

**WELFARE REFORM COMMITTEE**  
**FUTURE DELIVERY OF SOCIAL SECURITY IN SCOTLAND**  
**WRITTEN SUBMISSION FROM LESLEY MCDADE**

Currently Iain Duncan Smith is informing that immigrants that successfully manage to get to the UK especially via the Channel Tunnel are being paid £36 per week out of the welfare budget. This sum of money appears to me substantially inadequate. It equates to approximately £5 per day. You cannot get a sandwich and a juice in M&S for a £5 a day. You cannot get a cake and a coffee in Costa in Scotland for a £5 a day.

Assuming the immigrant is frugal and buys a bag of potatoes, 1/2 dozen eggs and a tin of beans - how do they afford to cook the meal on gas or electric.

The issue concerning IDS appears to be sub-human.

Therefore I would respectfully suggest that any immigrant successfully getting to the UK especially Scotland that they do not receive funding at all out of welfare as this is the wrong pot of money. I respectfully suggest that they be provided with a significantly increased sum of money out of the International Development Fund and a pot of 0.7% GDP. I respectfully suggest that immigrants be funded absolutely out of this Fund especially in Scotland: that charity should start at home and that there is nothing to prevent the Minister for International Affairs, the Foreign Secretary or the Home Secretary or the Scottish Office and Secretary of State from ensuring that this fund is made available to a severe humanitarian crisis on our doorstep - to either process the 5000 or so immigrants in Calais or to bring them into the UK to process them once not twice. As such, I would promulgate the issue of the funding of a humanitarian crisis absolutely in Scotland and purposefully in the Highlands.

Furthermore, there is potential for consensus ad idem to occur in Scotland should promulgation of the international fund be available to the Scottish - there are substantial buildings in Scotland that need development, i.e. a Gothic Mansion somewhere near Glasgow - google Carbuncles: and there is even a ghost village with 500 units which is derelict and a burden on the Highlands since the 70s called Pophail. There is absolutely no reason why an international fund could not be used to develop sites around the UK and Scotland to deal with an international humanitarian crisis. The democratic issue is that there is a need to do something and with the Germans seen to engage in an humanitarian effort at 800,000 people our current efforts at 147 people being processed with a 5000 issue on our doorstep is not acceptable to me as a member of the electorate. Our current stance is to deal with "effect" not "cause". If you deal with the "cause" - the immigrants - you would not need to deal with fences, lorries, channel tunnel extensions, sniffer dogs. Currently we are appearing subhuman in dealing with the latter and have spent £7m when that £7m could have been spent processing the immigrants.

There is therefore an issue specific to the welfare reforms that the people of Scotland are being subjected to austerity measures and being engineered into relative poverty with an increase in child poverty when there appears to be money to waste on fences, lorries, channel tunnel extensions and sniffer dogs ensuring that

the immigrant issue will require further money to be made available as the point of focusing on causation has been specifically missed. There therefore appears to me to be a deficiency of logic and rationality concerning welfare and the processing of immigrants and purpose of austerity being promulgated on the UK and specifically the Scottish. There has to be a point to creating a 0.7% GDP international pot of funding for humanitarian and development issues and there is actually no reason why the pot has to be spent overseas when the crisis is in the UK. The ability to marry funding correctly should mean that there is "value added" as a cost measure. The issue appears to me to see a "benefit" in the immigrants, rather than that they are a "burden" on society. That means the reality check for the current Government stance is to see the immigrants first as human beings, not lorries and Channel Tunnel extensions.

## **Welfare Reforms**

I write to you concerning the article dated 27/08/15 by the Guardian<sup>1</sup> as evidence of misconduct in public office by Ian Duncan Smith and his welfare reforms agenda which are having a disastrous impact and which have affected society to the degree of savagery and subhuman activity. This article is not acceptable in a democracy especially when we are supposed to be a developed society and country.

Please accept this submission as evidence of criminality in society that these people have been socially engineered into death and as a direct consequence of a reform policy and measure in society. The issue is significantly serious due to the number of deaths and to the timeous nature of the deaths as there has been an immediate outcome and impact concerning this policy. As such it is established as fact that this policy measure and reform to British society and British democracy has to have accountability, responsibility and transparency and that Ian Duncan Smith and the Conservative party must accept this accountability, responsibility and transparency as being substantially significant to themselves.

