

PPS/CHANCELLOR

file no TEB/CA/01

copied to:

Mr Salveson (for transmission to No.10)
PS/CST
PS/FST
PS/EST
PS/MST(C)
PS/MST(R)
PS/Home Secretary
PS/Lord Chancellor
PS/Foreign Secretary
PS/Secretary of State for Education and
Science
PS/Lord President of the Council
PS/Secretary of State for Northern Ireland
PS/Secretary of State for Defence
PS/Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
PS/Secretary of State for Environment
PS/Secretary of State for Scotland
PS/Secretary of State for Wales
PS/Lord Privy Seal
PS/Secretary of State for Industry
PS/Secretary of State for Social Services
PS/Secretary of State for Trade
PS/Secretary of State for Energy
PS/Secretary of State for Transport
PS/Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
PS/Secretary of State for Employment
PS/Paymaster General
and officials in HMT, Revenue Departments
and other Departments in Whitehall

TREASURY WEEKLY BRIEF

I attach the latest version of this Brief. Changes from the previous Brief, of 10 May, are sidelined. Questions and answers on the impact of the Falklands crisis will be found from now on in new Section U.

m m Deyes

M M DEYES

Rn

R I G ALLEN

7 May 1982

EB Division
H M Treasury
01-233-3364

ECONOMIC BRIEF: CONTENTS

SOURCES

A	GENERAL ECONOMIC STRATEGY AND BULL POINTS	EB
B	ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND PROSPECTS	EB
C	LABOUR MARKET	EB
D	TAXATION	FP1/2
E	PUBLIC EXPENDITURE AND FINANCE	GEP1/2
F	CIVIL SERVICE STAFFING AND PAY	Manpower 1/Pay Divisions
G	SOCIAL SECURITY	SS1
H	PUBLIC SECTOR BORROWING	GEA1
J	MONETARY AND FINANCIAL POLICY	HF3
K	PRICES AND EARNINGS	IP2
L	BALANCE OF PAYMENTS	EF1
M	FOREIGN EXCHANGE AND RESERVES	EF1
N	EUROPEAN MATTERS	EC1
P	INDUSTRY	IP1
R	NATIONALISED INDUSTRIES	PE1/2
S	NORTH SEA AND UK ECONOMY	PE1/MP2
T	WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE	EF2
U	FALKLANDS CRISIS EFFECTS	EB, EF, GE, OF

ANNEX	AIDE MEMOIRE: RECENT ECONOMIC INDICATORS	EB
-------	--	----

A GENERAL ECONOMIC STRATEGY

1. Government's main economic objectives

Main objectives are to achieve, over a period, a sustained improvement in the economy through reduction of inflation and promotion of enterprise and initiative. Reduction of inflation requires maintaining steady but not excessive downward pressure on monetary variables, and complementary fiscal policies. Improvement of supply side depends on restoration of flexible and competitive market economy and better incentives.

2. Contribution made by 9 March Budget to economic strategy?

Budget continues Government's medium-term strategy for economy. Designed to make further progress on inflation and restore base for economic growth, improved output and increased employment. Tax cuts and other measures designed to help both business and individuals, within responsible fiscal framework.

3. Not enough help for industry?

Main help for industry is in pursuing policies that allow for lower inflation and ease pressure on interest rates. In addition, specific Budget measures aimed at industry and business will cost about £1 billion in 1982-83. Signs of recovery in profits and rather stronger financial position of industrial and commercial companies. (See also Section P).

4. Budget did more for industry than for people?

Help to industry is help to people. Higher allowances and thresholds more than compensate for inflation in last year and make up some of ground lost last year. Many other smaller changes (eg on charities) will help particular groups of people.

5. Effect of Budget on personal incomes, incentives etc?

See Section D.

6. Fiscal policy tighter than intended?

[PSBR outturn 1981-82 £8½ billion; Budget forecast in March 1981 was £10½ billion]

Not possible to answer this question until more known about why PSBR was lower in 1981-82. In assessing significance of low borrowing requirement in early months of this year, one needs to set it in a wider context. Lower borrowing by public sector in first quarter of 1982 must have been factor in sharp fall in our interest rates in those months - at a time when overseas interest rates generally remained high and stable.

7. 1982-83 PSBR needs revision?

[Guardian 17 May hints at scope for tax cuts].

Crucial judgement is, what PSBR would be consistent with Government's objectives for reducing monetary growth and inflation at acceptable interest rates. Nothing that has happened to date would suggest that judgement reached in the Budget needs any revision. Always a great number of uncertainties about economic developments both at home and abroad - and, as Chancellor indicated in Budget Speech, we shall keep development of fiscal policy under close review. (See also Section H for further material).

8. 1981-82 PSBR outturn inconsistent with MTFS?

Misleading to look at PSBR for individual years in isolation. Government's aim is to reduce PSBR as ratio of GDP over the medium-term. The estimates for outturn in 1981-82 suggest that the ratio in that year was about 3½ per cent, similar to ratio planned for this year. But looking over a longer run of years the trend is clearly downward.

9. Government's impact on inflation disappointing?

[NB ~~RPI~~ April figure to be published Friday 21 May likely to show single-figure inflation].

Judged by results, policy is succeeding. 12-monthly RPI inflation rate now 10½ per cent (March figure published 23 April) - down from 11 per cent in February. Single figure inflation rate expected shortly. In case of manufacturers' prices 12-monthly inflation rate already in single figures (8¼ per cent).

10. Economic recovery in doubt?

[February industrial production figures, published 15 April, show only relatively modest recovery from strikes/severe weather affecting December/January levels; industrial production still at broadly same level as last autumn; next figures to be published Tuesday 18 May. Next GDP(O) figures to be published Thursday 20 May likely to show fall.]

Profile of recovery likely to be uneven and jerky particularly when affected by such factors as very severe weather and industrial disputes. It remains the case that activity is above levels of last spring. Prospect is for resumed and continued recovery. This is supported by almost all independent assessments, CSO's cyclical indicators and business opinion survey indicators. Most encouraging pointer for sustainable recovery is progress being made against inflation.

11. Latest figures show decline in export volume?

Only one aspect of trade figures. Export volumes still about level of a year ago. Current account remains in healthy surplus. Imports of finished manufactures have fallen, indicating improved competitiveness of UK manufacturers.

12. Outlook for unemployment?

Budget forecast shows continuation of recovery; not the practice to publish estimates of the overall effects of the Budget, or its individual measures, on employment or output. (See also Section C)

13. Armstrong/unified Budget?

Await TCSC report with interest. Proposals need careful consideration. But Government does already take account of tax and expenditure when taking decisions on each.

14. Treasury model of economy 'rigged' to produce discouraging results from running TUC's alternative strategy through it?

[FT and The Times 13 May reported TUC complaints arising from paper put in by Chancellor for discussion at 7 April NEDC, showing five simulations, of which two requested by TUC at January meeting. Treasury published statement 14 May replying to TUC criticisms].

No question of Chancellor 'nobbling the favourite'. Model used for simulations in NEDC paper just same as used for pre-Budget work in Treasury. No secret that current model differs significantly in some respects from earlier version. Changes made in it in light of recent research were explained in Chancellor's paper, of which copy has been placed in House of Commons Library.

15. Outcome of Paris/Helsinki talks?

See T1.

16. Falkland effects?

See new Section U.

(i) Activity recovered since last Spring. Most recent major independent forecasts see the prospect of further recovery in 1982.

CBI survey (April) shows higher confidence and improved expectation of higher output and orders in next four months.

(ii) Earnings and settlements. Increases halved in 1980-81 pay round. Public sector in line. There is a good deal of evidence that average settlements in private sector are running lower than in the 1980-81 round. [CBI pay data bank for manufacturing settlements suggests average is now around 7 per cent compared with 9 per cent in previous round.]

(iii) Manufacturing productivity. Output per head rose 10 per cent during 1981. Output per head and output per person 4 and 7 per cent higher than previous peak in 1H 1979.

(iv) Unit labour costs: Pay moderation and higher productivity has meant dramatically low increase in manufacturers unit wage costs over last year - about 3 per cent in 3 months to February 1982 on a year earlier. Recent rate of increase below the average of our major competitors and comparable to that of Germany and Japan.

(v) Competitiveness. Cost competitiveness improved by over 10 per cent during 1981, reflecting pay moderation combined with exchange rate fall.

(vi) Profits: Industrial and commercial companies gross trading profits (excluding N.Sea and net of stock appreciation) rose strongly during 1981, up over 25 per cent between 1H and 2H 1981.

(vii) Exports have held up better than many feared (but lowish recent months figures have undermined earlier favourable comparison - non oil exports Sept '81 to Feb '82 up by less than $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on 1980). Engineering export orders up 17 per cent in 1981 on 2H 1980 to reach their highest level.

(viii) Unemployment. Rate of increase in unemployment has slowed further this year to just $\frac{1}{4}$ that of a year earlier. Vacancies improved since mid 1981. Short-time working in manufacturing reduced by over $\frac{1}{3}$'s since January 1981 and overtime working has increased.

(ix) Special employment measures. Total provision on Job Release Scheme, Temporary Short-Time Working Compensation and Community Enterprise Programme in 1982-83 now planned to reach over £520 million, with additional £61 million for young worker scheme (starting January 1982). Spending on Youth Opportunities Programme to rise to £700 million in 1982-83. 280,000 unemployed school-leavers last year found places on YOP by Christmas.

(x) Training. Over next 3 years £4 million to be provided to bring training schemes up to date. New Youth Training Scheme for school leavers to be introduced September 1983 represents major step towards comprehensive provision for young people.

(xi) Industrial relations. Number of strikes in 1980 and 1981 less than in any year since 1941 and number of working days lost only a third of average of last ten years.

