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## DATE: 17 JANUARY 1984

PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES: NOVEMBER OUTPUT FIGURES
The Chancellor has seen Mr Smith's minute of 16 January about the November production industries output figures, to be released today. He finds the figures for manufacturing very suspect, since they seem out of line with other relevant indicators, and indeed with current anecdotal evidence. He has asked what view Sir $T$ Burns takes of the figures.


J O KERR

1. MR FOLGER
2. CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER
unce the
CHEQUER

From Neil MacKinnon
2 February 1984


PHILLIPS AND DREW FEBRUARY FORECAST

P\&D's latest forecast will be released on Friday, 3 February 1984. The main feature is a Budget assessment (copy attached) which expects most of the assumptions contained in the Autumn Statement to be adhered to; in particular, the negative fiscal adjustment of $£ \frac{1}{2}$ billion is used in order to meet the £8 billion PSBR target. Other key features include a GDP (average) outturn for 1983 of almost 3 per cent, consistent with the IAF, but slowing down slightly in 1984 to $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Inflation falls to $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent by end -1984 though P.D do not rule the $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent figure in the IAF as "completely out of court". (See attached tables).
2. MAIN ECONOMIC AND POLICY ASSUMPTIONS
i. In 1984 , OECD real GNP growth of $3 \frac{1}{2}-4$ per cent (World trade volume grows only 3 per cent because the indebtedness of non-oil LDC's impedes their propensity to import though this is offset by increasing OPEC imports, assuming an unchanged oil price.
ii. Government economic policy adheres to the broad thrust of the MTFS as set out in the 1983 FSBR.

## 3. MAIN POINTS FROM THE FORECAST

i. GDP (A) grows $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1984 , slowing to $1-1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1985 as consumer spending becomes less buoyant. Over the medium term (1984-88) GDP growth averages $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent reflecting, in part, a diminishing contribution of oil to output growth.
ii. Consumers' expenditure rises by 2 per cent this year resulting from a further fall in the savings ratio in response to previous falls in inflation, and a $1 \frac{1}{2}-2$ per cent rise in real disposable incomes. In 1985 consumer spending spending grows $1-1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, in line with the movements in real incomes. Improving company profitability and increased activity contribute to a growth in GDFCF of $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent this year.
iii. Export volumes expand $4-4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1984 as world trade rises and the benefits of improved cost competitiveness feed through; but in 1985 exports expand by under 2 per cent. Import volumes expand slightly faster than exports this year and in 1985. The current account deteriorates after 1985 to reach a deficit of $£ 4 \frac{1}{2}$ billion in 1988 , reflecting mainly a diminishing contribution from oil.
iv. Retail price inflation peaks at 6 per cent in 1984 Q2 declining to $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent by the end of the year but remains in a $5-6$ per cent band during 1985. P.D's assessment reflects a combination of moderate pay settlements and commodity price movements offsetting to some extent the effects of a slowdown in productivity growth and an assumed slight fall in tradeweighted sterling.
v. The PSBR is expected to be £9 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion in 1983-84 and £8 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion in 1984-85. Growth in £m3 slows over the forecast period as bank lending eases and external and currency flows exert a contractionary influence. P.D see little scope for interest rate reductions during 1984 as the authorities maintain "positive real short-term interest rates as a means of depressing inflation expectations further'.

## 4. ASSESSMENT

P\&D remain at the top end of the range of outside forecasts, Their GDP growth forecast for 1983 is consistent with the IAF, and although they expect slower growth in 1984, this would be well within the margins of error. The outturn for consumer spending and exports, where they have yet to incorporate the good 1983 Q4 figures, could turn out better than P\&D expect.

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00.01 HOURS FRIDAY, 3 FEBRUARY 1984

PHILLIPS AND DREW FORECAST COMPARISON

*Defined in the IAF as world trade in manufactures (weighted by UK markets). P\&D do not provide a definition of world trade volume.

