



(c) crown copyright

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

C(79) 31

COPY NO 80

17 July 1979

CABINET

REPORT OF MINISTERIAL GROUP ON PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

Note by the Chancellor of the Exchequer

1. The Cabinet on 12 July invited a group of Ministers (the Lord President, the Secretary of State for Trade and the Chief Secretary, Treasury, with myself in the chair) to discuss the proposals on public expenditure reductions in 1980-81 in the Chief Secretary, Treasury's paper C(79) 26 with the spending Ministers concerned, and to report back to Cabinet for the meeting on 19 July.
2. Our report is attached.

G H

Treasury Chambers

17 July 1979

SECRET

CABINET

MINISTERIAL GROUP ON PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

—
REPORT

1. When on 12 July Cabinet discussed the Chief Secretary's proposals in C(79)26 concerning public expenditure in 1980-81, they asked this group (the Chancellor^{of} the Exchequer, the Lord President, the Chief Secretary, the Trade Secretary) to discuss the proposals with the Ministers responsible for the main spending programmes.
2. This we have done. Annex A lists the Ministers with whom we have held meetings. This paper represents our report.
3. In our discussions several of the Ministers concerned proposed or accepted reductions in their programmes beyond those offered earlier. Column 1 of Annex B shows the figures for cuts suggested in the Chief Secretary's paper, column 2 the offers now made by the Ministers concerned.
4. We have identified certain cases where we think larger cuts would be appropriate than have so far been agreed. These additional cuts are included in column 3, which we recommend as a minimum for cuts to be agreed now. The last column of the paper shows any differences between these and the original proposals by the Chief Secretary in column 1. The total would still be some £ $\frac{3}{4}$ billion less cuts than the economic projections suggest as necessary.
5. We set out below for each Department the main issues for decision, and our proposals for resolving these. First, however, we draw attention to two general issues which emerged from our discussions:

(a) Local Authorities

6. A number of Ministers drew attention to the difficulty of implementing reductions on local authority current expenditure which, given the exemptions, comprise a large proportion of the proposed total. Without specific statutory powers to compel local authorities to implement cuts in expenditure they can only be influenced indirectly, through the RSG settlement, housing subsidy arrangements and various forms of guidance. These instruments do not oblige them

SECRET

to comply with our plans for reductions in programmes, both because they can reallocate these among different programmes under their control, and because they can avoid the cuts by increasing their rates.

7. In this situation, it seems to us that the immediate announcement of the reductions in local authority current spending, as agreed by Cabinet, would be best stated as a single global total and percentage reduction, without giving any Government view on the proportionate cuts in individual programmes. The announcement would still of course need to include the agreed legislative changes; it would make clear that the "law and order" local government services were exempt; and it would say in general terms that the central government was prepared to back the local authorities in making these cuts, even at the cost of some reduction in the standards of services, and would be taking them into account in fixing the level of RSG later in the year.

8. There are some problems about this:

(i) Although individual Ministers could point to the legislative steps they were taking, it would preclude any individual announcements of the percentage cuts agreed in Cabinet for their services, and this might lead to false assumptions that they had accepted the uniform percentage cut in the case of each service.

(ii) The process of consultation about later years, which is envisaged for the autumn, would be made more complicated.

(iii) In any case totals for individual services over the whole run of years would need to be given in the public expenditure White Paper, which would indicate what had been assumed as the components of the overall reduction for next year, and might lead to questions on why these more specific indications had not been given initially.

9. Nevertheless, to give a single total for the reductions would avoid showing in precise terms the scale of the cuts in particular services, and would ^{usefully} reflect the actual freedom of local authorities. If practicable this total should include the cut in housing subsidies, discussed further in the 'Environment' section below. Accordingly, we recommend that Cabinet should agree to give a

SECRET

single figure in the announcement of these reductions. It will be necessary to consider whether means can be found to prevent or discourage local authorities from avoiding these intended cuts by raising their rates.

(b) Additional 3% Reductions

10. The reason why the further 3% reduction on most programmes is needed was explained in the Chief Secretary's paper (paragraph 14). Not surprisingly, a number of Ministers have told us of their difficulties in finding this further unallocated 3% cut, beyond the specified options put forward to meet the target for each programme agreed earlier by Cabinet. We accept that the proposed 3% has to be looked at in the context of each programme individually. Several of our colleagues have been able to accept some or all of this additional cut in their programmes. In a few other cases our recommendations below propose total reductions beyond the specified options, requiring some or all of this 3%. But in several programmes we have had to accept that the additional 3% is particularly difficult.