(xii) Inflation. Increase in RPI more than halved since peak (21.9 per cent) in Spring 1980. 12 monthly RPI increase in March of 10.4 per cent. Wholesale price inflation in single figures - 8½ per cent in year to April. CBI April survey shows lowest degree of unit cost pressure for 15 years.

(xiii) Examples of export successes reported in the Press include: computer-system for handling chemical structures bought by two Japanese pharmaceutical companies (Fraser Williams (Scientific Systems Ltd)); Minster Automation (Wimborne, Dorset) expect to send abroad over 100 TIGERS (a telephone management and accounting system) during 1982.

(xiv) Overseas investment in UK: US direct investment in Britain amounted to stock of over \$14 billion in 1980. Nearly 60 per cent of all US outward non-oil direct investment now takes place in EC - over half of that in UK. Half of all Japanese investment in the EC also comes to Britain.

(xv) Overseas debt repayments. Official external debt reduced from over \$13.3 billion at end-1981.

(xvi) Innovation. Total of industrial robots in use in UK reached 713 last year; expected to pass 1000 this summer, UK is fifth in World league table of robot users.

Economic Briefing Division, HM Treasury, 01-233 3819/5809

B ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND PROSPECTS

1. Recent position?

[NB Q1 GDP (output) figures to be published Thursday 20 May likely to show some weakening on Q4 1981].

All three GDP measures were higher in real terms in Q4 1981 than had been earlier in year. GDP (output) in Q4 was nearly 1 per cent up on Q2 - the earlier low point.

[IF PRESSED on apparent weakening of recovery (based on November/December/January industrial production) - see 2 below.

2. Recent industrial and manufacturing production figures show resumed decline?

[NB March industrial production figures to be published Tuesday 18 May. Separate briefing will be supplied to No 10. Latest industrial and manufacturing production figures show upward revision to January's index removing decline shown last month and some bounceback in February's index to level of last November.].

Latest figures (including revisions) show that as expected February saw some recovery from weather and strike - affected levels at turn of year; and that effect of these in January was less than earlier presumed. CSO's press notice clearly states that underlying level of output above low point of spring of last year. Industrial and manufacturing output in 4Q 1981 some 2-3 per cent above low point earlier in year. (Compare A14)

3. April CBI Survey gloomy?

[Report in FT 6 May quotes Sir John Cleminson, chairman of CBI economic statistics committee, as saying that latest Survey 'does not support some of the more optimistic statements which Treasury Ministers have made about the prospects of recovery'. CBI commentary and their spokesman's remarks, in common with past experience, not helpful.]

Survey shows improved business optimism, and improved prospects for output, orders, inflation and company liquidity. These are certainly consistent with - and indeed support - view taken by Chancellor at Budget time of further recovery and falling inflation during 1982.

4. Other evidence of improvement in economy?

See Bull Points (following Section A).

5. Government assessment of prospects

[FSBR forecast (9 March) assesses recovery to have begun. Main points are:

	per cent increase on year earlier	
	1982	1983 H1
GDP	1½	2
Manufacturing output	3	2
Consumers expenditure	½	½
Investment (private sector and public corporation)	4½	5
Exports	3½	3

Forecast expects some stockbuilding in 1982, Government expenditure flat.

FSBR forecast sees prospect of some recovery continuing into 1983. (Last two Government assessments of economy were broadly correct). Healthy rise in private sector investment and exports. Inflation well into single figures (7½ per cent) by mid 1983. Further progress depends on continued moderation in domestic costs and restoration of competitiveness.

6. Outside forecasts

[GDP profile in major post-Budget assessments:

	<u>NIESR</u>	<u>LBS</u>	<u>St James</u>	<u>Phillips & Drew</u>	<u>CEPG</u>	<u>FSBR</u>
	(Apr)	(Apr)	(Apr)	(May)	(April)	(March)
Per cent change 1982 on 1981	+1½	+1½	+1½	+1½	-½	+1½

Nearly all see prospect of continued recovery in 1982 in line with FSBR, (as always, a range, with Cambridge forecast (CEPG) being the more pessimistic) and see inflation at 8-9½ per cent by Q4 1982 - also in line with FSBR. [See also C3 (unemployment), K4 (inflation) and L6 (balance of payments).]

5. Government assessment of prospects

[FSBR forecast (9 March) assesses recovery to have begun. Main points are:

per cent increase on year earlier 1982 1983 H1 GDP 1½ 2 Manufacturing output 3 2
 Consumers expenditure 1½ Investment (private sector and public corporation) 4½ 5
 Exports 3½ 3

Forecast expects some stockbuilding in 1982, Government expenditure flat.]

FSBR forecast sees prospect of some recovery continuing into 1983. (Last two Government assessments of economy were broadly correct). Healthy rise in private sector investment and exports. Inflation well into single figures (7½ per cent) by mid 1983. Further progress depends on continued moderation in domestic costs and restoration of competitiveness.

6. Outside forecasts

[GDP profile in major post-Budget assessments:

	<u>NIESR</u>	<u>LBS</u>	<u>St James</u>	<u>Phillips & Drew</u>	<u>CEPG</u>	<u>FSBR</u>
	(Apr)	(Apr)	(Apr)	(May)	(April)	(March)
Per cent change 1982 on 1981	+1½	+1½	+1½	+1½	-½	+1½]

Nearly all see prospect of continued recovery in 1982 in line with FSBR, (as always, a range, with Cambridge forecast (CEPG) being the more pessimistic) and see inflation at 8-9½ per cent by Q4 1982 - also in line with FSBR. [See also C3 (unemployment), K4 (inflation) and L6 (balance of payments).]

C LABOUR MARKET

1. Recent unemployment figures?

[Unemployment (UK adult seasonally adjusted) rose by 28,000 to 2,850,000 (11.9 per cent) in April. Total unemployment rose by 15,000 to 3,008,000 (12.6 per cent). Average monthly underlying increase in adult unemployment (after allowing for men over 60 transferring to long term Supplementary Benefit) are:

1980					
Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	First 4 months
105	77	62	51	33	23]

April's rise (though higher than very low increases in February and March) suggests further slowing down of rise in unemployment this year.

2. Vacancy figures disappointing?

[Vacancies (UK seasonally adjusted) fell slightly for second consecutive month to 110,000 in April, compared with 113,000 in February. Vacancy flow data for March (latest month available) show continued rise in outflow.]

Despite slight falls in last two months, vacancies still $\frac{1}{4}$ higher than at low point in Q2 1981 and flow (ie vacancy turnover) has improved.

3. Unemployment expected to continue rising rapidly?

[Outside forecasters see continued rise in registered unemployment during 1982 reaching about 3 million (UK adults) in Q4. Opinion divided for 1983; some (CEPG, Cambridge Econometrics, ITEM, NIESR) see rise continuing but at a slower rate, some broadly flat (LBS, St James) others (P&D, S & Coats) expect slight (roughly 50-100,000) fall in 1983. Liverpool foresee fall of 400,000.]

Unemployment forecasts uncertain; independent forecasters encompass differing views for 1983 - several projecting stabilisation, some [a slight] decline. Rise in unemployment drastically reduced since end 1980. Clear evidence of further slowing down this year - Q1 1982 rise just $\frac{1}{5}$ that in Q4 1980. Vacancies, short time and overtime all improved last year. Employment situation will benefit from some further recovery in activity this year.

4. CEPG expect 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ million unemployed by 1990?

As always there is a range of unemployment forecasts, with CEPG amongst most pessimistic (see parenthesis to $\frac{3}{4}$ above). Notably, CEPG unemployment forecasts now less pessimistic than a year ago.

5. Government forecasts for unemployment

[1982 PEWP uses working assumption of an average level of 2.9 million unemployed in Great Britain (excluding school leavers) in 1982-83 and rest of survey period. School leavers, adult students, temporarily stopped and Northern Ireland imply UK total unemployed of 3.2 million in 1982-83.]

Very difficult to forecast; depends on so many factors. Following well-established precedent of previous administrations in not publishing. Public Expenditure White Paper figures are planning assumptions not forecasts.

IF PRESSED that PEWP figures show Government planning sustained higher level of unemployment: No. Maintaining constant figure for the Survey period is conventional assumption adopted by previous Administration. Greater the progress that can be made in reducing inflation and maintaining moderation in pay settlements, the better the prospects for unemployment.

6. Employment continuing to fall?

[Total employment declined 1.9 million or 8 per cent in 2 years to Sept 1981. Provisional Q4 figures indicate decline of about 200,000 compared with 150,000 in Q3 and 300,000 per quarter in H1 1981.]

Decline in H2 1981 almost half that in H1. Other labour market indicators improving (see C1-3 above).

7. Unemployment higher than in other countries?

[On standardised definitions in Q3 1981 UK employment was 11½ per cent compared with 6¾ per cent OECD rate; a UK doubling compared with an OECD rise of a third since 1979.]

Whole world affected by rising unemployment. In our case we have additional self inflicted wounds of high pay awards and low productivity. Unemployment now rising very fast in some countries eg Germany.

8. High Exchequer costs of unemployment? Recent Treasury estimates suppressed?

[Mr Varley in interview LBC 26 April suggested £15 billion a year.]

No 'right' figure for cost per additional person, or cost per additional 100,000 unemployed. Possible to produce wide range of estimates depending on assumptions made and concepts followed. No single figure of this kind can purport to show how charges in unemployment alter the public finances. IF PRESSED: Estimates have been made of cost of additional registered unemployment (eg for 1980-81 in February 1981 EPR). There has been continued work on the various elements included in that calculation. Treasury at present considering basis on which estimates of Exchequer cost prepared.]

9. What is Government doing to provide more jobs?

Government pursuing sensible fiscal and monetary policies to curb inflation and creating conditions for enterprise - only measures that will ensure sustainable increase in employment. Nevertheless Government expanding schemes to meet special difficulties and improve training - eg plan to spend £1½ billion in cash on 1982-83 (40 per cent more than in 1981-82) on special employment and training measures; new Youth Training Scheme costing £1 billion a year from 1983-84; and ~~new measure announced in Budget~~. MSC studying proposed new ^{non-}profit-making scheme announced in Budget Speech.