Comparison of forecasts

|  | Forecaster | 1983 |  |  |  |  |  | 1984 |  |  |  | 1985 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Date | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Year | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Year | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Year |
| Wages and salaries | LBS | Oct | 6.5 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.5 |
|  | NIESR | Nov | 6.7 | 5.8 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 6.8 | 5.9 | 6.9 | 6.1 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.3 | -5.3 | 5.1 |
|  | P\&D | Feb | 6.8 | 6.4 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.8 |
| Consumer prices | LBS | Oct | 6.3 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
|  | NIESR | Nov | 6.3 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.6 |
|  | P\&D | Feb | 6.3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.2 |
| Consumers' expenditure at 1980 prices | LBS | Oct | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | $1 . \mathrm{B}$ |
|  | NIESR | Nov | 3.8 | 4.7 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 1.8 | 0.6 | -0.5 | -0.8 | 0.3 | -0.6 | -0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | P\&D | Feb | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| Gross domestic fixed capital formation at 1980 prices | LBS | Oct | 5.8 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 7.2 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.4 |
|  | NIESR | Nov | 4.7 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 8.1 | 3.1 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
|  | P\&D | Feb | 5.5 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| Gross domestic product at 1980 prices | LBS(a) | Oct | 1.6 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.4 |
|  | NIESR(a) | Nov | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
|  | P\&D(b) | Feb | 3.4 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Balance of payments $£ \mathrm{~m}$ | LBS | Oct | 779 | -313 | 142 | 3 | 611 | -54 | 69 | 126 | 195 | 336 | 199 | 212 | 317 | 268 | 996 |
|  | NIESR(c) | Nov | 233 | 233 | 616 | 616 | 1698 | 120 | 121 | -12 | -13 | 216 | -100 | -101 | -91 | -91 | -383 |
|  | P\&D | Feb | 781 | -171 | 603 | 87 | 1300 | 300 | 100 | 100 | -100 | 400 | -600 | -400 | 0.0 | -100 | -1100 |

(a) Output estimate. (b) Average estimate. (c) Based on half-yearly estimates,
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## BUDGET ASSESSMENT

We expect the Chancellor to present a firm Budget which aims to fulfil most of the assumptions contained in his 1983 Autumn Statement. In this respect, we look for measures which are designed to limit the $1984 / 85$ PSBR to $2 \frac{1}{2} \%$ of nominal GDP, thereby keeping the PSBR/GDP ratio on a declining path over time. This would put the nominal PSBR target for the $1984 / 85$ financial year at about $£ 8 \frac{1}{4}$ bn on our estimates. In aiming at this figure, we foresee action in the Budget to raise net taxation by up to $£^{1} / 2 b n$, the figure foreshadowed in the Autumn Statement, in excess of those amounts involved in the indexation of tax allowances/thresholds and revalorisation of excise duties.

As regards excise duties, we expect increases which will add $2 p$ to a pint of beer, 30p to a bottle of spirits, $5 p$ to a packet of 20 cigarettes, $8 p$ to a gallon of petrol, $6 p$ to a gallon of derv and $£ 5$ to a car licence. However, to comply with EEC regulations, duty on table wine will probably be reduced by an amount sufficient to cut the price of a bottle by about 18 p.

On personal taxation, we envisage an indexation of the allowances and thresholds, which, for example, would raise the single (and wife's earned income) allowance by $£ 100$ to $£ 1885$ and the married allowance by $£ 150$ to $£ 2945$. We also expect child benefit to be increased from $£ 6.50$ per child per week to $£ 6.85$.

Other measures are expected to include a reduction in the first-year write-off allowance for capital equipment from $100 \%$ to $80 \%$, while minor changes in North Sea oil taxation are expected to be broadly neutral in revenue terms. There may possibly be changes relating to insurance premium relief and stamp duty. To offset the impact of some of these measures, we expect the Chancellor to announce the gradual phasing out of the employers' National Insurance Surcharge which currently stands at $1 \%$. We foresee a $1 / 2 \%$ reduction in the surcharge as from 1 August 1984 with the final $1 / 2 \%$ being eliminated from 1 April 1985.

Finally, as regards the monetary aggregates, we expect the Chancellor to confirm a $6-10 \%$ range for $£ M 3$ and PSL2 for $1984 / 85$, while we expect a lower range to be adopted for Mo and M1 (or M2).
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MANUFACTURING OUTPUT

The Chancellor has noted from the January report of the Monitoring Group that the more optimistic results from successive CBI surveys of manufacturing have yet to be reflected in the official output data and that this may be attributable to the fact that the weights used to calculate output data do not take sufficient account of expanding industries. He himself believes that this explanation is almost certainly right and assumes that the CSO are investigating the point with a view to early action. I should be grateful to know the latest position.