Due to the number of deaths the issue is perceived to be criminal and the outcome should be someone or some people being held responsible for these deaths with overall responsibility for the policy being processed as misconduct in public office against Ian Duncan Smith.

I have started a Petition on 38 Degrees (so called because it is the point when an avalanche occurs). My Petition is to raise awareness of a lacuna in the welfare reforms concerning the long-term unemployed, especially those on disability benefits.

People on disabled benefits often recover. A change in their circumstances means that they potentially lose their DLA/PIP and Severe Disability Allowance which can amount to about £500 per month. Some people are not quite "job ready" or there may be insufficient employment opportunity in their locality. Also people on long-term welfare benefits may lack skills, training and education and there is a lack of jobs stating "junior" or "trainee" where people who need to upskill to get back into the

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/aug/27/thousands-died-after-fit-for-work-assessment-dwp-figures?CMP=EMCNEWEML661912>

job market can join a workforce at a lesser degree of preparation with the employer investing in their staff.

However, my issue is about people engaging in the welfare reforms and doing volunteering. They have not received any benefit whatsoever and the lacuna means that there is no increased benefit for doing unpaid work to replace lost benefits which is potentially discriminatory for disabled people. If you go back to "paid" work, you receive an increment of £40 a week for a year, you receive a tax free threshold of £10,500 per year and if you are on a low income you are entitled to working tax credit. Perhaps you can now see my argument - volunteering is still work but should not be for altruistic reward only.

It is possible to do "permitted work" to the value of £100 and still claim benefits. My Petition proposes that if you do 4 hours voluntary work, you should receive £25; if you do 8 hours - £50; 12 hours - £75 and if you do 16 hours plus - £100. The maximum replacement benefit would be £100 with the potential to earn £400 per month to replace lost benefit with the Government saving £100 as austerity measures. This would keep people especially disabled people out of relative poverty and let them engage in the job market at their level of ability. Something for something.

The DWP collect information on volunteers as the charity has to notify this fact. A simple form perhaps online to your social security number is all that is required and if you really are altruistic then a cross in the box would enable you to receive nothing.

This issue is a serious issue as it is a lacuna in current thinking on welfare reforms which are going to disadvantage many people and put them into relative poverty.

This campaign means a lot to me and the more support we can get behind it, the better chance we have of succeeding.<sup>2</sup>

I understand that today is the last day of participation in the Welfare Reforms submissions for scrutiny of policy and measures. I anticipate you will accept that my response is a consequence of my experience of being on welfare benefits for the last 15 years of which I have engaged in volunteering for 9 years and am volunteer trapped. Moreover, I have had a significant reduction in my benefits due to recovery. Furthermore, I have been socially engineered onto benefits in the first instance and there are criminal issues associated with my being on benefits per se which the Prime Minister is notified via a request for Parliamentary Sovereignty. If you require further information in relation to my personal circumstances don't hesitate to ask, however, I would urge you to focus objectively on the fact that there is an apparent lacuna in the welfare reform agenda which is important because people are being socially engineered into poverty and it is apparent that under the austerity measures there is a "residuum" being created in society due to the welfare reforms specific to poverty.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://you.38degrees.org.uk/petitions/paid-benefit-for-volunteering-for-long-term-unemployed>

## **Zero Hour Contracts/junior-trainee posts/CV - Application packs**

In relation to the Welfare Reforms agenda and Ian Duncan Smith's need to get people off benefits and into work as well as to deal with the issue of people on benefits who are in work but are workpoor, I consider there is a serious issue in society concerning zero hour contracts. I understand from Catherine Stihler MEP that the British issue affects 1.8 million people in the UK on zero hour contracts.

I write a blog on topics of Jurisprudence as a legal activist and one of my articles is on zero hour contracts which I consider to be fundamentally illegal in concept and should therefore be outlawed and replaced with a basic plus commission format to socially engineer people into a wealth creation situation and not as the current welfare reforms socially engineer people into poverty or relative poverty as an austerity measure and agenda. My article is as follows:

"Zero Hour Contracts and a lacuna in the welfare reforms relating to volunteering"

Regarding the welfare reforms, I have been thinking about zero hours contracts and I would like you to debate this issue in Parliament.

The implied duty of mutual trust and confidence in a contract between employer and employee is to act in good faith.

The employer's duty is to remunerate. The employee's duty is to be willing to work.