DEFENCE

11. The defence budget represents 11% of total programmes in 1979-80. Our acceptance of the NATO target of average increases in the region of 3% in volume terms in the defence budget on the NATO definition (which is only marginally, and for this purpose unimportantly, different from ours) is one reason why cuts in other programmes have to be so large in order to produce the necessary reduction in public expenditure as a whole.

12. The Defence Secretary has now proposed, subject to the condition discussed below, that the defence programme for 1980-81 should be £13 million higher than the provision in the last Government's White Paper Cmnd. 7439, so that we can be shown as proposing to spend more than our predecessors.

13. The Chief Secretary's proposal is to use the NATO target as a criterion, by adding 3% to the revised volume of the defence budget in 1979-80, after taking account of the economy drive launched by the Defence Secretary and the exceptional treatment already given to defence in accordance with the Manifesto, viz:

- an extra £100 million for equipment
- adjustment of the cash limit to accommodate the accelerated armed forces pay increase in full, with

SECRET

no phasing and no 3% cut

- a further addition recently authorised to compensate for the VAT and oil duty increases which in all other programmes are to be contained within the cash limits previously fixed.

14. The Defence Secretary has reduced his bid for additional expenditure over the inherited plan from £88 million to £13 million, but is concerned about criticism if the budget is set below his current bid. He has also proposed the condition that the cash limits for 1980-81 should eventually be set in such a way as not to impose any additional volume squeeze.

15. As a result of the exceptional action mentioned above, and the expected shortfall in 1978-79, the defence budget for the current year 1979-80 already permits a 4.6% increase on 1978-79. The Defence Secretary's proposal would represent another 4.7% on top of 4.6%, a growth path far above the NATO target. On the lower figure suggested by the Chief Secretary there would still be an increase of more than 6% over the two years even if shortfall in 1980-81 were 1½%.

16. We recommend that the defence budget should be fixed in the way proposed by the Chief Secretary, that is, by applying 3% to the revised defence budget in the current year. This represents a cut of £115 million from the baseline for the present exercise. The point about cash limits should be noted, but this will have to depend on our general policy concerning cash limits which is currently under discussion separately.

SECRET

AID AND "OTHER" FCO EXPENDITURE

17. The Chief Secretary asked for net reductions of £132 million from the Aid Programme and £28 million from "other" FCO expenditure.

18. The Foreign Secretary has offered reductions of £107 million and £13 million respectively. He has commented as follows:

(a) Savings on overseas representation can be made only by reducing staff and closing overseas posts. Savings of 13% have already been achieved in this fashion over the last 10 years. He has offered £2½ million, which would involve cutting 120 jobs in the FCO and closing a substantial number of consular posts abroad. He considers that any further reduction now would involve wholly unacceptable damage to our external interests. He has also agreed to savings on accommodation overseas, provided by the PSA, to the extent of £3 million.

(b) It is essential to maintain the BBC's world service in English, and to secure its audibility, and also to maintain the vernacular services to iron curtain countries. But he has agreed to savings of £4 million by dispensing with some other vernacular services.

(c) He has also agreed to a saving of £3 million on British Council expenditure, but is unwilling to agree to more unless it were on the basis of a full-scale policy review of the British Council's activities.

(d) He can accept a saving of £½ million on expenditure on international organisations but believes that to do more would be seriously damaging to our external interests.

(e) The aid programme contributes to securing exports and to promoting specific foreign policy objectives; he is unwilling to accept a reduction by more than £107 million, which would leave the aid programme in 1980-81 at the same level as in 1979-80.

We recommend:

(i) That the savings offered by the Foreign Secretary on "other" FCO expenditure should be accepted, subject to the proviso that a

SECRET

full-scale interdepartmental review should be mounted of the activities of the British Council which are funded by the FCO, with a view to securing further net savings by functional changes.

(ii) That the Foreign Secretary should make some further savings in the aid programme, beyond £107 million; each 1% is worth about £8 million.

AGRICULTURE (including Scottish and Welsh Programmes)

19. Net reductions were sought of £43 million. The Minister of Agriculture was prepared to accept the items proposed in C(79)26 other than the £20 million related to capital grants, but reserved the right to pursue some part of his additional bid for arterial drainage. The grant arrangements were under urgent review, but he did not wish to endanger investment and the UK's competitive position. He would however be prepared to offer an additional £11.5 million of land disposals.