10. Government reaction to MSC Task Group report on future of training for young people?

Task Group's proposals are of considerable significance for future shape of training arrangements for young school leavers, both employed and unemployed. Government will consider recommendations carefully with a view to reaching a decision as soon as possible this summer.

D TAXATION

1. Burden of taxation

[Total taxation (i.e including for example income tax, indirect taxes, corporation tax, rates and NIC) in 1978-79 was 34½ per cent of GDP (at market prices), 36 per cent in 1979-80, 37½ per cent 1980-81. It is forecast to be 40 per cent in 1981-82 and 39½ per cent in 1982-83.]

This has inevitably increased during a time when the recession has been adding to public spending. Changes proposed in Budget will reduce total burden in 1982-83 compared with 1981-82. [NB: Not true of burden on persons.]

2. Burden of tax has risen for most households since 1978-79?

[Comparisons given in Parliamentary Answers to Mr Straw 3 December, 17 February and 18 March col W199.]

Slow growth of output and difficulty of restraining public expenditure have inevitably meant higher tax burden. But real personal income after direct taxes still higher than under last Government. And more honest to raise taxes to finance necessary higher expenditure than to increase borrowing, with the increased interest rates and inflation that would bring.

3. Burden has fallen for the rich?

Abolition of absurdly high marginal rates and raising of thresholds in 1979 essential to remove disincentives. Reimposition of an 83 per cent top rate of income tax would finance a reduction of less than one quarter of 1p in the basic rate.

4. Burden has risen most for the poor?

Proportion of income paid in income tax and NICs will fall in 1982-83 for lowest paid taxpayers. And low paid with children entitled to benefits such as FIS.

5. Scope for tax cuts because of lower than expected PSBR in 1981-82?

No reason to believe that PSBR in 1982-83 will be lower than forecast (see A8⁷). Government want to cut taxes further, when economic circumstances permit, but more tax cuts too soon could jeopardise recovery.

6. Personal tax burden increased by recent Budget - when NICs taken into account?

[Full explanation given in Parliamentary Answer 11 March OA col 955].

The real increase in personal allowances and tax thresholds will reduce income tax as a percentage of income at all levels of incomes. Those over pension age who are taxpayers will benefit from income tax changes and will be unaffected by NIC rise, and, of course, State pensions are being uprated from November. [IF PRESSED: In immediate cash terms, increases in personal allowances etc will compensate for NIC increase for majority of

taxpayers. Taking into account increased earnings in 1982-83 (for example using the Government Actuary's 7½ per cent assumption) percentage of income paid in income tax plus NIC will rise for most people, but will fall for the lowest paid (below about ½ average earnings (married) and below about 1/3 average earnings (single).]

7. No improvement in incentives?

There will be 1.2 million fewer taxpayers than if allowances had remained at 1981-82 levels, and ½ million fewer higher rate taxpayers. For the substantial number taken out of tax or with reduced marginal rates, incentives will improve.

8. Poverty trap/unemployment trap getting worse?

[Joint (Treasury/DHSS/Inland Revenue) memorandum submitted to TCSC Sub-Committee.]

The poverty and unemployment traps are a matter for concern. They are the result of attempting to relieve poverty over a period of years when the economy has shown little growth. The answer is to get sustained growth going again - this is the objective of our economic policies.

9. Budget reduction in NIS not enough for industry?

Cut welcomed by CBI and industry generally. Provides substantial help on business costs. 1 per cent reduction maximum possible without risks for PSBR: outright abolition too costly. And other measures to help business directly - energy, construction, innovation and enterprise packages plus helpful - and welcomed - improvements in capital tax regime (see also Section P).

10. Excise duties increases inflationary/harmful to industries

Increases in excise duties as a whole slightly less than broadly compensate for past year's inflation. Variations between duties take account of industrial considerations e.g supplementary increase last July on tobacco/Scotch whisky industry/help for industry by smaller increases on e.g derv - mainly used by industry.

11. Government take from North Sea oil too high?

See S1.

12. Merger of tax and social security planned?

See G5.

E PUBLIC EXPENDITURE AND FINANCE

[Public Expenditure White Paper (Cmnd 8494) published 9 March. Gives planning totals of £115.2 billion in 1982-83, £121.1 in 1983-84 and £128.4 in 1984-85. About £5 billion higher than last White Paper in 1982-83 and £7 billion in 1983-84. Net effect of changes announced in Budget is to reduce totals to £114.9 billion, £120.4 billion and £127.6 billion].

1. Public expenditure too high?

Spending in 1982-83 planned to be about £5 billion (4½ per cent) lower than intended by last Government even if higher than planned when this Government first took office. Decisions to increase spending represent flexible but prudent response to changed circumstances e.g. additional spending to help young unemployed. Drive to improve management in public sector and reduce administration expenses continues.

2. Ratio of public spending to GDP is getting back to peak levels of mid 1970's?

Ratios in 1980-81 (43½ per cent) and 1981-82 (45 per cent forecast) remain below level of 1974-75 and 1975-76 (46 per cent in both years). [NB 1981-82 ratio could be nearer 44½ per cent. See H5.] Rise in ratio in 1981-82 mainly reflects higher expenditure on social security at a time when real GDP falling. Ratio expected to fall in next few years: assumptions in MTFs would mean figures of 44½ per cent in 1982-83, 42½ per cent in 1983-84 and 41 per cent in 1984-85. Reflects assumed GDP growth and curbing of public expenditure.

3. Increase spending in recession?

No good trying to spend way out of recession. Any benefits would be short-term. If increased spending not financed responsibly, would soon lead to more inflation. If financed prudently, would lead to higher interest rates and/or higher taxes. We are responding, within limits of prudence, to needs of current circumstances.

4. Real terms comparisons

No volume equivalents of cash plans. But cash increase in plans between years is 9 per cent in 1982-83, 5 per cent in 1983-84 and 6 per cent in 1984-85 (and projection of GDP deflator in MTFs is rather lower than this in 1982-83, rather higher in 1983-84 and about same in 1984-85). So in cost terms [i.e. cash inflated/deflated by general movement in prices] there is an increase in 1982-83, a decrease in 1983-84 and a small decrease in 1984-85.

5. Plans unrealistic, given e.g. overspending in 1981-82/future rates of inflation?

Total spending in 1981-82 expected to be only a little [NOT FOR USE: 0.4 per cent] higher than planned a year ago. Major reason for overspending is present level of spending by local authorities; this has been taken into account in plans. Realism, particularly in respect of local authorities and nationalised industries, is one reason why plans for future years are

higher than in previous White Paper. Large Contingency Reserves due to greater uncertainty in later years and designed to give realistic planning totals.

6. Higher inflation than allowed for in PEWP may raise public spending?

True that inflation assumption in FSBR slightly higher than in PEWP, but:

- for 1982-83 confident that planning total including Contingency Reserve will hold;
- for later years inflation assumption in FSBR a little higher than cost factors used in building up cash programmes;
- in due course, will consider adequacy of cash provision on programmes.

Meantime, uncertainties due to, for example, inflation, are one reason for large Contingency Reserves in later years; makes for realistic planning totals.

7. NIS reduction: effect on public expenditure?

[Programmes will be reduced to reflect reduction in NIS paid by public sector. First estimates of effect (included in post-Budget revised planning totals) is some £360 million in 1982-83 and £450-500 million in later years.]

Government's intention in reducing NIS is to help private industry, not public sector. Effect of clawback on public sector will leave its position broadly unchanged. (See also P2).

8. Not enough capital expenditure?

Government prepared to give priority to worthwhile capital projects wherever this can be done within overall spending totals. Plans do allow for changes between 1981-82 and 1982-83 as follows:

- public sector spending on new construction increased by 14 per cent;
- nationalised industries investment to rise by 26 per cent;
- increase in housing investment output [NOTE: if LAs take full advantage of receipts from sales, gross new investment can be as high as £3 billion next year];
- slight increase in work done on water and sewerage projects even though provision reduced).

9. Cuts in capital

Some reductions in cash provision necessary, but recent falls in tender prices (following sharp increases between 1978 and 1980) will mean that programmes mainly affected (roads, water, local environmental services) should be carried out as planned. Planned capital expenditure also reflects decline in needs since early mid-1970s (e.g roads, schools).

Planned spending should not jeopardise future standards and availability of public amenities and services.

10. TCSC criticise change to cash planning?

The TCSC do not dispute decision to change to cash planning. They are concerned rather with presentation of figures.

11. Cash planning means concentration on first year, not enough on services in later years?

Government recognise case for medium-term planning. But planning must be related to availability of finance as well as prospective real resources. Cannot accept unconditional commitment to forward plans for services. Volume plans formerly had to be cut when conflicted with financial constraints - e.g after IMF intervention in 1976.

12. Cash figures should be accompanied by constant price figures to give some idea of levels of service?

Constant price figures of limited value in new situation. Cash programmes intended to have primacy. Necessary to get away from old system of volume planning and destroy idea that programme-managers automatically entitled to be compensated for effects of inflation by revaluing their programmes. In any case old 'volume' figures not a measure of level of service. Simply measured resources put into programmes - inputs. The level of service provided - output - takes account not only of resource inputs, but efficiency and effectiveness of their use. We are continuing to review and develop use of output measures in planning and management of public expenditure.

13. End-year flexibility?

Possibility of end year flexibility is being looked at again. There could be some managerial advantages in such a scheme. But we also have to consider question of cost.

14. Cash limits 1982-83 and public sector pay?

(See Sections F and K.)