Mom
MISS M O'MARA


1. SIR TERENCE BURNS
2. CHANCELLOR
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MANUFACTURING OUTPUT FIGURES

You queried last month the reliability of recent official figures for manufacturing output, suggesting that the modest growth they showed was out of line with other, more buoyant, indications and with anecdotal evidence.

## below

2. As shown in Mr Smith's note on tomorrow's Industrial Production figures, the latest official data suggest a rather more buoyant picture than last month. They suggest that during the second half of last year manufacturing output was growing by about one per cent a quarter. However, taking 1983 as a whole, output was only $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than in the previous year. Other indicators, particularly those from the CBI survey, still seem to be indicating a stronger recovery than the official series though the gap has certainly narrowed.
3. As background to these revisions you may like to see the attached note, which attempts to bring together the alternative indicators of manufacturing output, with particular emphasis on the CSO and CBI measures. One feature of the CBI data that the note investigates is whether their weighting factors have perhaps helped them pick up more successfully than the CSO the impact of more buoyant sectors. In fact, the reverse turns out to be the
case: the pick-up in 1983 in the CBI series in part seems to have reflected an over-weighting of some of the more traditional sectors which have grown relatively strongly from their depressed 1982 position.
4. Although the CBI measure does not tell a very convincing story, there is some less formal evidence that manufacturing output has been more buoyant than the official data suggest. Both expenditure and income measures of GDP have been growing faster than the output measure; some of this discrepancy could reflect a downward bias in manufacturing output, although the past history/revisions does not point to this as a likely culprit. Perhaps more telling evidence comes from the labour market, with the rise in average hours in the second half of last year not fully explained by changes in employment or measured output.


JON SHIELDS

## CONFIDENTIAL

ALTERNATIVE MEASURES OF OUTPUT GROWTH IN MANUFACTURING AN ASSESSMENT

Although the most recent official statistics suggest that the growth in manufacturing output was resumed in the second half of 1983, other indicators, particularly those emerging from the CBL survey, still indicate a more buoyant picture, tending to throw doubt on the official series. At the same time the official output measure of GDP has been performing very modestly compared to the income and expenditure measures, reinforcing the suspicion that manufacturing output is being under-recorded. This note comments on the relationship between the CSO and the CBI series in recent years and looks at some of the other evidence available. The concluding section offers an assessment of the current situation.

CSO DATA
2. The most recent official statistics suggest that manufacturing output grew by about one per cent during the third quarter of 1983 and a further one per cent in the fourth quarter. However manufacturing output in 1983 was only about $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than in the previous year. The output of the production industries rose by $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent last year, helped by a substantial increase in energy production. The chart below shows the behaviour of these series since 1978.

CHART A
INDEX OF OUTPUT OF THE PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES


## CONFIDENTIAL

3. The latest figures for the fourth quarter of 1983 are only based on monthly indicators and will not be securely based until the quarterly sales inquiries are available in two months time. Reflecting this general point, considerable revisions have been made to the third quarter figures in recent months. They were revised downwards by $\frac{1}{2}$ a per cent in December, reflecting a revised seasonal adjustment. They were then revised up by a similar amount in January and again in February as the analysis of the quarterly sales inquiries became available. The figures for October and November were also increased this time, reflecting an allowance made for manufacturer's stocks. Since the underlying growth is not very pronounced these revisions have had a considerable impact upon estimates of trend. Indeed, until this week's figures were released, the CSO's statistics suggested that manufacturing output was very little higher than in the Autumn of 1981, having simply recovered from the relapse seen in 1982. The recovery in the second half of the year now looks much stronger.

THE CBI SURVEY
4. The CBI Survey of manufacturing industry has been offering a more buoyant picture than the official statistics recently. Respondent firms have on balance been reporting increases in both actual and expected output over the last twelve months. The January survey showed a balance of 21 per cent of firms reporting increases in output over the previous four months. A similar number expect their production to increase over the next four months.
5. The chart below shows the balance of CBI respondents reporting increases in production over the previous four months, together with the change in the CSO manufacturing series over the previous quarter. The chart shows that although these series exhibit a similar cyclical pattern the general degree of correspondence has not been exact, especially since 1980.