20. We believe that there is scope for saving in the grant regime, and that these would have the additional merit of certainty and permanence. We recommend that the review of capital grants be conducted on the basis that the £20 million savings required will be secured and will be announced as soon as possible, although we would not rule out some recourse to land disposals in 1980-81, to make up the total reductions sought.

FORESTRY

21. The proposed reduction of £5 million was accepted, but it was suggested that further consideration should be given to the scope for increased disposal of surplus land on the basis that the Forestry Commission might be given the incentive of a share of the proceeds. We do not rule out such an examination, but the bulk of any savings will be needed in the disposals exercise, and for present purposes we recommend that the reduction of £5 million should stand.

INDUSTRY

22. The original objective was a reduction of £157 million. This will be achieved, largely as a result of changes in regional aid which we have already agreed. The Secretary of State has now agreed to save a further £30 million - the full 3% cut which the Chief Secretary invited him to make. Part may come from the NEB's provision for investment in the microelectronics company Inmos, but the bulk will be found by arranging for the private sector to take on certain Industry Act loans at present financed by the Department. The total savings of £187 million will be nearly 16% of the Industry programme published in Cmnd 7439.

TRADE

23. The net reduction sought was £20 million, of which the extra 3% reduction represented £5 million. The Secretary of State has an additional requirement for £6 million in respect of the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which it had previously been hoped to cover in full by savings elsewhere, although there are a very limited number of possible sources in this programme. We accept that the CAA bid is unavoidable. Allowing for additional offsetting savings amounting to £3 million, we recommend acceptance of a slightly smaller net reduction of £17 million.

ENERGY

24. The Secretary of State for Energy has not agreed to £17 million of the £24 million cuts proposed; the Chief Secretary also proposed that additional bids of £41 million should be dropped. At issue is expenditure on nuclear and non-nuclear R & D and the Department's (small) share of total expenditure on energy conservation. We recommend that the cuts should not be pressed, and that no provision for the Secretary of State's additional bids for 1980-81 should be made at this stage.

TRANSPORT

25. The Minister of Transport is willing to make cuts amounting to £231 million* or 8.8% of his programme (the total of specific cuts proposed in Annex B to

*The cut of £4 million on DVLC has been excluded to avoid double counting with the Lord President's savings on the Civil Service.

SECRET

C(79)26 excluding the further 3%). He points out that such cuts would have a severe effect on new road construction both by the Government and by local authorities, would involve substantial increases in bus and train fares and would reduce the total programme well below the levels both of 1977-78 and of 1973-74. The Minister does not therefore regard it as feasible to make the further reduction of £70 million or 3% proposed in C(79)26. He has however offered to contribute about £20 million towards that reduction, mainly by a further cut in the trunk road programme.

26. Accordingly we recommend a total reduction of £250 million on roads and transport.

HOME OFFICE

27. The Chief Secretary proposed reductions amounting to £12 million and additions limited to £22 million (mainly on manpower for the police, prison and probation services). The Home Secretary agreed to make reductions of £12 million, but he will substitute a saving of £1 million on the Race Relations Commission for half the saving on the Equal Opportunities Commission. He also proposed a further addition of £15 million (on top of the £22 million) for the police support services, for prison industries etc. and for the building programmes for magistrates' courts, the probation service and the police.

28. The Committee asked the Home Secretary to reconsider his proposals on the building programmes and prisons, and to estimate the cost of the Government's decision to admit additional refugees from Vietnam. After re-consideration he reduced his additional bid to £12 million, and he estimated the cost of Vietnamese refugees at £2 million.

29. Accordingly we recommend that the net addition to the Home Office programme should be raised from £10 million to £24 million, which would include provision for Vietnamese refugees.

ENVIRONMENT

30. The Chief Secretary asked for a total reduction of £1,603 million. The Secretary of State for the Environment has offered a net £887 million, leaving £716 million to find.

SECRET

31. The Committee noted the Secretary of State's view that:

(a) He did not consider himself committed to the reductions agreed in Opposition on the housing programme, which, at 19%, exceeded the reductions called for in nearly all other programmes.

(b) There would be grave practical and political objections to securing subsidy savings in 1980-81 by means of rent increases above earnings, given that the necessary legislation might not receive Royal Assent in time and that rent increases could not be guaranteed unless local authorities' discretion over rent levels were reduced.

(c) Offsetting increases totalling £200 million in the housing programme were necessary for additional council house improvement and local authority mortgage lending.

