

24th September 1986

Some ideas. Figures would need checking. I will try to think of some jokes. There is a German^{one} where I say on page 5 "It is called re-distribution. Its real name is RETRIBUTION."

P. 1 - Claims

P. 3 - Labour holds employee owning shares

P. 4 - New dependencies; share of ownership

P. 5 - People working for own good
adds to the present good.
which is more easy.

P. 10 - Wages low to decide for
WW high wages

A wealth of opportunities

1.

W.W.

Which is more democratic? The determined socialism of the Labour Party and the slightly more delicately veiled socialism of the Alliance ^{or} ~~or~~ capitalistic free enterprise?

^{ultimate}
The aim of socialism is to take choice away from ordinary people. You ^{must} ~~can't~~ choose your employer. It must be the state.

^{must}
You ~~can't~~ start or run your own business. That's the prerogative of the state.

You can't choose what to buy in the shops. You ^{must} ~~can't~~ buy only what the state decides ^{what it will produce and} you ~~should~~ ^{shall} have.

^{must}
 You'll keep less and less of your own money. The state will
 decide on ^{how} ~~what~~ your ^{earnings are} income is, to be ~~spent~~ ^{shared out}.

That's what the higher taxes on everyone promised by Labour
 and the Alliance are all about. The state will redistribute ~~it~~ ^{your money}
 because you aren't fit to know how to spend ~~your own money~~ ^{it}.

The ethos of socialism is deeply undemocratic. Individuals
 aren't free to think or act for themselves.

It's a system which has condemned Russia and large parts of
 the world to needless poverty. That's why ^{the most} intelligent Communists
 like the Chinese are trying to break away from socialism.

They've recognised the truth that peasants who own their own
 land and can make their own profits produce far more food than un-
 willing labourers herded into state ~~co~~ ^{pp} collective farms. There are
 glimmerings of an understanding of this in Russia and a thirst for
 it in the occupied Eastern European countries.

But once socialism gets a hold it's hard to shake it off.
Vast bureaucracies ^{desperate to keep their power and privileges,} ~~of vested interest~~ are founded on it.

The admission that it's all been a ghastly mistake is ^{too bitter} ~~has~~ to make. So the Labour Party is still pretending that nationalisation of steel and coal and other great industries is a good idea.

Its remedy for unemployment is to require the nationalised industries to take on one million people they don't need. The consequent losses, of course, ^{is} should be borne by extra confiscations from taxpayers who are supposed not to know how to spend their own money as well as the government.

Labour's so obsessed with state socialism ^{that} it wants to re-nationalise British Telecom, British Airways, British Freight Corporation. It hates employees owning shares which might go up in value, or having shares with a voting say in the company.

Why have I been so keen to roll back socialism? Because as it creeps on it destroys individuality and democracy.

Many will always work for the state. But the socialists want to ensure that the income left to them after confiscatory taxes can ^{only} be spent on what the state has decided shall be sold.

Contrast that with what we've been doing. As fast as we can we've been selling nationalised industries to the general public with priority to employees.

We've given them a new dignity and freedom and a sense of ownership. That's not some vague socialist ^{"Social" ownership} ~~proposition~~ but a real one which is an incentive to do better and make more profits.

Mercury is part of Cable & Wireless which we sold off to the public. It's a competitive rival to BT. Naturally the socialists promise to renationalise it hating the idea that anything can escape their clutches.

We shall not be content until we've privatised everything. That's democratic freedom of choice for employees and the public. The opposite of socialist state control.

We've set up numerous schemes to help people start their own businesses. We've tried to shape taxes to encourage enterprise.

We believe that people working for their own good adds to the general good. The more wealth that's created the more it will circulate to improve everyone's income.

Which is more caring? A system which deliberately restricts the amount of wealth that can be created or a system which spurs everyone on to earn as much as they can?

Socialism looks at what money there is in the country to-day. It then devises taxation to punish those who earn more than socialism thinks is good for them and says it will give it to ~~the~~ help those who are poorer.

