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Indicators of social disaster

- Deprivation
- Child poverty
- Third world diseases
- Alienated youth
- Mental health crisis
- Suicide rates
- Homelessness
- Foodbanks normalized
- Private charities overwhelmed
STOP THE WAR ON THE POOR
Third world boarding houses

One of the filthy rooms in a boarding house visited by The Nation. Photo credit: The Nation
staff members said they were exhausted by the level of desperate need pouring through the charity's doors. July 2017

Auckland City Mission chief executive Chris Farrelly said the charity was 'at capacity', with more people seeking its help every day.
New Zealand's most shameful secret: 'We have normalised child poverty'

• Unicef and charities urge New Zealand to act on child poverty

Minister dismisses Guardian report highlighting issue as ‘sensationalist’ from a paper that ‘supports Jeremy Corbyn’
Charities overwhelmed

50c a day helps a New Zealand child get to school warm and dry
Economic costs of social disintegration

Incarceration
Youth offending
Health system
Education
Loss of productive adults
Implications for the Ageing of the population
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The welfare state is founded in a set of values

Values $\rightarrow$ policy $\rightarrow$ outcomes

Our values have been subverted

Those who not understand history are doomed to repeat it
Welfare devolving: Return to 19th century thinking

- 1846 Destitute Persons Ordinance
- 1938 Social Security Act (SSA) 1964
- 1972 Royal Commission on Social Security
- 1988 Royal Commission on Social Policy
- 1991 Budget/welfare reforms
- 1996 Child Tax Credit
- 2006 In Work Tax Credit
- 2007 SSA new purposes and principles
- 2017 Back to the 19th century…
“They passed vigorously enforced laws placing all welfare duties upon families. They kept handouts to the destitute miserly, demeaning and short-term.

The "world without welfare" of early colonial New Zealand represents perhaps the purist test to date of what happens when a society turns its face against public assistance to the poorest and most vulnerable, in pursuit of ideals and personal independence.”
Beginning of the welfare state

• 1938     Michael Joseph Savage

The inspiration for the Social Security Act 1938 was the determination to end poverty in New Zealand. –MSD website

Social Security Act 1964

“An Act to provide for …Superannuation Benefits and of other Benefits designed to safeguard the People of New Zealand from Disabilities arising from Age, Sickness, Widowhood, Orphanhood, Unemployment, or other Exceptional Conditions; . . . and, further to provide such other Benefits as may be necessary to maintain and promote the Health and General Welfare of the Community
1972 Royal Commission on Social Security

“The aims of the system should be to ensure that everyone is able to enjoy a standard of living much like that of the rest of the community, and thus is able to feel a sense of participation in and belonging to the community.”
“a means test relates to both income and assets. In some instances in the past this was even extended to include resources of near relatives”

All main benefits (except universal ones) were ‘income tested’

People could maintain their balance sheets

Means tests applied only for supplementary assistance
Flowering of the welfare state continues in 1970s

- Sole parent benefit (DPB 1973)
- National Superannuation (1977)
  - No means test  Poverty cured
- ACC (1974)
  - Right to compensation and medical attention
- Growing influence of the Human Rights movement
  
  International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: the right to an adequate standard of living
1988 Royal Commission on Social Policy

Lange’s counter to neoliberalism

- Access to sufficient share of income and resources to allow all to **participate** in society, have a genuine **opportunity** to achieve potential and **live fulfilling lives**
- Relief of need
- Ensure the wellbeing and healthy development of **all children**
Darkness of Rogernomics 1987-

- flat tax package
- Welfare top ups for the deserving (working) poor
- Benefits for the needy only
- No more principles of participation

Labour paves the way
1991 Budget

Dumped universal welfare state

Benefits cuts

Family benefit gone

All state assistance tightly targeted
Redefining our values

“Fairness: People with genuine needs should have adequate access to state assistance - those who can look after themselves should be encouraged to do”
Children getting seriously ill through poverty, say doctors

Families huddling to beat winter cold

Debts

Families miss out on food

Women hardest hit by slump, new poll shows

Strategies for survival

Is Foodbank enough?