For the rest, the Secretary of State's view was that the additional '3% savings' on housing (£120 million) and DOE (other) (£75 million) were impracticable, but that the full savings on PSA were practicable given the abandonment of dispersal.

32. There are three main issues for the Cabinet to decide on the housing programme:

(a) Level of cuts agreed in Opposition

Do colleagues agree that the minimum level of housing reductions in 1980-81 should be that broadly endorsed by the Treasury and Environment teams in Opposition (£1,144 million)?

(b) Rents above earnings

Do colleagues agree that this will require subsidy savings achieved by increasing council house rents faster than increases in earnings? If so, urgent consideration will be needed on how legislation can bring this into effect for 1980-81, and whether action is necessary to prevent local authorities avoiding these rent increases by raising their rates.

(c) Additional bids

Do colleagues agree to reject the additional bid for £200 million on local authority mortgage lending and council house improvement,

SECRET

given that there is no specific Manifesto commitment in these areas?

33. An intermediate position, over the whole range of DOE programmes, would be to drop the additional 3% for housing and 'other' (£195 million out of the £1,264 million total). But on balance we recommend that the full savings proposed for these programmes (including the additional 3%) should be made, and that:

(a) Net housing subsidy savings of £150 million should be secured through rent increases. The Secretary of State should be invited to discuss urgently with the Chief Secretary the legislative and practical implications.

(b) The additional housing bids should be set aside.

(c) The further savings required should be sought first by scrutiny of the provisions for new housebuilding, given the currently low level of approvals and starts; improvement of municipalised property, given the cut-back in municipalisation; and improvement grants, when last year's actual ^{spending} was over £80 million below the baseline provision.

EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

34. The Chief Secretary in C(79)26 proposed reductions amounting to £860 million. The Secretary of State for Education and Science has offered cuts of £517 million (6%). In addition to what he proposed in his paper (C(79)29), this would be secured mainly by removing the obligation on local authorities to provide school meals for secondary pupils, and school milk. He has pointed out that cuts of this size would involve:

(a) Contentious legislation - as well as the relaxation on school meals and milk, local authorities would be enabled to impose charges for nursery education and for school transport.

(b) No improvement, though also no worsening, in the standards of provision in school, further education and higher education.

SECRET

(c) The removal of any minimum maintenance grant to students (now £335 a year) and the imposition of a charge of up to £700 a year towards tuition costs, which would thus increase the contribution by amounts ranging from £70 for parents with incomes below £13,000, up to £1,000 for those with incomes above £25,000.

Moreover the reduction in the services for the under-fives, for school transport and for school meals would all put additional burdens on mothers and limit their opportunities to take part-time work.

35. We nevertheless recommend that the total reduction on the education and science programme should be at least £517 million. We have asked the Secretary of State to consider whether further savings might be found by increasing fees for overseas students who are already here instead of only for those who start their courses in September 1980. About £420 million of the savings offered by the Secretary of State would be included in the overall reduction in local authority current spending (paragraphs 5-8 above), and we recommend that this contribution should be increased to £450 million, bringing the total reduction on this programme to £547 million.

OFFICE OF ARTS AND LIBRARIES

30. The reductions sought in C(79)26 total £33 million. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster has represented to us the damage which big cuts in the arts and libraries programme would do, and has reminded us of the statements made in Opposition that we would not impose "candle-ends" economies in this area. He is however prepared that his local authority expenditure should bear the same percentage cut as the average borne by local authority expenditure generally, which would provide about £17 million, and we also understand him to have offered to postpone the new British Library building (a course already advocated by a substantial body of cultural opinion) at a saving of about £6 million. These savings, however, are still only about half the total originally sought, and leave the Arts Council and national museums and galleries expenditure untouched.

37. We note what the Chancellor/said about our pre-Election stance, but we do not consider that this programme need be protected to this extent. While we accept the Chancellor/^{of the Duchy's} proposal that his local authority determined expenditure should be cut by the same overall percentage as all local authority expenditure

SECRET

(estimated at 7½%), we recommend also that the remainder of his programme should take a percentage cut of 7½% overall, to be allocated as the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster decides. We estimate that this would give a total saving of £28 million.