## CONFIDENTIAL



CHART B CSO ANL CBI INDICATORS OF MANUFACTURING OUTPUT GROUTH
6. There are several possible reasons for the relatively poor correspondence between the two series:
(a) Although the CBI get a good response to their quarterly Survey (typically about 1700 replies, covering about $50 \%$ of manufacturing) their coverage is not as good as the CSO's (which covers about $80 \%$ ).
(b) The CBI currently classify their results using the 1968 Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) and 1975 based output weights. This is less up to date than the CSO's analysis which is based on the 1980 SIC and 1980 output weights.
(c) The CBI question is rather vaguely worded, allowing scope for alternative interpretations. For example, their enquiry into answering practices suggests that some 10 per cent of firms interpret it as a question about the level of output over the previous four months compared with the same period over the previous year. Econometric evidence, discussed below, suggests that a rather higher percentage of firms interpret it in this way, or at least take into account the annual change when replying.

## CONFIDENTIAL

(d) The CBI question is qualitative, indicating a rise or fall in output, whereas the CSO measure the change quantitatively, in terms of sales, gross production and other activity variables. It is difficult to translate the CBI data into quantitative figures. However the CSO method is not without its drawbacks either. For example, if firms are producing for stock this will have the effect of boosting output relative to sales variables and it is difficult to allow for this, at least until stockbuilding data become available a couple of months later.
7. The chart shows that although the CBI have been more optimistic than the CSO recently, they were in fact more pessimistic during 1981 and 1982. It is interesting in this respect that the more traditional industries - metal manufacturing, textiles, vehicles and the like - fared relatively poorly during 1981 and 1982 but enjoyed something of a revival during 1983. Since the CBI's 1975 based output weights give these industries a relatively high weight this is likely, in part at least, to explain the divergences we have seen between these series since 1980. This possibility is investigated in the annex which concludes that this kind of compositional effect may in part explain the relatively dismal picture being put out by the CBI during 1982 and may help account for the relatively buoyant picture they have been offering more recently. There is nothing to suggest that the CBI survey is picking up the buoyancy of "sunrise" industries missed by the CSO data - in fact, quite the opposite.
8. It is also interesting that 1981 and 1982 were periods in which manufacturers were running down their stocks, suggesting the possibility that the CSO figures may have underestimated the amount of destocking and therefore tended to over-estimate output in industries where this was based on sales figures (about 60 per cent of the total). Although the relative

## CONFIDENTIAL

scales used in the chart are rather arbitrary - judged in order to align the cyclical movements in the series - the quarter to quarter movements in the CSO series are much more volatile than those of the CBI series. This seems to be because firms tend to discount the effect of short term fluctuations when responding to the CBI questionnaire. The fact that the CBI series discounts the fall in output during the road haulage strike in the first quarter of 1979 certainly supports an explanation of this kind.
9. Econometric research on these two series has not come up with any very satisfactory relationship. Research at the CBI suggests that the balance of respondents reporting a change in production is correlated better with the level of the CSO output series than its change. Research at the Treasury suggests that it is better correlated with the annual change in the CSO series than the quarterly change. Both of these results suggests that CBI respondents may be confused by the question or take a rather longer term view of changes in output than their enquiry into answering practices would suggest. The kind of discrepancy we have seen over the last twelve months is well within the range of error of these equations.

## OTHER INDICATORS

10. Other indicators of activity in manufacturing give a slightly mixed picture though they appear consistent with the latest output estimates. The average weekly hours worked in manufacturing has continued to fall, though at a slower rate than in 1982. The latest figures suggest a monthly fall of 8,000 per month in the second half of 1983 and 18,000 in the first half, compared to a fall of 25,000 per month in 1982. Set alongside the CSO figures for manufacturing output, these statistics would suggest a small increase in output per hour since the summer months and a rather larger increase in output per head.