Benefit cuts

Tenants could be ‘forced’ out
Welfare devolving: Return to 19 century thinking

- 1846 Destitute Persons Ordinance
- 1938 Social Security Act (SSA) 1964
- 1972 Royal Commission on Social Security
- 1988 Royal Commission on Social Policy
- 1991 Budget/welfare reforms
- 1996 Child Tax Credit
- 2006 In Work Tax Credit
- 2007 SSA new purposes and principles
- 2017 Back to the 19th century
1996: The Child Tax Credit

Figure 1: Maximum real family assistance (1-child family) 1986-2004 ($2004)

Inclusion via paid work
What Labour said in 1996

To divide children into those whose parents are good parents because they work and children who are bad because their parents do not is absolutely disgusting.

Annette King MP 1996
“a simplistic tangle of bigotry and ignorance … barely disguised attack on beneficiaries … mean spirited, ill thought through and punitive … unholy product of National’s deeply held view that everyone on a benefit is a bludger and Treasury’s new right agenda … based on highly questionable incentive arguments” Michael Cullen 1996
But in 2006 Labour took the child tax credit and made it far worse

- Called it the In Work Tax Credit
  - Part of weekly assistance paid to mother
  - Worth $72.50 or more a week
  - Requirement of “off benefit”
  - Required number of hours
    - 20 sole parent
    - 30 couple
Paid work at the centre of policy:

- Paid parental leave
- KiwiSaver
- Childcare subsidies
- In Work Tax Credit

Children's rights and needs - invisible in legislation.

Child unfriendly work hours. Child unfriendly local environment.

New baby support for working parents only, child payments reflect work of parents.

Paid work only solution to child poverty.

Work related child tax credits exclude many poor children.

Sanctions for not working. Low benefits, high abatement to encourage full-time work.
2005-7  Labour’s Working for Families

Working for Families costs, $ billions

- 2001
- 2003
- 2005
- 2007
- 2009
- 2011
- 2013
- 2015

Bar chart showing the increase in costs from 2001 to 2015.
So what is wrong with WFF?
The Child Poverty Rate fell but...

“Working for Families had little if any impact on the poverty rates for children in workless households” MSD 2012
The Human Rights Case
CPAG v the Attorney General

– 1996 HR complaint against CTC rejected
– 2002 CPAG lodged complaint under Part 1A
– 2008 The Human Rights Review Tribunal
– 2011 Appeal in the High Court
– 2013 Appeal in the Court of Appeal
The decision: The Court of Appeal found...

... the IWTC part of Working for Families paid to the mother in a so called ‘working’ family was discriminatory and caused material harm to the beneficiary families who were excluded.

However the Court decided the harm to over 200,000 of NZ’s poorest children was justified.
"And the wolf ate all children but it didn't matter because they were the children of People not like us"

“Creation of the other”
Rewriting our values

PURPOSE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT (2007)

• to help people to support themselves and their dependents while not in paid employment;
• to help people to find or retain paid employment;
• to help people for whom work may not currently be appropriate because of sickness, injury, disability, or caring responsibilities, to support themselves and their dependents.
• to enable in certain circumstances the provision of financial support to people to help alleviate hardship:

• to ensure that the financial support takes into account—
  
  that where appropriate they should use the resources available to them before seeking financial support under this Act;

  to impose administrative and, where appropriate, work-related requirements on people seeking or receiving financial support under this Act.
THE PRINCIPLES:

Work in paid employment offers the best opportunity for people to achieve social and economic well-being;

• the priority for people of working age should be to find and retain work;

• people for whom work may not currently be an appropriate outcome should be assisted to plan for work in the future and develop employment-focused skills; and

• people for whom work is not appropriate should be supported in accordance with this Act.

Labour paves the way…
“National is supporting this bill going to the Social Services Committee. Why on earth would we not? We have been arguing for this for 7 years.