SOCIAL SECURITY

38. The reductions sought by the Chief Secretary totalled £253 million. The Secretary of State for Social Services has represented to us that these must be viewed against the major savings, in excess of £500 million, which on present assumptions are expected to result in 1981-82 from breaking the earnings link for pensions and making employers responsible for the first six weeks of sick pay. He proposed therefore that certain of the 1980-81 reductions sought amounting to £116 million (earnings related supplement, women's pension age, maternity and death grants, maintenance benefit preferences) should not be proceeded with, on the grounds that they would be exceedingly contentious and might be impossible to get through the House. On the other hand he offered three further areas for savings, amounting to £105-£120 million (depending on how early next summer the necessary legislation, already planned, can be secured).

39. In our view the items which the Secretary of State wants to drop would indeed be very contentious, and we are content that they should be dropped. We accept two of the three further proposals, worth £75-£90 million (deferment of the 1980 uprating by one week, and extending waiting days from three to six for sickness benefit). £30 million of savings from additional attack on fraud etc., involves the difficulty that it would require a further 600 civil servants, and would have repercussions which would bring it into conflict with the policy of containing Civil Service manpower. This leaves a total of £212-£227 million, or £26-£41 million short of C(79)26. We would recommend acceptance of the higher figure (£227 million); but if delays in the legislation meant that this could not be delivered in full we think the Secretary of State should be pressed to find the missing £15 million by some other means, and that he should be asked to consider now how he would do this if need be.

40. The offer of £30 million savings at the cost of 600 extra staff raises broader issues, which we have not been able to resolve. But we recommend that the Secretary of State should nevertheless find £227 million of savings for 1980-81.

SCOTTISH OFFICE

41. The bulk of Scottish Office expenditure is operated as a block for PESC purposes. The size of the block is adjusted in an agreed proportion (10:85) to the aggregate adjustment to comparable English programmes. On this basis, the Scottish equivalent reduction to the reduction offered by spending Ministers for England would be £197 million. The reduction equivalent to our recommendations would be £285 million.

42. The Secretary of State, while agreeing in principle to accept the reductions produced by the operation of the 10:85 formula, pointed out that in practice he could not undertake to secure reductions in excess of the original proposals in C(79)11. The difficulty arose largely because 40% of his programme block was local authority current expenditure; many of these authorities would be unwilling to make the full cuts. Also savings on housing depend on assumptions about rents unlikely to be realised.

43. The Secretary of State undertook to secure net savings of £25 million in trade, industry/^{etc.} which is outwith the Scottish block on the understanding that any unforeseen new demand for selective financial assistance could be the subject of a claim on the Contingency Reserve.

44. There is no separate issue for decision on the Scottish block. The precise amount of the Scottish reduction, apart from the agreed £25 million for trade, industry/^{etc.} will depend, on the basis of the formula, on the size of the total reductions decided for the comparable English programmes.

WELSH OFFICE

45. The Chief Secretary asked for a total reduction of £130 million. The Secretary of State for Wales has offered £110 million, representing the Welsh share of relevant programmes. But he has said that he cannot find the £20 million which represents the further general 3% reduction.

The Committee noted Mr Edwards' view that:

- (a) Given the general industrial situation in Wales and the decisions already taken on regional policy (which would affect

Wales disproportionately) the total reduction proposed by the Chief Secretary would create very serious difficulties.

(b) He should not be expected to find any additional expenditure resulting from the closure of Shotton, since he considered that steel closures should be dealt with on a GB basis.

(c) There was a case for treating Welsh housing more generously than English, as shown by the document recently circulated by the Chief Secretary which compared public expenditure and relative needs in England, Scotland and Wales.

46. The issue for decision is whether the Secretary of State for Wales should make the further 3% reduction (£20 million).
47. There is also the question of the treatment of any additional expenditure resulting from steel closures. The Committee sympathised with the view of the Secretary of State that some special treatment was needed because it relates to a general GB problem.
48. We recognise that it will be difficult for the Secretary of State for Wales to make the full reduction proposed by the Chief Secretary. But this is equally true of other programmes; we do not consider that this is a case for giving Wales wholly exceptional treatment. We therefore recommend that the full reduction of £130 million proposed by the Chief Secretary should be made, subject to a relief of £2 million in respect of the cost of remedial measures at Shotton.

NATIONALISED INDUSTRIES

49. The Chief Secretary recommended option cuts in nationalised industry borrowing (including a bid for extra coal grants) worth £720 million in gross terms, yielding a net reduction of a little over £350 million compared with Cmnd 7439. Options worth £565 million - all except those mentioned below - have been agreed. The outstanding issues and our recommendations are as follows:

(a) Coal

The Secretary of State for Energy has agreed to seek savings, but says

SECRET

the proposed £55 million is not feasible. We consider that £30 million compared with the industry's financing figure of £623 million should be possible for an industry with a turnover of over £3,000 million and total investment of over £600 million. We therefore recommend that credit should be taken for it.