15. Cut public sector pay bill/administrative costs of central government?

Only one third of current expenditure is on wages and salaries and much of that is for nurses, teachers, members of armed forces, police and so on. Provision for public service pay increases next year limited to 4 per cent. Administrative costs are not far short of 10 per cent of total public expenditure. We are determined to reduce that proportion, and to maintain drive for more efficient management throughout public sector.

16. Falklands effects?

See new Section U.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

17. Overspending in 1982-83? Government response?

Disappointed that preliminary figures show local authorities are budgeting to spend above Government's plans. Overspending particularly to be regretted since plans are realistic. Local authorities could achieve them if they try hard enough. Government's response to combat overspending will be announced shortly. Scottish Secretary has announced that he will seek to reduce the grants of Lothian Regional Council (by £45 million) and Stirling District Council (by £1½ million). The authorities have only themselves to blame for these grant penalties. They can avoid them if they plan for more reasonable levels of expenditure.

18. Government's plans for later years are unattainable?

[Press reports have claimed that White Paper implies 9 per cent total reductions in 1983-84].

Government's plans for 1983-84 are fair and realistic - they are 4 per cent higher than for 1982-83. [IF PRESSED: if this means that LAs are faced with need to make substantial economies, reason will be LA's overspending in 1982-83].

19. Large rate increases this year are Government's fault?

Not at all. If local authorities had sought to spend in line with Government's plans, rate increases should be very low. Where they are high, it is because local authorities have chosen to overspend.

20. Effect of NIS reduction on local authorities?

As Chancellor announced in Budget, we intend that local authorities overall will be neither worse nor better off as a result of decrease in NIS. We are aware of the difficulties involved in offsetting the reduction by a decrease in grant, and are looking constructively at possibility of postponing the reductions for local authorities until April 1983.

21. Green Paper on Domestic Rating System: Government response?

Government is considering carefully all representations received. We wish to produce proposals for a scheme that will remedy shortcomings of present system while commanding wide support.

F CIVIL SERVICE STAFFING AND PAY

[Functions being exercised by HM Treasury since 16 November 1981: (1) civil service manpower, pay and allowances, retirement policy and superannuation scheme, staff inspection and evaluation, (ie central allocation and control of resources), (2) responsibility for Central Computer and Telecommunication Agency and Civil Service Catering Organisation (3) civil service industrial relations. Functions being exercised by Management and Personnel Office (MPO): (1) civil service efficiency, personnel management, recruitment and training, (2) Office of Parliamentary Counsel (3) machinery of government questions.]

1. Civil Service too big/does too much/is over staffed?

Since the Government came to office, Civil Service has been reduced by 9 per cent to 666,400. This is smallest since 1966. This results from a reduction in functions, privatisation and improvements in efficiency. We are on course to achieve our aim of having a Civil Service of 630,000 by April 1984. This is 102,000 fewer staff in post than in April 1979, and will mean the smallest Civil Service since the end of the war.

2. Civil service pay: non-industrial civil servants

[Settlement date 1 April 1982.]

Civil Service Arbitration awarded pay increases ranging from 4.75 per cent to 6.25 per cent - worth 5.9 per cent overall - and increases in annual leave. Government announced on 6 May its decision to accept the award. Increases (announced 12 May) for the higher civil service (under-secretary and above) are larger; they have been decided in the light of the recommendations of the Top Salaries Review Body. Cash limits and manpower targets are not being adjusted. (See also Section K)

3. Civil Service pay: industrials

[Settlement date 1 July 1982]

Claim for increase in pay in line with inflation, a shorter working week and longer holidays, is under consideration.

4. Scott Report/Public sector pensions?

See K 23.

G SOCIAL SECURITY

1. Now that unemployment benefit is to be brought into tax why not restore November 1980 5 per cent abatement?

Decision to abate UB not simply taken as proxy for tax but to reduce public expenditure and improve incentives to find and keep work. (Chancellor's Budget statement in March 1980 made that perfectly clear.) Those reasons remain valid. Any improvement on rates announced would seriously worsen incentives. Cost too would be high - £60 million in full year [net of reduced claims for supplementary benefit, but gross of tax].

2. Why cut child dependency additions to unemployment benefit?

[In line with practice in recent years, uprated level of child dependency additions to unemployment benefit (not Supplementary Benefit) abated by amount of increase in Child Benefit. In consequence, CDAs will drop from current level (80p) to 30p next November.]

Child dependency additions to unemployment benefit are being phased out, and will eventually be replaced entirely by Child Benefit. In this we are following practice adopted by last Labour Government.

3. Increasing supplementary benefits by less than forecast movement of prices hits at poorest of the poor, and breaks an election pledge?

The benefits will retain their value in real terms. Beneficiaries receive not only their scale rate entitlement but a cash payment to cover their housing costs in full. By uprating scale rates in line with RPI which includes housing costs, there has been some double provision. The change corrects that. The abatement of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent represents a broadly based adjustment for the likely relative movement of housing costs to November 1982. [NOTE: we do not want to make public a forecast of a housing index.]

4. Death grant - increase to realistic level?

[Consultative document about death grant published 3 March, comments asked for by 30 July.]

Social Services Secretary would welcome comments on recently published consultative document on death grant. As have made clear, aim is to redistribute in more sensible fashion resources now devoted to death grant - cannot afford to add to those resources.

5. Merger of income tax and national insurance planned?

Government's written evidence to TCSC did not suggest such a merger. Committee asked about feasibility of merging the two systems, and the evidence gave an illustration of what a joint system would look like.

H PUBLIC SECTOR BORROWING

1. Reasons for £2 billion PSBR undershoot in 1981-82?

Reasons not yet fully understood, since information on borrowing comes earlier than information on the flows of expenditure and revenue that give rise to that borrowing. Budget forecast based on best estimates at time of 1982-83 FSBR. Always considerable uncertainties at time of Budget. Spending, and some forms of borrowing, often high and variable in March. We shall certainly study reasons for shortfall and see what lessons they hold.

2. Why treat PSBR as a crucial statistic when forecasting errors of this size can occur?

Importance of balance between government's spending and income recognised by all governments, whatever the difficulties of forecasting.

3. Implications of shortfall 1982-83 for fiscal policy and MTFS?

See A. 7.

4. If PSBR higher in 1982-83 than in 1981-82 won't interest rates have to rise?

As percentage of GDP, outturn for 1981-82 is more or less equal to the forecast for 1982-83 ie around 3½ per cent. The 1982-83 forecast is still a low figure both by comparison with deficits abroad and in relation to size of deficits over past decade.

5. Implications for public expenditure in 1981-82 and 1982-83?

Not known exactly what 1981-82 outturn will be nor the implications for 1982-83, as will be some time before information on 1981-82 outturn will emerge. [IF PRESSED: It is estimated, on very incomplete information, that the planning total will fall from £105.2 billion in the FSBR to around £104.5 billion (around £104 billion was provisional estimate given in other briefing) and that ratio of public expenditure to GDP will fall from 45 per cent to 44½ per cent].

6. Implications of CGBR outturn in April for year 1982-83?

[CGBR for April published last week £0.8 billion, compared with £2.4 billion in April 1981.]

Too soon to make any change in forecast for year on basis of only one month's figures. Last year's figures distorted by Civil Service dispute.

7. Effect of Civil Service dispute on PSBR?

PSBR in both 1981-82 and 1982-83 affected by Civil Service dispute. In 1981-82 some £ $\frac{3}{4}$ billion of receipts delayed from March 1981 were collected, but some £1 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion of receipts due in 1981-82 will now be collected in 1982-83. Debt interest cost of the strike some £ $\frac{1}{2}$ billion in 1981-82.

8. Fiscal policy should be based on cyclically adjusted/real PSBR?

Some merit in inflation-adjusted measure as indicator of fiscal stance in some circumstances. But there are dangers here: it would be quite wrong to expand PSBR in cash terms in response to an upsurge in inflation merely to keep inflation-adjusted measure constant. Policies intended to eradicate inflation, not to adjust to it.

J MONETARY AND FINANCIAL POLICY

1. Monetary growth in 1982-83

[In banking April (second month of target period) M3 and PSL2 provisionally estimated to have increased by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent respectively; M1 to have been flat (all seasonally adjusted). Target range is for annual rates of growth of 8-12 per cent.]

Too early to judge outturn with any greater precision than at Budget time. But recent figures encouraging.

2. Monetary conditions too tight?

Behaviour of exchange rate and money GDP as well as monetary aggregates suggest financial conditions have been moderately restrictive as intended. But bank lending still high, despite level of interest rates. Companies' financial position much stronger than a year ago. (See P3)

3. Bank lending

Still very strong. Part at least is substitution for lending by building societies and other forms of consumer credit. To extent that it is additional, adds to inflationary pressure, so must avoid premature relaxation of interest rates.

4. Prospects for lower interest rates?

[Bank base rates reduced by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 13 per cent with effect from 12 March. Have come down by 3 per cent from peak of 16 per cent last autumn. Market rates have recovered to levels just after Budget.

Of course we want to see lower rates. Have seen significant reductions over past 6 months. But we must proceed cautiously if we are not to let up in the fight against inflation.

5. Will high and unstable US rates affect UK rates?

US rates not sole determinant of UK rates, but high US rates certainly an adverse development and in September were a key factor in driving our rates up. Recently, however, sterling has remained reasonably firm, probably helped by improved prospects for wage round, and good trade figures. UK interest rates have eased this year against US trend; but we cannot insulate ourselves from difficult international background. (See also T10.)

6. Falls in interest rates since New Year incompatible with strategy?

Taking account of all evidence, present levels of interest rates are consistent with policy of continuing downward pressure on inflation.

7. MTFS being quietly shelved?

[3rd MTFS states Government's objectives 'to reduce inflation and to create conditions for sustainable growth in output and employment', by 'steady but not excessive downward pressure on monetary conditions'. Key financial indicators are the monetary aggregates and exchange rate. Target range for growth of M1, £M3, PSL2 in period February 1982 - April 1983 of 8-12 per cent. Illustrative path of 7-11, 6-10 per cent in 1983-84, 1984-85. Targets for later years to be set nearer the time.]