## CONFIDENTIAL

11. Our worries about the official manufacturing series go hand in hand with our concern about the CSO's output measure of GDP, which has been growing more slowly than the income and expenditure measures since 1980. We would usually be inclined to attribute this discrepancy to a mis-measurement of the output of the distribution and service sertonrs, since this is the area which is least well covered by the CSO. However on this occasion there is a suspicion that this is also due to an under-recording of manufacturing output. This could be because the structural changes which have occurred since 1979 have caused the registers used by the CSO to conduct their inquiries to become out of date, a problem which is inherent in any attempt to measure or survey manufacturing output, including the CBI's. This could have two effects - working in opposite directions. On the one hand, some growth areas may become under-represented whilst, on the other, the method of grossing up to allow for firms which do not reply might mistakenly attribute output to firms which have in fact ceased trading. The CSO update their registers on a continous basis in order to prevent them becoming out of date, and in view of the large changes which we have seen recently are currently mounting a major review, recruiting new firms in areas which they felt have become under-represented.
12. Indicators of activity elsewhere in the economy have been much more buoyant than those for manufacturing. However the explanation for this probably lies in the pattern of demand and competition from overseas. We have not been expecting manufacturing output to increase by very much this year, essentially because demand has been led by consumption. Consumers' nondurable expenditure does not have a large manufactured content and it seems fairly clear that the increase in durable expenditure has been largely met by overseas suppliers. At the same time investment and (at least until December) manufactured exports were relatively depressed. From this point of view the behaviour of manufacturing output is perhaps not surprising.

## CONFIDENTIAL

12. Although we have our doubts about the CSO's manufacturing output index we have been unable to find conclusive evidence that recent recorded growth figures have been on the low side. The index appears to be at variance with the CBI's survey results though less so now that the December estimates are available. Moreover the relationship between these series based of course on CSO data less subject to revision - has not been a very precise one, certainly since 1980. We found nothing to suggest that the CBI survey was picking up the buoyancy of "sunrise" industries missed by the CSO. If anything, we would tend to the opposite conclusion given the outdated weighting system employed by the CBI. In view of this, the rather vague way in which the CBI question is put and the poorer coverage of their survey, we would currently regard the CSO output index as likely to be the more reliable.
13. The relatively modest performance of the output measure of GDP relative to the income and expenditure measures in recent years however leads us to suspect that manufacturing output might still be under-estimated by the CSO. It is possible that the manufacturing index will be revised further as firmer figures become available over the next few months. But the history of the manufacturing output series suggests that large revisions are unlikely: revisions to the output measure of GDP have more usually reflected changes to the output of the service sectors which are measured relatively poorly.

ANNEX: COMPOSITIONAL EFFECTS ON THE RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF CSO AND CBI MEASURES OF MANUFACTURING OUTPUT SINCE 1980

Since 1980, the CSO manufacturing output index and the CBI's Industrial Trends survey have from time to time been giving a rather different indication of output growth in the manufacturing sector. This may in part be because of the different weighting systems and methods of classification they employ. This note investigates the effect which different weighting systems might have had in recent years.

## The CSO Manufacturing output index

2. The CSO's monthly manufacturing output series is a base-weighted index built up from 174 component indicators, each representing the production of an individual industry. These indicators are continually under review and new ones are included as they become available. Ideally, value added measures of output would be employed but in most cases sales figures (suitably deflated), or gross output indicators are used. The weights used in constructing the index equal the share of each industry, defined in terms of the 1980 Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), in total manufacturing output in 1980.
3. The monthly series are benchmarked using quarterly sales inquiries and the Annual Census of Production. The registers used to conduct these inquiries are also updated on a continuous basis and typically cover over $80 \%$ of manufacturing output and employment. Nevertheless, changes in the population of firms in the economy cannot be reflected immediately in the CSO's registers, which may at times become unrepresentative. The CSO accept that this is likely to have happened in recent years given the major structural changes which we have seen. This could have two effects, working in opposite directions. On the one hand, some growth areas may become under-represented whilst, on the other, the method of grossing up to allow for firms which do not reply might mistakenly attribute output to firms which have in fact ceased trading. In view of these potential difficulties the CSO are currently mounting a major review of their registers and are recruiting new firms where this is felt necessary. They are also investigating the use of the VAT registers in this work.