We want to tighten up the provisions in this bill. This is basically just a wet dishrag of a bill, designed to make the Government look as if it is doing something, but it is not actually doing very much at all.”  

Anne Tolley: 2007
1999-2008 Labour paved the way…..

Paid work is the (only) answer to child poverty
2008-2017
No holes barred reforms

• Relentless focus on work
• Work work work- any work so long as paid
• Tighter and tighter targeting of assistance
• Sanctions for non compliance
  – Poverty as a weapon
• Ugly culture in WINZ
  – Power to decide what is a relationship
  – What is income
  – Appeals process stacked in their favour
Targeting efficiency: Families have too little disposable income even if ‘working’
Suffocating effects for working poor
Under National 2018
Gross income $35,000….An extra $10,000 means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wff</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student loan</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwisaver</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation supplement</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total effective tax</td>
<td>8,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disposable income</td>
<td>$1,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible loss of childcare subsidy up to $60 a week
Payment of child support 18-30%
One injustice unchallenged leads to another and another.

Sanctions: where are the children?
The ugly culture
The top and bottom pull apart
Endless persecution even prosecution

• Jill is a sole a parent she gets SPS $325
• Jack is her boarder. He gets JS $210

oops

• “relationships could develop quickly and some people might not be aware of their obligation to tell Work and Income.” Minister Tolley.

Coupled they get $187.50 each- $160 less pw and have a joint income test of 70% on earned income over $80
To help distinguish the nature of a de facto relationship, Work and Income (2014) suggests that the beneficiary ‘thinks about these issues’:

• You live together at the same address most of the time.
• You live separately but stay overnight at each other’s place a few nights a week.
• You share responsibilities, for example bringing up children (if any).
• You socialise and holiday together.
• You share money, bank accounts or credit cards.
• You share household bills.
• You have a sexual relationship.
• People think of you as a couple.
• You give each other emotional support and companionship.
• Your partner would be willing to support you financially if you couldn’t support yourself.
Informants are requested to supply detailed information as detailed on the Work and Income website (2014): Information that helps us when you report a suspected fraud. This includes:

- Do they live with a partner but say they're living alone?
- If you think they do then we'd like to know:
  - the full name of their partner and any other names they're known by
  - their partner's age and date of birth
  - their partner's address
  - whether their partner works and who employs them
  - why you think that they're a couple
  - how long they've been in a relationship
  - whether they have had children together
  - the names and ages of any children they have.
Relationship ‘fraud’ prosecutions

Kathryn’s story: CPAG 2014

Malcolm Evans
Income is what MSD says it is

“When I use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, “it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less.” “The question is,” said Alice, “whether you can make words mean so many different things.”

MSD says
Expenditure - Benefit = undeclared income
Ms X. in the High Court:

MSD argues that LOANS to support kids are INCOME
Solo mum's loans should be treated as income, MSD argues

A single mother who took out loans to make ends meet while on a benefit is being prosecuted by the Ministry of Social Development, which says that…

RADIONZ.CO.NZ
…that where appropriate they should **use the resources available to them** before seeking **financial support** under this Act;

---

**The gift/loan issue**

52. **In relation to the issue of whether the money received from Ms Fountain’s mother constitutes income, the Ministry’s submission is twofold:**

52.1 **Regardless of whether the money is a gift or a loan, it constitutes income under the Act.**

---

**Return to the Destitute Persons Act**

**A short step to charitable model of the 19th century?**
Is reprieve in sight?

New Zealand has a people’s government
Task for new government

• SSA must be reframed
• Human rights not paid work at the basis

"Without families and communities, the economy means nothing. It has no life of its own. Its only purpose is to enable us to live, to care for one another and to raise our children to take our place. If we lose the power to do that, no matter how fast the GDP rises or how much the budget surplus grows, we will have no future worth working for." Anne Else, False Economy 1996.
Changing the dialogue
We all have a role to play

10% GDP

90% Unpaid invisible work of maintaining the social fabric