



Public affairs with a difference...

- [Population rises by 1,000 every day](#)
- [Scottish Labour to end universal benefits](#)
- [Ford to lay off hundreds of workers](#)
- [Why are public sector is losing faith in Remploy](#)

Welfare, Work, Economy, jobs

### Population rises by 1,000 every day

[Daily Telegraph](#), [The Times](#)

Record levels of immigration and a higher birth rate saw the number of people living here grow by 1,000 every day.

The Office for National Statistics has said that Only Germany and France, which are far bigger, are home to more people than Britain. The ONS's latest calculations show that the population of England and Wales increased by 95,000 (0.17 per cent) between census day last year, March 27, and the mid-year point, June 30. This works out at more than 1,000 people a day, taking the total to 56,170,900.

Over the course of those three months in 2011, 187,600 babies were born and 121,000 people died. Some 98,200 foreign nationals moved to Britain with the intention of staying for more than a year, while 68,500 people left the country, putting net migration over the period at 28,400.

The Home Office is cutting the number of visas offered to international students and restricting the number who can stay after graduation.

Only the most skilled foreign workers can take up jobs in Britain and must earn at least £18,600 if they want to bring their spouses over as well.

### Ford to lay off hundreds of workers

[The Independent](#)

Ford workers in Britain will be among several hundred to lose jobs across Europe because of falling demand. Redundancies amongst permanent staff will be voluntary.

Ford employs 15,000 people in Britain, based at its factories in Southampton and Dagenham, among a total European workforce of 66,000, which is based largely in Germany.

The announcement follows a 19 per cent drop in Ford's European sales, disclosed in July – which could lead to a £630m loss this year. Collectively, vehicle makers across the European Union have seen sales fall by 7.1 per cent in the first eight months of this year.

### Crisis in social care costs Britain over £5bn a year

[The Independent](#)

Britain's economy is losing more than £5bn a year as a result of a growing crisis in social care funding which is being aggravated by austerity measures.

People are giving up an estimated £4bn in pay that would have been channelled back into the economy because they are being forced to leave work to care for elderly or disabled relatives.

The Treasury is also missing out on £1bn of taxes it would otherwise have paid, while carers are claiming some £300m in benefits to help cover their living costs. The "missing" £5.3bn is equivalent to more than 0.3 per cent of Britain's gross domestic product, charities warned last night.

More than 300,000 people quit work in 2010-11 to look after relatives – and the number is increasing because of continuing cuts to care budgets. In a report from Age UK and Carers UK, they said the problem would worsen unless ministers reversed cuts to town hall budgets that were affecting services, and finally acted to settle the long-term funding of social care.

### Scottish Labour plans to end free universal benefits

[The Independent](#)

Scots face losing all their free benefits – from free elderly care to tuition fees – following a radical policy re-think by the Scottish Labour Party.

Successive Scottish administrations have brought in a host of free, universal benefits since they were given control over domestic policy through devolution in 1999.

As a result, Scots get many services for free that have to be paid for in the rest of the United Kingdom. These include free care for the elderly, free prescriptions, free university tuition fees, free eye tests, and they have also had council tax levels frozen for the past five years.

But all these advantages could soon be brought to an end following a major shift in policy by the Scottish Labour Party.

### Why are public sector procurers losing faith in Remploy?

[The Guardian](#)

Colin Cram argues that the reason for this is that there is a lack of communication and engagement between the provider of employment services and the government is the real reason.

He argues that the lack of fit between what Remploy produces and what government buys sounds like a lack of communication and engagement with each other. Furthermore, nearly all heads of procurement understand the implications of social benefit clauses. The reasons given sound like an attempt to excuse or rationalise the unacceptable.

The challenge for public sector procurers and what is left of Remploy is to develop a workable plan, to which Remploy and all significant public sector organisations should sign up.