## The CBI Industrial Trends Survey

4. The CBI Quarterly Industrial Trends survey is built up from the replies of about 1,700 firms, estimated to cover about half of manufacturing employment. The coverage is thus somewhat less than the CSO's. These replies are first grouped by employment size and industry. Four employment size groupings and forty four industry groupings (the latter based on the 1968 Standard Industrial Classification (SIC)) are employed, giving a total of 146 "cells". In effect, a separate survey is carried out for each of these cells. The industrial and the overall results are obtained by weighting these cells up appropriately, using weights equal to the share of each cell in total manufacturing output in 1975. The industrial classification and weights used by the CBI are thus less up to date than those used by the CSO. The CBI is currently moving over to the 1980 based classification and weighting system and will be publishing the February results on this basis.
5. The CBI face the same sort of difficulties as the CSO in keeping their panel of respondent firms up to date. However, about 200 new firms are added every year, a similar number dropping out. They find that it is fairly easy to recruit new firms, especially non-members who have an incentive in the form of a free subscription to the survey results.
6. The use of different weights in the CBI and CSO series could account for some of the divergences which we have seen between them since 1980. These are shown in chart 1, which shows that the CBI were more pessimistic than the official figures would warrant in 1981 and 1982 but were more optimistic during 1983. The first column of table 1 shows an industrial breakdown of the changes in manufacturing output between 1975 and 1980 (as measured by the CSO using the 1980 SIC). It therefore reflects differences in the weights which the CBI and the CSO are currently attaching to these industries. The next two columns show changes in output during the two periods over which the divergence changes sign, between 1980 and the fourth quarter of 1982 and between this quarter and the three months to November 1983. The industries which experience the largest reductions in output between 1975 and 1980 and are therefore given a high weight by the CBI relative to the CSO (notably metal manufacture, man made fibres, motor vehicles and textiles) also tend to experience the largest reductions in output between 1980 and 1982. This

TABLE 1 THE INDUSTRIAL COMPOSITION OF CHANGES IN MANUFACTURING OUTPUT

Changes in Mutput 1975 to 19801980 to 1982 Q4 $\frac{1982 \text { 24 to Sept }}{\text { Oct, Nov } 1983}$

| Metal manufacture | -19 | -4.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Other minerals | -11 | $-\mathbf{3 . 7}$ | -1.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Chemicals | +10 | +0.3 | +7.7 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Man-made fibres | -26 | -33.8 | +26.4 |
| Metal goods n.e.s. | -18 | -6.6 | -0.3 |
| Mechanical eng. | -17 | -13.5 | -4.8 |

Electrical eng. $+6-2.6+9.9$

| Motor vehicles | -14 | -22.5 | 5.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Other transport equipment $+1+2.0-0.5$

| Food | +7 | -3.1 | -0.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Drink and Tobacco $+8 \quad-9.1+4.9$

| Textiles | -18 | -13.4 | +5.1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clothing and footwear | -8 | -12.3 | +1.1 |
| Paper and publishing | +5 | -10.9 | +1.9 |
| Other manufacturing | -3 | -11.0 | +2.9 |
| Total Manufacturing | -5 | -7.2 | +2.3 |

helps explain the relatively dismal picture emerging from the CBI over these years. On the other hand these industries experience something of a revival during 1983 and are amongst the most buoyant, helping to explain the relatively optimistic picture the CBI has been offering recently. Table 2 shows this effect from the perspective of the CBI results:
Table $2 \quad \frac{\text { Selective changes in CBI industrial output balances }}{\text { October 1982 - January 1984 }}$

Industry
Balance reporting rise in output over previous 4 months July 1982 January 1984
Textiles
(incl man made fibres) $-23 \quad+24$

Motor Vehicles

Metal Manufacture
$-44$
$+25$
$-48$
$-2$

Total Sample
$-16$
$+21$
7. It is difficult to judge the effect these weighting and classification differences may have had at the aggregate level. However as a rough and ready check on this we may compare the CSO's previous manufacturing series which, like the current CBI series is based on the 1968 SIC and 1975 output weights, with the CSO's new 1980 based series. Quarterly changes in these two indices are shown alongside the CBI balance in chart 2. The comparison shows that the use of the different weights makes little difference during 1981. However, the 1975 based series does suggest a rather larger fall in output during 1982, and a larger bounce-back during 1983 than does the 1980 based series and thus relates better to the CBI balance over this period. Unfortunately construction of the 1975 based index was discontinued after the second quarter of last year, so it is difficult to check the effect that compositional changes have had in more recent months. The CBI are currently reworking some of their recent surveys using their new 1980
based output weights. However, this involves them in a lot of work, and they do not expect to have any results for some time.