I am thinking that Zero Hour Contracts could be illegal via the duty of the employer to remunerate. Remuneration requires you to pay something, not nothing. The law requires that something to be the minimum wage.

Whether it can be argued that a basic plus commission on part-time and full-time contracts is a better way forward than zero hour contracts needs to be debated. That would potentially assist IDS to reduce the benefits burden/deficit and keep people out of relative poverty.

But the employee only requires to be willing to work, that does not necessarily mean they actually have to work - so if the employer does not have any work to do, people can feng shui the office, update websites, do blogs, create leaflets and posters, ring round the yellow pages, update proformas, archive their emails, organise a football/netball/hockey match, do volunteering, or second staff to clients etc - there is usually something that can be done which is not quite company business when there is no work - creativity and imagination.

The emphasis should not be on people on benefits, the emphasis should be on the employer who is exploiting his/her employees.

In English law and the law of obligations a contract comprises three components to be legal: offer + plus acceptance + valuable consideration. That people are doing zero hours and therefore receiving no remuneration it would appear to me to be a breach of the implied duty of mutual, trust and confidence by the employer. Whether there is a special case for employment contracts is not known, but I don't think so."

Furthermore, the issue of mass youth unemployment and disability affected employment can easily be dealt with by ensuring that employers recruit at a lower level in their organisations and there is a need for "junior" and "trainee" positions so that people can get a chance of employment where they have no or low skills, training and education and are not quite job ready or needing reasonable adjustment to their career or to change career altogether especially concerning being disability affected.

Moreover, there is a need to ditch the application pack in favour of better online recruitment software and to also get back to using the CV which takes 5 seconds to attach to an email or upload to a browser thereby enabling the recruiter to spend 30 seconds assessing whether to interview or not. The Application pack takes 1-2 hours to complete and often with no impact via interview selection or feedback. It would also be useful as an issue of employment policy that if you apply online or via CV that you are emailed at the closing date with objective information on issues like how many people applied for the post; gender/sex/disability/race etc. and even whether people are completing equal opportunity data.

All of the above measures would improve the current welfare reform agenda and progress recruitment and employment law and would be beneficial to the reform agenda that IDS is seeking to encourage in society but has been going the wrong way about it.

## **Poverty in Wales**

Whilst the scrutiny committee is specially dealing with Scotland, I don't have Scottish evidence re stats for poverty in Scotland. However, I attach two articles by the BBC recently concerning the worklessness in Wales.<sup>34</sup> I consider a statistic of 1 in 3 children living in Poverty in this region of the UK to be social engineering and if this is the present day statistic then to do austerity measures via the Welfare Reforms in this part of the UK would have a significant impact and I am concerning that people and children are being socially engineered into poverty under the Welfare Reforms which would mean that a "residuum" is being created in British democratic society by design.

I found these articles truly shocking in content in today's democratic society.

Welfare Reforms should be constructive and objective to progress and benefit society, i.e. to engineer wealth creation. I do not consider that the current structure of the welfare reform agenda to be wholly supportive of a progressive society and some areas and people in our democracy are being deliberately processed as a burden under the issue of austerity measures.

It is necessary for people to live at a level that is not relative poverty. To improve society people must have sufficient to spend in the local economy which enables VAT to go to the Treasury, PAYE to go to the Treasury, Corporate Tax to go to the Treasury, Tax on Dividends and savings to go to the Treasury and business rates to

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-33527289>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-33080593>

the local authority. All of these measures are wealth creating and enable circularity to ensure public services are maintained at a standard. To stop or prevent that process is to socially design a shrinking economy which will significantly impact on already deprived areas through loss of amenities.

There is therefore a need to address serious ideological thinking in the welfare reforms agenda where people and especially children are living in relative poverty especially where it is by design.

For example if people recover from a disability and their benefits are removed the loss can be as significant as £500 per month. This may mean that they cannot afford to pay the TV licence so that they are specifically engineered into a position of inequality in society. If they cannot afford to pay broadband in today's society they are at a specific inequality of entering the job market concerning basic IT skills as well as being able to apply for jobs on line, and this is especially so, if the economy is seen to be shrinking because people are not spending and pay tax revenue to the treasury - there may be seen to be a significant loss of amenity if for example the local library were to close or a person could not afford to get to their local library - eg free access to computers and newspapers etc or even children's books.