No. Updated MTFS is realistic and flexible, describes how monetary policy operated in practice. MTFS serves useful purpose. Right to retain and adjust in light of experience.

8. Monetary targets discredited?

Monetary targets have important role in defining medium term direction of policy. But short term movements in monetary aggregates not always reliable guide to monetary conditions. Policy decisions based on assessment of all available evidence.

9. Overshoot of 1981-82 monetary target

[£M3 grew by 13.0 per cent per annum in 1981-82 target period compared with target range of 6-10 per cent; M1 grew by 7.2 per cent per annum, and PSL 2 by 12.1 per cent per annum over same period.]

Growth in £M3 was above top end of 1981-82 target range, even allowing for effects of Civil Service strike. At least part of excess reflects increasing market share of banks in mortgage lending. Also reflects longer term effects of institutional changes such as ending of corset, abolition of exchange controls and changes in savings behaviour. These factors imply higher monetary growth permissible for same increase in nominal incomes.

10. Falklands crisis effects?

See new Section U.

K PRICES AND EARNINGS

1. Inflation still higher than when Government took office?

[Average 12 monthly rate of RPI inflation between February 1974 and May 1979 was 15.4 per cent; average level of inflation since May 1979 has been 14.1 per cent.]

Average level of inflation will be lower under this Government than under its predecessor. This will be the first Government since the war that has achieved a lower rate of inflation than its predecessor.

2. When will single figure inflation be achieved?

[12 monthly rate of RPI inflation 10.4 per cent in March compared with 11 per cent in February, and 21.9 per cent in May 1980. RPI April figure to be published Friday 21 May likely to show single figure inflation.]

We expect rate of inflation to be below 10 per cent shortly.

3. What reason is there to expect a further decline in inflation?

Over the next year or so, moderation in unit labour costs should continue to exert downward pressure on the rate of inflation, as should weak commodity prices. Competitive pressures on firms to limit price rises are also likely to remain strong.

4. FSBR inflation forecast more optimistic than major outside forecasts?

Assessments released since Budget expect single figure inflation to be recorded this year (LBS, NIESR, P&D, Simon and Coats, St James). April CBI quarterly survey shows substantial decline in net balance of firms expecting higher prices and costs in next four months. Balance of firms expecting higher costs now lowest for 15 years].

5. Effect of 1982 Budget on RPI?

Compared with full indexation of excise duties, direct effect of Budget is RPI reduction of 0.1 per cent (or an increase of 0.1 per cent including also the direct effect of the 2 December measures). [IF PRESSED on non-indexed basis: direct effect is 0.8 per cent increase in the RPI (or 1.4 per cent including also 2 December measures).]

6. Effect of 1982 Budget on TPI?

Compared with full indexation of excise duties, direct effect of Budget is TPI reduction of 0.4 per cent (or increase of 1.1 per cent including also direct effect of 2 December measures). [IF PRESSED on non-indexed basis: direct effect is 1.6 per cent reduction (or a 0.3 per cent increase including also 2 December measures).]

7. Nationalised industry prices

Nationalised industry price rises have been due in part to the ending of the previous Government's policy of artificial and distortionary price restraint. But since middle of 1980-81, gap between NI price increases and RPI has narrowed. [See R12]

8. Private sector pay

[CBI figures suggest that manufacturing settlements monitored since 1 August are averaging around 7 per cent.]

Settlements have been lower in recent months, reflecting an increasing sense of realism about pay. But the need is for continuing low settlements which are consistent with maintaining economic recovery and improving employment prospects.

9. Public sector pay

Government's approach to pay in the public services must take account of what the taxpayer can afford. Pay negotiations in the nationalised industries and local authorities are a matter for the parties concerned, as are the financial consequences of any settlements reached.

10. 4 per cent pay factor abandoned?

The 4 per cent factor is not a pay norm, but a broad measure of what Government thinks reasonable and can be afforded in fixing provision from which public service wage bill has to be met. Government has decided to accommodate cost of Civil Service arbitration award within the relevant provision. Only if exceptional difficulties arose later in the year would limited calls on the contingency reserve be considered.

11. But doctors, dentists, armed forces have also had more than 4 per cent?

Part of cost of Government's proposals for doctors and dentists will be met within existing provision, and part from contingency reserve. Financing of the AFPRB award will be decided when current uncertainties about the defence budget have been resolved.

12. Government norm now 6 per cent?

There is no norm, nor has there been. The 4 per cent factor remains the basis on which provision for public service pay has been set. Where extra provision has been needed to help finance proposed higher increases, as with nurses, doctors and dentists, it has been found partly from other savings on programmes concerned and partly from contingency reserve.

13. Government satisfied with 6 per cent?

Increases of 6 per cent are higher than provision which the Government made for pay within programmes. They will have implications for level of non-pay expenditure.

14. Current level of pay settlements

The recent decisions on public service pay which the Government has announced confirm the downward trend of settlements since the last pay round, when they generally averaged 8-9 per cent. Settlements are also well below rate of inflation for second year running.

15. Why only 4 per cent for NHS ancillaries and white collar grades?

Cost of the Civil Service arbitration award will be accommodated within 4 per cent pay provision. Moreover, within the range of pay increases announced both for the Civil Service and the Armed Forces, many civil servants and Servicemen will get only a little above the 4 per cent being offered to some NHS groups.

16. Top Salaries Review Board increases too large compared with (eg 6.4 per cent for nurses)

[Government announced on 12 May increases of 14.3 per cent for senior civil servants and senior members of the Armed Forces, and 18.6 per cent for the judiciary.]

Government believes these increases are fully justified. Essential to ensure adequate supply of candidates of sufficient calibre for the Bench, and to provide adequate career structure and differentials in higher levels of Civil Service and Armed Forces. TSRB are only group whose present salaries are below those recommended for April 1980.

17. Why only 4 per cent for MPs (also announced 12 May)?

Problems of recruitment, career structure and differentials do not apply to MPs. Government therefore felt it appropriate to propose increases no higher than the pay factor included in Estimates.

18. Average earnings index

[Year on year growth 11.3 per cent in February compared with 10.8 per cent in January, though (unpublished) underlying increase slightly less than in recent months at around 10½ per cent. NB March figures to be published Wednesday 19 May.]

Recent buoyancy of earnings partly reflects increase in hours worked, which is an effect of the emerging revival of activity, particularly in manufacturing. Change over the 12 months to February straddles two pay rounds - not useful indicator of recent trends.

19. Comparison of TPI and index shows that real take-home pay has fallen over the past year

Yes. But follows growth of 17½ per cent in personal living standards in three years 1977-80.

20. Movement in TPI

Fact that TPI has been increasing faster than RPI (roughly 3½ per cent faster over year to March 1982) reflects measures taken to restrain Government borrowing -essential if inflation is to be controlled.

21. Government aiming to cut living standards?

[Although RPDI was 1 per cent higher in 1981 Q4 than in 1979 Q1, it is likely to fall below the 1979 Q1 level during 1982]

Government seeking to create conditions for sustained improvements in living standards. This requires creation of more competitive and profitable industrial sector. Means that less of increase in nominal incomes should be absorbed by higher pay. The lower the level of settlements, the greater the headroom for output and employment to expand.

22. Incomes Policy

Proposals for incomes policies, including recent refinements, do not avoid many of the familiar problems of norms, evasion, administrative cost, and interference with market forces. Experience gives no encouragement to the idea that incomes policies can be made to work on a permanent basis. They always succumb to the distortions they create.

23. Index-linked pensions and the Scott Report?

The Government is considering the whole question in the light of the Scott Report. Our aim is to ensure that public servants' pensions are fair to taxpayers, as well as to current employees and pensioners and their dependants.

M EXCHANGE RATE AND THE RESERVES

1. Policy towards the exchange rate

[Since last autumn sterling has remained broadly stable. The average £ effective rate in Q1 1982 was over 10 per cent lower than in Q1 1981. Recent lows were \$1.7470 on 6 April, DM 4.07 on 20 October. Highs were \$1.97 on 30 November, DM 4.407 on 9 February. Rates at noon on 14 May were \$1.8195, DM 4.202 and an effective of 90.4. Reserves at end April stood at \$18.159 billion, compared with \$19.0 billion at end March.]

The Government has no target for the exchange rate. The rate is taken into account in interpreting domestic monetary conditions and taking decisions on policy.

2. Bank of England intervening to support the rate?

Policy is unchanged. The Bank do intervene to smooth excessive fluctuations and preserve orderly markets particularly when conditions are unsettled. But as the Chancellor has already stated we have no target - undisclosed, secret or otherwise - for the exchange rate.

3. Coordinated intervention to reduce the value of the dollar?

All the experience in recent years is that exchange rates for major currencies cannot be manipulated by intervention alone. Intervention can help to steady markets, but not counter major exchange rate trends. That takes changes in real policies, affecting interest rates, monetary conditions and fiscal policies. Lower US inflation is in everyone's interest: the matter for real concern is the US fiscal/interest rate mix, a problem all countries are familiar with.

4. Sterling should join the EMS?

[See N11-12]

5. Lower the exchange rate to help UK competitiveness?

Effective exchange rate is now about same as when Government came to office. So any loss of competitiveness since then is entirely due to our paying ourselves more than we can afford. Only way to achieve lasting gains in competitiveness is by cutting inflation and bringing costs under control.

6. Debt repayments

We have made excellent progress with our plans to reduce the burden of external debt substantially during this Parliament. We aimed to reduce official external debt to \$14 billion by end of 1981. This has been more than achieved - external debt is now around \$13½ billion, compared with over \$22 billion when the Government took office.

7. Falkland crisis effects?

See new Section U.

L BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

1. February trade figures

Current account surplus in February estimated at £ 664 million - largest monthly surplus since normal processing of trade figures resumed last September. Visible trade surplus was £174 million, and projected invisible surplus of £480 million reflected EC budget refunds of around £800 million in 1982 Q1.

2. Exports

Exports partially recovered from fall in January, and continue above level of a year earlier in volume terms. Export of oil and consumer goods (other than cars) were notably strong.

3. Imports

Import volumes of finished manufactured goods were 6 per cent lower in January and February than in 1981 Q4. However imports of basic materials have risen slightly over this period. This suggests that domestic industry is using materials at much the same rate as in 1981 Q4 but that UK manufacturers are now being more successful in the home market.

4. Why is invisible surplus projection so high?

The projected invisibles surplus of £480 million takes into account further EC budget refunds of over £800 million in Q1 1982 (see N5). Earnings of overseas oil companies operating in the North Sea are likely to have been depressed, reducing debits on the interest, profit and dividends account.

5. Balance of payments Q4 1981

Current account established to have been £1,541 million in surplus in Q4, including a visible trade surplus of £623 million. Total 1981 current account surplus £8 billion.

6. Prospects for 1982?

[FSBR projects surplus of £4 billion on current account; average margin of error is £2 billion. Outside forecasts range from near balance to £7 billion surplus.]

Nearly all forecasts see continued surplus - albeit below last year's record level.

7. Falklands crisis effects?

See new Section U.

N EUROPEAN MATTERS

MEMBERSHIP OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

1. 'Mandate negotiations'

[SUBJECT TO FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS DURING WEEK.]

Foreign Ministers continued their discussions informally on 16 [and 17] May. The Commission proposed a one-year solution to the UK budget problem, as provided for in the original 30 May agreement. We are considering this proposal, although we believe that early agreement on a longer term solution remains the best course for both Britain and the Community.

2. Linkage with CAP prices or Argentine sanctions?

On agricultural prices, all member states agreed that the three chapters of the Mandate - development of Community policies, agriculture and the budget - must be taken together. Agricultural prices and the budget are thus ^{organically} originally linked. We could not agree to the former, which has a large effect on our budget contribution, without any idea what that contribution will eventually be. On Argentine sanctions, there is and can be no link whatever with the 'Mandate' negotiations, and no one has suggested that there should be such a link.

3. What level of contribution would HMG consider fair?

Government has made it clear that, in spite of our relative economic position, UK is prepared to remain a net contributor - but only on a very modest scale.

4. Net UK contribution to community too high?

A lot lower than it would have been without the refund agreement of 30 May 1980.

5. UK refunds in respect of 1981

Commission paid us before 31 March £813 million for supplementary measures as first instalment of our refunds in respect of 1981. This represents 81 per cent of our entitlement for that year. Our net contribution for 1981-82 is now put at some £200 million - very substantially less than it would have been without the 30 May 1980 budget agreement.

6. UK a net recipient in 1981?

[Commission's latest estimates suggest that we were small net beneficiaries in 1981]

On our figures, we remained a small net contributor to the allocated Community budget.

We also, of course, contribute to aid etc. which is part of the unallocated budget. Very satisfactory that the outturn was better than expected: for we remain one of the less prosperous member states.

7. Will UK have to repay or forego refunds if net contribution less than originally estimated?

No. The UK is clear that minimum net refunds payable under 30 May agreement are 1175 million ecus (European Currency Units) for 1980 and 1410 million ecus for 1981.

8. Do supplementary measures grants lead to additionality?

There is additionality in that refunds enable public expenditure in the regions and elsewhere to be higher than would otherwise have been possible.

9. Policy for CAP reform

Key measures are price restraint, curbs on surplus production and strict control of the growth of guarantee expenditure.

10. Costs of CAP to UK consumers

The Minister of Agriculture has dealt with a number of questions on this. Costs to consumers of the CAP as such depend on nature of alternative support system that is envisaged. Arrangements leading to a reduction in the cost of food to the consumer could well involve increased costs to taxpayers.

EUROPEAN MONETARY SYSTEM

11. What is the current attitude of the UK Government?

We fully support the EMS, and acknowledge the contribution which it has made to stability in the exchange markets. However, we do not yet feel able to join the exchange rate mechanism. We must wait until conditions are right for the system and for ourselves.

12. Join the EMS for exchange rate stability?

There is no reason to suppose that by the simple act of joining the EMS exchange rate mechanism we would guarantee exchange rate stability. This has not been the experience of the current participants. Genuine stability requires a return to low inflation rates throughout the Community.

P INDUSTRY

1. Prospects for industry-recovery?

Fall in output has now come to an end. Industrial production in Q4 1981 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent up on Q3 and some 2 per cent up on H1. Budget forecast suggests there may be 3 per cent increase in manufacturing output in 1982 as a whole. Latest CBI survey encouraging (see B3).

2. Company financial position?

[Non-oil industrial and commercial companies (ICC's) gross trading profits (net of stock appreciation) rose by over a quarter between 1H and 2H 1981, but from a very low base - ICC's real rate of return just $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1981. ICC's finances showed some weakening in 4Q reflecting slowdown in destocking and unwinding of civil service dispute, but finances better in 1981 as a whole -

	1979	1980	1981 Year	H1	H2	£bn
Net borrowing requirement (+)/repayments (-)	+6.1	+5.7	+4.4	-1.2	+5.6	
Financial surplus (+)/deficit (-)	-2.7	- 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	+1.2	+1.5	-0.3]

Increase in profits (albeit from low level) encouraging. Some apparent deterioration in financial position reflects slowdown in rate of destocking, and effects of unwinding of civil service dispute (which delayed companies' tax payments), but companies' finances much healthier in 1981 than in two previous years.

3. Births and deaths of firms

[Report in FT 11 May of Henley Management College Paper showing 'more firms now dying than being born?']

No really satisfactory statistics to measure this. Henley used lists of firms registered under Companies Acts - not same thing as list of actively trading companies (eg sole traders and partnerships excluded, firms sold in liquidation to other companies counted as 'deaths'). A better guide might be the list of 1.3 million firms registered for VAT: latest available figures (1980) show births and deaths roughly in balance.

4. Rate of return still too low?

[Real pre-tax rate of return of ICCs was $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1981 - half the previous lowest figure in 1975.]

Yes, but Government can only help in limited ways. Fundamental improvement in ICC's profits and real rates of return depend on improved performance by companies, both

management and employees. Much encouraged by recent productivity gains and trend towards moderate pay settlements.

5. High interest rates damaging for industry and investment?

[Each 1 per cent in interest rates raises interest payments on industry's borrowing by around £250 million.]

Budget measures have eased pressure on interest rates, and the recent $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent fall in the banks' base rates is encouraging. But Government believes best way it can help industry and promote investment is to create a climate in which business can flourish. Essential to get rate of inflation down so as to create a stable environment for business decision-taking. Continuing relatively high level of interest rates must be seen in context of priority attached to reducing inflation and need to control growth in money supply underlying the MTFs. (See brief J).

6. Government help for small firms

Budget provided further help for small businesses, increasing the number of measures taken so far to over ninety. Enterprise package included further reduction in weight of corporation tax; further increases in VAT registration limits; increase in global amount available for loans under Loan Guarantee Scheme this year (see below); and doubling of investment limit under Business Start-Up Scheme to £20,000 a year. New measures will encourage start-ups and existing firms.

7. Response to Loan Guarantee Scheme?

Scheme operating successfully. We have already issued more than 3,900 guarantees - about half to new businesses. Total lending under scheme is just under £132 million. Budget provided for the lending ceiling - in year to May 1982 - to be raised from £100 million to £150 million. Further £150 million will be made available in following year. Three more banks admitted to scheme in April making total of thirty financial institutions now participating.

8. Progress with setting up Enterprise Zones?

[Chancellor inaugurating Isle of Dogs zone on Friday 21 May.]

Excellent progress being made. All of eleven zones now in operation, following designation of final zone - Isle of Dogs - in April.

9. Response from private sector?

Response has been very encouraging. Many new firms are setting up in the zones, existing firms are expanding their activities and vacant land has been brought into use. Too early to assess success of zones.

R NATIONALISED INDUSTRIES

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS WITH NATIONALISED INDUSTRIES

[Industry Secretary announced 15 March that Government is to change its dealings with nationalised industries by agreeing objectives with each, putting more emphasis on efficiency by increasing Monopolies and Mergers Commission references and through board structures, and by strengthening business expertise in Whitehall.]

1. Whitehall making a take-over bid for the industries?

Monitoring not same as interference in management. Crucial for officials and Ministers to be informed about the industries' progress and about any problems that arise; no intention to interfere with proper role of management within the industries.

EXTERNAL FINANCING LIMITS

2. EFLs for 1982-83 and future years?

Nationalised industries' total external finance increased by £1.3 billion in 1982-83 (£1.2 billion after allowing for NIS cut and other changes), £1.7 billion in 1983-84, £1.2 billion in 1984-85 - a total of over £4 billion over the three years of the Survey. Government has given full recognition to problems faced by the industries in a period of recession. Increase in 1982-83 was roughly half what the industries bid for.

3. Unreasonable to reduce EFLs following NIS cut?

Reduction in the National Insurance Surcharge was designed to benefit private sector; not the intention that public sector should gain from it. Amendments to EFLs announced 7 April are offsets to the addition to the industries' internal resources that would have followed the NIS cut. No industries will be worse off than previously, and their plans should be unchanged.

4. Pay assumptions?

Government has not set pay or any other assumptions for the industries. Moderate pay settlements - and restraint of current costs generally - essential if investment programmes to be maintained and prices to consumers kept down.

INVESTMENT

5. How robust are the forecasts of nationalised industry demand/contributions to public expenditure, given the recent track record?