## Conclusion

8. In view of this we would conclude that the use of an outdated weighting system has made the CBI results slightly unrepresentative, giving an undue weight to traditional industries which fared relatively badly during 1982 but recovered during 1983. It is difficult to know how much this effect is worth. So this conclusion must remain highly tentative, at least until the CBI have been able to rework their recent surveys on the new 1980 basis.


CHARTI CSO AND CBI INDICATORS OF MANUFACTURING OUTPUT GFOWTH


Alternative Indicators of the change in Manufacturing output


INDEX OF OUTPUT OF THE PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES - DECEMBER 1983 (to be released at $2.30 \mathrm{pm}, 14$ February)

The table below is a summary of the main results. As usual the emphasis should be on the less erratic three month on three month comparisons. (See also attached tables 1 and 2 for more details.)

OUTPUT (percentage changes)

2. For the third successive month back series have been revised. The main effect is that October and November figures for manufacturing (and production industry) output

## PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL until 2.30 pm, Tuesday, 14 February

(and $\frac{1}{2}$ )
are now about 1 / per cent higher than previous estimates. This contributed to the 1 per cent increase in the fourth quarter, which, following a similar increase in the third quarter, means that the manufacturing output index now shows a fairly clear upward movement in the latter half of 1983. (See attached chart.) There is now much less of a 'discrepancy' between the output index and other indicators of manufacturing activity such as CBI Surveys and hours worked.
[3. For information only: The revision to the October and November estimates reflects in part an initial underestimatc by CSO of storkbuilding within those industries for which sales figures are used to proxy output. The revised figures incorporate DTI's best estimate of these stock changes in the fourth quarter. Provisional stocks figures for 1983 Q4 are not released until 23 February.]

## Manufacturing

4. Output in all the main industrial groups within manufacturing, except chemicals, rose in the fourth quarter. (See table 2.) The rise of $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the year to 1983 Q 4 has to be seen in the context of the fall in output through 1982. Between 1982 and 1983 as a whole output is now estimated to have risen by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, as forecast in the Autumn Statement.

## Energy

5. Movements here are dominated by oil and gas extraction, which rose 5 per cent in 1983 Q4. Output of coal continues to be depressed by the miners' overtime ban.

## Construction

7. Fourth quarter figures will not be available until next month.

## By market sector

8. Growth continues to be concentrated in the intermediate goods industries, which encompasses the energy industries. Despite a sharp increase in car production, the output of consumer goods industries was flat during both the third and fourth quarters. The output of capital goods industries rose 1 per cent in 1983Q4. (This is consistent with recent CBI Surveys suggesting a strengthening in demand in this sector.)

## ASSESSMENT

9. Some encouragement can be drawn from these latest figures which, along with survey and labour market evidence, suggest increased activity in manufacturing industry. Manufacturing output - about a quarter of whole economy output - increased by around 1 per cent in both the third and fourth quarters of last year, with most industries within manufacturing showing higher levels of output.

## INDEX OF OUTPUT OF THE PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES

$1980=100$ seasonally adjusted



## TABLE 1

## OUTPUT OF PRODUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES

$1980=100$, seasonally adjusted

|  | Production and Construction (Divisions 1-5) | Production (Divisions 1-4) | Manufacturing ${ }^{1}$ (Divisions2-4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1978 | 103.4 | 103.1 | 109.6 |
| 1979 | 106.8 | 107.0 | 109.4 |
| 1980 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1981 | 95.4 | 96.3 | 93.6 |
| 1982 | 97.1 | 98.0 | 93.7 |
| 1983 | n.a | 100.5 | 95.0 |
| 1983 Q1 | 98.6R | 99.5R | 94.4 |
| Q2 | 98.3 | 99.5 | 94.1R |
| Q3 | 100.4 | 101.0R | 95.3 R |
| Q4 | n.a | 102.0 | 96.2 |
| October |  | 101.6R | 95.7R |
| November |  | $102.0$ | 96.0R |
|  |  | 102.6 | 96.9 |
| \% changes |  |  |  |
| Latest 3 months on previous 3 months | hs +2.1 | +1.1 | +0.9 |
| Latest 3 months on year earlier | +2.8 | +4.0 | +3.6 |
| Latest 3 months on 1981 Q1 | $+6.2$ | +7.5 | +4.1 |
| Notes |  |  |  |
| 1 Division 1 is Energy and Water Supply Industries and accounts for 26 per cent of the total "production" index with manufacturing being the remaining 74 per cent. |  |  |  |
| ' R ' signifies revised figure. |  |  |  |