Concerning relative poverty a loss of benefits with an inability to gain employment means that people are faced with fuel poverty and may also be accessing food banks. It also means that people are forced to use charity shops and buy food that is not necessarily the most healthy for them.

This therefore is the residuum - socially designed poverty. This is not acceptable as a policy agenda in a Democratic country such as ours where we are perceived to be a wealthy nation, nor is it ideologically acceptable that a deficiency in thinking in a developed country should be allowed to promulgate in society to this extent. The articles above are representative of Wales, and it is not known what impact the austerity measures are having on Scotland, but to take £12 billion out of the economy by social design which is not based on progressive wealth creating policy is not acceptable.

Perhaps the Scots can show some solidarity with the Welsh on the issue of current poverty in society.

### **Pets and the impact of the welfare reform**

I have no evidence on this issue, but it appears to me to follow that if £12 billion of austerity measures is going to impact via the welfare reforms and some people are going to be affected to their detriment by being socially engineered into relative poverty, then the issue of pets and how they can be afforded is a serious issue.

I have not seen any press releases specific to pets and relative poverty measures but if people are going to food banks, then there is a raised presumption that pets are affected too.

There may also be an issue of people under the reform agenda where they are losing benefits ability to afford to have a pet per se. This may be a social isolation issue for some.

## Immigrants and the Welfare Reforms

I read recently or heard it on the BBC news, I am not sure which, that the welfare budget is paying £36 per week to immigrants. From what I can gather, of the 5000 immigrants in tent city at Calais, approximately 147 have successfully reached the UK and been subsequently processed. I therefore presume that 147 immigrants are receiving £36 welfare benefits in the UK. Whilst the press appear to be over zealous and sensational on the issue of immigrants living on welfare benefits when the facts don't substantiate any significant impact on the welfare benefits system, there is a significant two significant issues.

Firstly £36 a week for an immigrant to live on in the UK is inadequate. For approximately £5 a day you would be hard pushed to get a sandwich and a juice from Marks & Spencers or cake and a coffee from Costa. If an immigrant is frugal and buys a bag of potatoes, 1/2 dozen eggs and a tin of beans - how are they meant to cook the food on current gas and electricity prices. Therefore the issue that welfare benefits are paying any money arises as the causative issue is a humanitarian crisis and the immigrants should be being processed out of the international development fund of 0.7% GDP which the British have designated as their proportion of funding to international crisis and aid development. There is therefore no need for immigrants to be a "burden" on the welfare budget at all and the international fund should pay out an adequate sum to facilitate a humanitarian crisis on the doorstep of the UK: charity starts at home. Moreover, if the Home Office and Foreign Office correctly identified funding for immigrants it should mean that the 5000 humanitarian crisis would be processed in the UK with value added and mutual benefit and reciprocity being made available via the charity sector, churches and missionaries based here in the UK who are able to support a humanitarian crisis which is correctly identified as such. The press would then no longer be over zealous or sensationalist on topic and there would be significantly less bias, prejudice and discrimination towards immigrants in general. We do have to deal with the fact that the UK is a Christian society as a societal norm.

Secondly, the Home Secretary/Foreign Secretary spent £7m on fences, extensions and hardware/software to the Channel Tunnel, sniffer dogs and soldiers to deal with the "effect" of a lorry convoy problem. Where people on welfare benefits are being told they are losing their benefits and are effectively been socially engineered into "relative poverty", spending £7m on fences to deal with a lorry problem is not acceptable because it is frivolous. Spending £7m to deal with the "causative" issue - a humanitarian crisis in Calais by processing the people into the UK and doing the right and ethical/moral thing in society - treating people as human beings first, not a lorry problem, would have meant that the "effect" the lorry problem would simply have disintegrated and the convoy would have dissipated. There is therefore an issue of logic and rationality at the heart of Government in these two departments which would suggest that there is money to be frivolous with plus more as the humanitarian crisis still exists and has not been processed, yet people on welfare benefits are being told there is a £12 billion austerity measure necessary in welfare reforms.

So where does the truth of the matter lie - there is money available for lorries which is wasted money or people on welfare MUST have austerity measures. There appears to be a material nonsense in ideology.

Where there is some room for improvement is for the Defence budget to access the international fund to do peacekeeping duties and for the immigrants to be processed correctly concerning available monies and funding.