Plans published in PEWP at Budget time considerably less optimistic than those published last year. In particular, in increasing substantially the external finance available to the industries in each year of the Survey, Government recognised effect of lower demand on the industries' internal resources - now expected to be well below the levels in last year's White Paper (by about £2 billion in each of the years 1982-83 and 1983-84). The industries' external financing needs still expected to decline over Survey period, but from higher base and at more gradual rate than forecast last year.

6. Investment plans unlikely to be attained?

No Government can unconditionally guarantee a level of investment by the nationalised industries. Approved levels set out in White Paper are consistent with the industries' agreed external financing requirements, on the basis of their internal resource forecasts. But perfectly possible that plans might need to be revised, for example if the industries fail to restrain their current costs, including pay.

7. But shortfall in capital spending 1981-82?

[Figures in FSBR imply shortfall of £¼ billion.]

Not easy to establish firm reasons after the event. Such evidence as we have suggests a mixture of reasons. Most important has been cut in investment in response to changed circumstances such as lower market demand. These cuts have been extraneous and have not borne any direct relationship to EFL pressures. Other cuts have been for wholly beneficial reasons, such as lower than expected inflation and cost savings.

8. Take nationalised industry investment out of PSBR?

Real problem of pressure on resources cannot be solved by changing statistical definitions. Since nationalised industries are part of public sector, their borrowing - for whatever purpose - must by definition form part of public sector borrowing requirement.

9. Private finance for NI investment?

[NEDC Working Party's study of nationalised industry investment was discussed at Council's 5 October meeting: agreed there should be review of progress to be completed by June 1982.]

We have indicated willingness to consider new financing proposals. Direct market finance can only be justified if there is genuine element of performance-related risk for investors, in order to improve incentives to management efficiency, and if new forms of saving are

tapped, to avoid adverse monetary consequences. Market financing does not of itself lessen burden on financial markets.

10. Does Government propose to sell shares in BT?

Recent press reports are speculative. As the Chancellor announced in Budget statement, detailed work is proceeding on 'Buzby bond'. Government continues to examine ways in which market pressures could be brought to bear on nationalised industries, including BT.

11. Finance more nationalised industry investment by cutting current spending?

Yes. As in private sector, moderate pay settlements and control of other costs are essential. Ability to finance new investment in nationalised industries bound to diminish if excessive pay settlements agreed. Each 1 per cent off wages saves about £140 million this year; and each 1 per cent off total costs saves £330 million this year.

NATIONALISED INDUSTRY PAY AND PRICES

12. Nationalised industries' prices

[March figures: RPI up 11.4 per cent, NI component up 11.5 per cent.]

Nationalised industries' price rises have been due in part to ending of previous Government's policy of artificial and distortionary price restraint between 1974 and 1980. But since middle of 1980-81, gap between NI price increases and RPI has narrowed. Artificial price restraint would result in unacceptable increased burden on taxpayer and distortion of market forces.

[CAUTION: gap between NI and 'all items' RPI could widen again in near future. Factors include LT fare increases in spring, winter electricity discount scheme ending, dropping out of RPI of last year's double revalorisation of excise duties.]

PRIVATISATION

13. What further sales expected?

Special sales of assets in 1982-83 forecast at around £700 million and around £600 million in each of the later years. These figures well above those in last White Paper. This reflects primarily very large sales of energy assets - Britoil and the British Gas Corporation's major offshore oil assets - to be made possible by Oil and Gas (Enterprise) Bill currently before the House.

14. Special asset sales in 1981-82

Gross sales in 1981-82 totalled £481 million, so target published in 1981 Public Expenditure White Paper of £500 million nearly met. Pleasing result - included two large sales - Cable and Wireless (£182 million) and Amersham International (£64 million).

15. But what about net figure?

Delivery of BNOC oil in 1981-82 paid for in 1980-81 and taken into account in special disposals figure for that year reduced 1981-82 receipts by £573 million to total of -£92 million. But it is the gross figure which is the true measure of success of Government's privatisation programme.

16. Government has sold assets too cheap?

[Heavy oversubscription for British Aerospace, Cable and Wireless, Amersham International, followed by large increases in prices when shares first traded.]

Not in Government's interest to see shares underpriced, given the loss to the PSBR, but also risks in pitching price too high. Getting balance right not easy - especially when company's shares have not previously been traded. Government will continue to consider alternative forms of sale eg tender, but critics should note that sale by tender could make it harder for small investor to buy shares.

17. Do you accept criticism in PAC Report on British Aerospace?

[PAC critical of British Aerospace sale, notably pricing of issues and cost of underwriting].

Hon members will have to wait for formal Treasury Minute responding to PAC report.

18. Government running into heavy weather over sale of Wytch Farm?

The British Gas Corporation is proceeding with arrangements for sale of the Government's interest in Wytch Farm. It is too early to say when the sale will take place.

S NORTH SEA AND UK ECONOMY

1. In view of recent falls in price of oil, why did HMG not reduce tax burden on North Sea oil producers?

[Budget tax changes included abolition of Special Petroleum Duty, increase in Petroleum Revenue Tax rate from 70 per cent to 75 per cent, and new system for advance payments of PRT (all from 1 January 1983), plus smoothing of PRT payments from July 1983 (this improves HMG's cash flow at companies' expense). Changes reduce the marginal rate of tax (from 90.3 to 89.5 per cent); involve slight fall in Government 'take' (no change 1982-83, costs £70 million 1983-84).]

Recognise need for tax structure robust to both falling and rising prices. Detailed study showed us that under new structure, levels of profitability should still be sufficient to make exploration and development attractive. Hope that new tax structure will provide more secure and stable regime.

2. Onerous tax system damaging future field developments?

[Shell/ESSO announcement plans for Tern shelved partly because of tax system; reports that Phillips are postponing T-block complex and BP their Andrew field].

Other adverse factors - falling oil prices; high development costs - much more important. No evidence that tax system alone is inhibiting future development.

3. Government should do more to stimulate UK Continental Shelf oil production in 1990's

[Select Committee on Energy's Report on depletion policy published noon 18 May: recommends reserve powers to impose production cuts but main emphasis on promoting development of fields to come into production in 1990's - increase pace of licensing rounds and overhaul fiscal regime].

Government's considered reply will be given in due course. Accept need to prolong high levels of UKCS production until end of century at least. Energy Secretary announced 17 May Government's plans for Eighth Round of licensing. Do not accept that fiscal regime makes North Sea development unattractive. On Committee's general proposal for overhaul of regime, would point out that industry does not want a structural upheaval: it would create serious uncertainty and major transitional problems.

4. Benefits of North Sea should be used to strengthen the economy?

[FSBR projections (in money of the day) of Government revenues from North Sea: £6.4 billion in 1981-82, £6.2 billion in 1982-83, £6.1 billion in 1983-84, and £8.0 billion in 1984-85. Lower than last year's projections, principally because of downward revision to oil price expectations. Projections already incorporate fall to \$31 a barrel for Forties oil. Contribution of North Sea to GNP estimated at 4 per cent of GNP in 1981. Not projected to rise before 1985.]

Yes. Government's strategy derives greatest possible long-term benefit from North Sea. Revenues ease task of controlling public borrowing. This will help to achieve a lower level

of interest rates to the benefit of industry and the economy as a whole. Without North Sea revenue other taxes would be higher or public expenditure lower. But keep revenues in perspective. Less than 6 per cent of total General Government receipts in 1981-82.

5. Government revenues from the North Sea should be used to finance cheap energy for industry?

It would be inequitable and inefficient to use the benefits of North Sea oil to subsidise some users. The age of cheap energy is past. Energy prices should recognise the cost of marginal supply and reflect the competitive position of industrial fuels. Only then can consumers receive reliable signals on which to base their energy consumption and investment decisions.

6. North Sea revenues should be channelled into a special fund to finance new investment, particularly in energy?

North Sea revenues are already committed. Setting up a special Fund would make no difference. More money would not magically become available. So the money for this Fund would have to come from somewhere else. This would mean higher taxes or lower public expenditure, if public sector borrowing is not to rise. If borrowing did rise, then so would interest rates. Not obvious that net effect would be good for investment.

7. Are we really any better off for our North Sea oil?

We are better off with oil - at current oil prices - than we would have been without it. We have been spared the fall in real national income that other industrial countries have suffered following oil price rises. But North Sea oil is costly to produce, so we are not necessarily any better off than we would have been had oil prices not risen. No need therefore for the possession of oil to require a contraction in our industrial base.

T WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

1. Results of OECD Ministerial and IMF Interim Committee meetings?

At both meetings Finance Ministers reaffirmed that successful policies to reduce inflation were essential to create sustained recovery. They stressed urgent need for budgetary discipline smaller fiscal deficits, monetary restraint, promotion of productive efficiency and reduction of rigidities in markets for labour and goods. Clearly both communiques accorded closely with HMG's strategy.

2. Governments will have no choice but to reverse policies now unemployment has risen to post-war record levels in many Western countries?

[Unadjusted unemployment exceeded 10 million in USA and 1 million in Canada in January. It exceeded 2 million in Italy in September, 2 million in France in October, and 1.9 million in Germany in February. Highest ever unemployment levels in Canada, France, Italy and UK and highest in USA and Germany since the War.]

Not a question of U-turns. OECD governments meeting last week agreed reduction of unemployment 'cannot be achieved on a sustainable basis' unless inflation reduced. But not just industrial countries' view: 2 days later Interim Committee of International Monetary Fund - on which developing countries sit - agreed 'combating inflation is a necessary step for resumption of sustainable growth at a satisfactory pace reduction in inflation and inflationary expectations, in nominal and real interest rates and in existing rigidities is essential for steady expansion of output and reduction of unemployment'.

3. Anti-inflation policies are working

[Inflation down from a year ago in 6 of major 7 economies - significantly down in US (from 10.6 to 6.8 per cent), Japan (6½ to 3), Italy (20 to 16) and UK (12½ to 10½). Small reductions in Germany (to 5.2 per cent) and Canada (to 11½), but increase in France (from 12½ to 14).]

