of the household are eligible under the Act and subsection 2(1) of these regulations, shall receive \$15,000 per year.

#### 4. Receipt of Income

(1) Minimum Income Benefits under section 3 shall be reduced by 50 cents for every dollar of income earned by the low-income individual or a member of the low-income household through employment. For greater certainty, income earned pursuant to an existing social benefit program or scheme shall not reduce the Minimum Income Benefits under section 3.