(b) Scottish Electricity

The Secretary of State for Scotland argues that a saving of £10 million is not feasible without either delaying investment at Torness nuclear station or a higher price increase than in England and Wales. We recommend that a saving of £5 million (under 1% of turnover) should be made.

(c) British Aerospace

Cancelling the 146 project would save £40 million a year throughout the Survey period. The Secretary of State for Industry favours cancellation and hopes to be able to confirm this later in the week after a meeting with BAe. We recommend that the saving should be scored now and that if the project were after all to go ahead, the Secretary of State should seek equivalent savings elsewhere.

(d) The Post Office

The Post Office has just revealed a worsening by some hundreds of millions of pounds in its estimates for 1980-81 (partly resulting from accounting changes). This must be cured before the option cut of £50 million can be settled. But we consider that this should be possible either by investment reductions taking account of slower economic growth or by price increases, and on this basis recommend that the cut of £50 million should be scored. The Secretary of State for Industry expects to report on this at Cabinet.

50. These recommendations would mean that savings of £340 million compared with Cmd. 7439 would be obtained.

MINOR PROGRAMMES

51. "Minor" programmes, made up wholly or mainly of staff costs, have not been covered in this exercise, but will of course be expected to make a contribution

SECRET

to the Lord President's search for staff savings.

CONCLUSION

52. In summary, we recommend the reductions in programmes set out in column 3 of Annex B, and amounting to £4,011 million; and the proposals for the nationalised industries in paragraph 49. Reductions in local authority current spending would be announced as a single figure estimated at £780 million, representing a percentage cut of 6% on average from the previous (White Paper) plans for 1980-81. The precise figure will depend on decisions still to be taken on the distribution of cuts within programmes, and will need to be converted to the definition of current expenditure normally used in the RSG context.

53. Cabinet will note that, despite the difficulties in achieving even this total, it is still £799 million lower than the Chief Secretary's target of £4,810 million. We shall need to discuss in Cabinet whether any means can be found of further reducing this gap.

ANNEX A

The Group has held discussions with the following Ministers:

Secretary of State for Defence
Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
Secretary of State for Agriculture
Secretary of State for Industry
Secretary of State for Trade
Secretary of State for Energy
Secretary of State for Transport
Secretary of State for the Environment
Secretary of State for Home Affairs
Secretary of State for Education and Science
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Secretary of State for Social Services
Secretary of State for Scotland
Secretary of State for Wales

MINISTERS' PROPOSALS AND MISC 11 RECOMMENDATIONS

£ million, 1979 Survey prices

	Chief Secretary's proposal (C(79)26)	Ministers' proposals	MISC 11 recommen- dation	Difference between recommendation and C(79)26
	1	2	3	(1 - 3)
fence	-300	+13	-115	-185
O (ODA)	-132	-107	-115	-17
O (other)	-28	-13	-13	-15
C Budget	+236	+236	+236	-
FF/IBAP/DAFS/WOAD	-43	-37	-43	-
restry Commission	-5	-5	-5	-
dustry	-187	-187	-187	-
ade	-20	-12	-17	-3
GD	+170	+170	+170	-
ployment	-513	-513	-513	-
ergy	-24	-7	-7	-17
ansport	-305	-250	-250	-55
E (housing)	-1264	-621	-1264	-
E (PSA)	-54	-54	-54	-
E (other)	-285	-212	-285	-
me Office	+10	+25	+24	-14
rd Chancellor's Dept	-4	-4	-4	-
ucation and Science	-860	-517	-547	-313
ts and Libraries	-33	-23	-28	-5
ISS (health)	-85	-85	-85	-
ISS (personal social services)	-118	-118	-118	-
ISS (social security)	-253	-242 to 257	-227	-26
ISO	-10	-10	-10	-
SD (civil superannuation)	-	-	-	-
DI	-3	-3	-3	-
ottish Office (excl. DAFS)	-410	-222*	-310*	-100*
lsh Office (excl. WOAD)	-130	-110*	-130*	-*
orthern Ireland	-160	-88*	-111*	-49*
TOTAL	-4810	-2996 to 3011	-4011	-799

Figures for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland are provisional. The figures are being revised to match the reductions for corresponding English services.

Decisions are also required on savings on the nationalised industries (see paragraph 9), which are not included in the above figures.