Yes. Firm fiscal and monetary responses to 1979-80 vindicated by events. UK still some way to go to match US, Germany or Japan in bringing down inflation, but moving in right direction and ahead of some other European countries.

4. Governments' policies have failed or worsened situation?

No. Adjustment to second oil shock better than to first. Investment has performed better, impact on wages better contained and dependence on oil reduced. But these gains must be reinforced by continued firm policies.

5. UK policies out of line with other countries?

UK far from alone as made plain again in communiques from recent IMF and OECD meetings where Ministers reaffirmed commitment to reducing inflation and improving

productive efficiency. Most countries have already begun taking necessary medicine: US President agreed with Republicans in Congress on plan to reduce budget deficit further \$27 billion, following spending cuts last year. German budget deficit cut almost 30 per cent this year. President Mitterand has declared next year's budget deficit must not exceed 3 per cent of GDP. Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Australia and Sweden have also announced measures to cut planned public spending. Irish Government also acting to reduce deficits. And most countries have set non-accommodating monetary targets.

6. Prospects for UK economy worse than for other countries?

No. Treasury and most independent forecasters expect UK growth this year of about 1½ per cent rising to an annual rate of 2 per cent by early next year. This is very closely in line with the OECD's forecast for OECD Europe. Unemployment is expected to rise in all major countries except Japan. UK inflation (GNP deflators) likely to be around the OECD average and below that in France, Italy and Canada.

7. Prospects for US economy?

[Commerce Department's index of leading indicators fell in March for 11th successive month. Industrial production is flat, and seasonally adjusted unemployment is 9 per cent. M1 significantly above target range after 4 months. But consumer price index fell in March, bringing year on year inflation to 6.8 per cent - rate over last 6 months 3 per cent at annual rate.]

Sixth consecutive month of falling US inflation rate very good news - stabilising influence for the world economy. Helped by realistic and flexible wage settlements in which unions have given job security priority over wage increases. Reasonable prospect US economy should pick up later this year.

8. US Budget compromise?

[President's compromise with Republicans to reduce budget deficit further £27 billion below latest estimate of cost of President's February proposals (\$132 billion) opposed by Democrat majority in House of Representatives. Independent budget plans abound.]

Important for many countries that agreement on US budget should be reached soon. President's latest proposal would keep Federal deficit around 3 per cent of GNP.

9. US interest rate developments

[Prime rates currently 16½ per cent - flat for several weeks. Treasury Secretary Regan's announcement last week that reduced Federal deficit would cause lower US interest rates by end of year had no immediate effect as short term rates had already eased half a point in anticipation of the compromise.]

Prime rate well below peak of 21½ per cent last summer. Settlement of Budget for fiscal 83 would improve prospects for lower interest rates, especially given recent rate of inflation in US.

10. Prospects for international interest rates?

Always difficult to forecast interest rates with certainty, but firm and balanced policies should over a period bring lasting reduction in both inflation and interest rates.

11. What does OECD forecast?

[Some OECD forecasts on world economy leaked to The Times in April.]

Latest OECD forecast ('Economic Outlook') published in December; next not due to be published until July.

U FALKLANDS CRISIS EFFECTS

1. UK economy affected by Falklands crisis?

UK is basically in a strong financial position: inflation is coming down; interest rates were falling before the crisis; balance of payments remains healthy; output is recovering. Disturbance due to Falklands dispute small in relation to overall macro-economic picture. And the basic strengths in the economy have not changed.

2. Effect of Falklands dispute on markets?

[After rising initially, interest rates have recovered to levels a little below those obtaining before the crisis.]

Initial shock seems to have been absorbed without significant ill-effect, reflecting confidence in government handling. Too early to say what long term effects will be, but Government determined not to be deflected from its path. Recent indicators good, eg RPI, money supply figures.

3. Effects of Falkland Islands dispute on sterling?

Hardly surprising if the uncertainties had some unsettling effect. But markets are aware that the underlying position of the UK is strong, with inflation falling, growth picking up and a healthy balance of payments surplus. The Falklands dispute is small in relation to this overall macroeconomic picture, and there is no question of it requiring any change in our basic economic strategy.

4. Will dispute with Argentine affect UK trade figures?

Volume of UK-Argentine trade negligible (£20 million a month on either side).

5. Will the freeze on Argentine assets affect the standing of the City?

We have not confiscated Argentine's assets, merely frozen them. This action was taken under extraordinary provocation; we believe the international financial community will understand this.

6. Does the freeze involve reintroducing exchange controls?

No. We are denying Argentina access to her assets which is the reverse of traditional exchange control - which controlled payments by UK residents to non-residents.

7. Balance of advantage favours Argentina in mutual freezing of assets?

Argentine retaliation will not affect UK economy as a whole. Although UK assets in Argentina greatly exceed Argentine assets here their assets here are highly liquid. The

crisis and our action will greatly reduce Argentina's capacity to raise loans on the international markets. At least two Argentine public foreign borrowing operations amounting to \$400 million have been suspended since the crisis began.

8. Argentina's debts

[NOT FOR USE: Argentine foreign debt at end 1981 estimated at \$34 billion - about half the size of Mexico's or Brazil's.]

Sign of times that Argentine military aggression should create instability in global capital markets. All the more important to negotiate settlement quickly and to discourage similar acts in future. [IF PRESSED on debt default possibility: Banks have taken fairly relaxed attitude because ultimately overseas debt must be repaid by exports; Argentina's export sector is agriculture, which, according to most experts, is fundamentally healthy.]

9. Falkland Islands: Cost/Financing of operation?

No cash ceiling on the cost of the operation; needs of task force must and will come first. Obviously too early to assess cost - duration and nature of operation still unknown. When the cost is known we shall decide how to deal with it. But cost can and will be met in ways consistent with Government's economic strategy. [IF PRESSED: Not all of cost will be additional. At this stage, extra cost represents very small proportion of (over £14 billion) Defence Budget. No cash or budgetary problem immediately in prospect.]

10. Cuts in defence spending have weakened our ability to respond to Falklands crisis?

No. We have not cut defence spending since 1978-79. We have increased it by over 85 per cent in cash terms - a real increase of about 11 per cent - to over £14 billion. We are spending more on conventional naval forces in real terms than was spent in year before we came to office. When expenditure on modernising strategic deterrent is at its peak we will still be spending more on conventional Navy than in 1978-79.

PRESENT SITUATION

Clearly a range of outside forecasts; from ITEM and CEPG the more pessimistic to Liverpool more optimistic. Most major post-Budget assessments (LBS, NIESR, St James, P&D, St J) judge impact of Budget and falling oil prices favourable. Output by most groups forecast to grow about 1½ per cent in 1982 (cf FSB's 1½ per cent), inflation to fall to single figures by end 1982 (cf FSB's 9 per cent in 4Q 1982); very much in line with FSB. CEPG broadly in line on inflation prospects, but see little prospect of any growth in output in 1982 or 1983. Most groups expect continued rise in unemployment (UK adult sa) during 1982 to around 3 million. Forecasts for 1983 vary, from some groups expecting further rise (CEPG, NIESR, ITEM) to others (P&D, Simon and Coates) expecting some slight decline (roughly 50,000-100,000) and Liverpool expecting fall of 400,000.

GDP output estimate rose in both Q3 and Q4 1981. Level in Q4 some 1 per cent above Q2. Recent months' industrial output figures affected by bad weather, car and rail strikes. Nevertheless, Q4 1981 manufacturing output some 2-3 per cent above low point in Q1 1981.

Consumers' expenditure was unchanged in Q1 1982: continuing the flat trend of the last 2-3 years. The average level of retail sales in the first 4 months of 1982 was 1 per cent higher than H2 1981. The volume of visible exports has tended to move erratically however the latest evidence suggests that the recent trend has been flat. The significant rise in the trend of visible imports volume which took place in mid-1981 has not continued in the early months of 1982. DI investment intentions survey conducted in October/November suggests volume of investment, by manufacturing, distributive and service industries (excluding shipping) will rise by about 2 per cent in 1982 following a fall of about 5 per cent in 1981. A large rise is tentatively expected in 1983. Investment by manufacturing (including leasing) is expected to rise during 1982, but for the year as a whole it is likely to be 1 per cent lower than 1981. An appreciable rise is expected in 1983. Manufacturers', wholesalers' and retail stocks dropped by £25 million (at 1975 prices) in Q4 1981 the smallest quarterly fall in the last two years of continuous destocking.

Unemployment (UK, seasonally adjusted excl, school-leavers) was 2,850,400 (11.9 per cent) at April count, up 28,000 on March. Vacancies were 109,600 in April.

Wholesale input prices (fuel and materials) rose 1½ per cent in April however the year-on-year increase fell to 7½ per cent. Wholesale output prices rose ¾ per cent in April and are 8½ per cent above a year ago. Year on year RPI increase fell to 10.4 per cent in March. Year-on-year increase in average earnings was 11.3 per cent in February. RPDI was flat in the last three quarters of 1981; it fell 2 per cent between 1980 and 1981 after rising 17 per cent between 1977 and 1980. The savings ratio fell 0.7 points to 13.1 per cent in Q4 1981.

PSEER £8.6 billion in 1981-82 financial year but distorted by the effects of the civil service dispute. CGBR (unadjusted) £0.8 billion in April 1982.

In banking April Sterling M3 rose $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent while M1 was unchanged and PSL2 rose $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

Visible trade has showed a surplus of £0.7 billion over the 6 months from September 1981. Current account surplus over same period of £2.7 billion. UK official reserves fell by \$0.8 billion to \$18.2 billion at end-April. At the close on 14 May the sterling exchange rate was \$1.8250 while the effective rate was 90.4.