That is called redistribution. It's real name is RETRIBUTION.

That way the amount of wealth in the country stays the same or goes down. In the end there's less money not more for the social services.

We believe in trying to make the country rich. Then more ^{to} will be available to help the less well off.

Retirement pensions, National Health Service, education, can all be improved ^{more} when there's more money about. We've been making some progress.

Because we've been trying to use our resources less wastefully the mindless slogan "Cuts" has been shouted by the socialists and their allies. The truth is different.

Since 1979 the single retirement pension ^{is} has gone up from £19.50 to £38.70 a week in November 1986. The pension for couples ^{is} has gone up from £31.20 to £61.95 in November 1986.

That's an increase of 96.4%. After allowing for inflation ^{it's} that's an increase in real terms of nearly 11 per cent.

In 1978 ^{5,370,000} ~~5,370~~ million patients were treated in hospitals in England. In 1985 the figure had gone up to ^{6,353,000} ~~6,353~~ million. Where are the cuts?

In Labour's last financial year 1978-79 £6,418 million was spent on the NHS. The figure for the financial year 1986-87 is £17,700 million.

Even after inflation that's an increase of 24 per cent. Not much cut about that.

On education the spending in the financial year 1984-85 after allowing for inflation was 18 per cent up on 1979. In 1979 there was an average of 18.9 pupils to one school teacher. At this moment there are only 17.8 pupils to one teacher, the lowest ratio ever.

In 1979 the average school teacher earned £5,390 per year. To-day it's £11,150. After allowing for inflation that's an increase of 24 per cent.

There are 140,000 more students at universities and polytechnics than there were in 1979. Yet still we hear the mindless slogan of 'Cuts.'

X This was the latest figure I'd get from the Edu Dept. This must be a later one

If we go back to Socialist policies there'll be real cuts.

So many billions ^{would} will be spent in subsidising loss-making nationalised industries that however large the rise ⁱⁿ of taxes for everyone there wouldn't be enough to go round ^{for} the social services.

Our way is to increase the wealth of the whole country. Our way really is caring.

The alternative offered by those who ~~always~~ boast about their compassion is to try to spend ~~all the~~ money we haven't got and to prevent more being made. That's not compassion. It's unintelligent ^{lazy, spiteful} self-indulgence.

John.

I wish with all my heart that we could make strong reductions of the unemployment figures. There's a practical difficulty.

The population explosion in the early Sixties has meant far more school leavers wanting jobs than ~~is~~ normal. We've been creating new jobs by the hundred thousand but it's still not enough.

In two or three years that population explosion will have slowed down. At the present rate of creating jobs there'll be more than enough to match those leaving school.

Another factor makes unemployment more difficult. Hundreds of thousands of women now want to work from backgrounds ^{from which} ~~where~~ they previously didn't.

Naturally I'm all for the equality of women at work. But we must appreciate that it has some effect on the unemployment figures.

Gradually our programme ^{of} ~~in~~ encouraging enterprise and reducing taxes will bring down unemployment. In America sharp reductions in taxation have been followed by sharp falls in unemployment. There's no reason why the same shouldn't happen here.

I know it's agonisingly ^{slow} ~~slow~~. But it's better than a sudden squandering of taxpayers money which temporarily provides new jobs which can't last because they're not profitable.

We've been through all that several times. Higher taxes all
round lead to insistence on higher wages. Higher wages diminish
our competitive edge against foreign producers.

Higher taxes and higher wages not justified by increased output
set inflation soaring again to the levels of the last Labour government.
In turn our competitiveness is further savaged.

The end result is more unemployment than before. And less
wealth in the country. And less for the social services.

We've done a lot to advance Britain and it can easily be wrecked
by a few years of socialism whether provided by the Labour Party
or the Alliance.

Despite the difficulties British industry and British business
are in far better trim to make us more prosperous than they were
in 1979.

We have constructed the platform for the launch into a more satisfying future for everyone.