CONFIDENTIAL<br>until 2.30 pm, Tuesday, 14 February

TABLE 2

|  | Percentage change, latest 3 mon |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Previous <br> 3 months | Same 3 months last year | 1981 Q1 (trough of out production ind |
| Total Production industries | 1.1 | 4.0 | 7.5 |
| Energy \& water supply | 1.4 | 4.8 | 16.3 |
| o.w. extraction of oil and gas | 4.9 | 10.4 | 35.9 |
| Total manufacturing | 0.9 | 3.6 | 4.1 |
| o.w. Metals | 3.5 | 9.8 | 4.6 |
| Other minerals* | 0.3 | 1.0 | 9.9 |
| Chemicals (and. man made fibres) | -2.0 | 6.1 | 8.5 |
| Engineering | 1.5 | 3.3 | 5.6 |
| Food, drink, tobacco | 0.8 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Textiles, etc | 0.7 | 3.4 | 0.0 |
| Other** | 0.9 | 3.2 | -1.9 |

* Mainly building materials
**Paper, printing, publishing; timber, furniture, rubber, plastics.


FROM: J O KERR
DATE: 14 February 1984

MR MONCK
cc Chief Secretary Financial Secretary Minister of State Economic Secretary Sir P Middleton Sir 'I' Burns Mr Bailey Mr Lovell Mr Battishill Mr Folger Mr Ridlcy Mr Hall

## MANUFACTURING: OUTPUT AND PAY

The Chancellor last night saw the latest figures on manufacturing output, and the underlying increase in average earnings in manufacturing, in the year to December. He notes that with output up by only $l \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, average earnings were up by about $9 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent. He finds the disparity very striking, and considers that it consorts very oddly with the pleas from e.g. the CBI.


J O KERR


The first attachment to Mr Shields' minute of February 13 "Alternative Measures of Output Growth in Manufacturing - An Assessment" contains very interesting information about revisions to the manufacturing output index made over recent months. The scale and cumulative impact of these revisions, as detailed in paragraph 3, have indeed, as Mr Shields said "had a considerable impact upon estimates of trend". We appear to be faced, yet again, with the problem that Roger Nightingale has so often written about; the latest published figures are always flat, while revisions to the recent past raise the base. At no point does public attention get sufficiently directed towards the underlying trend which ultimately emerges. Is there not a case for getting the substance of these revisjons drawn to public attention in the form of a written PQ? This could be on the lines of:

Question: Will the Chancellor publish details of recent revisions to the index of manufacturing output, and comment on the trends they reveal?
At the very least we would lose nothing by so doing!


## A $\mathbb{N}$ RIDLEY

FROM: MISS M O'MARA
DATE: 15 February 1984

MR SHIELDS
cc PS/Chief Secretary PS/Financial Secretary PS/Minister of State PS/Economic Secretary Sir P Middlcton Sir T Burns Mr Monck
Mr Battishill
Mr Evans
Mr Odling-Smee
Mr Folger
Mr Sallveson
Mr Rialey
Mr Portillo

PROD'

MANUFACTURING OUTPUT FIGURES

The Chancellor has seen Mr Ridley's minute of 14 February. He thinks his proposal of an arranged $P Q$ is a good idea but would like to see the Answer in draft before reaching a final decision. I should be grateful if you could supply one.
mom
MISS M O'MARA

1. MR MONCK
2. CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER
Taking probotints int aleut
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cc Chief Secretary
Financial Secretary
Minister of State
Economic Secretary
Sir Peter Middleton
Sir Terence Burns
Mr Bailey Mr Shields
Mr Kemp Miss Sinclair
Mr Evans Dr Rowlatt
Mr Lovell Mr Ridley
Mr Battishill Mr Hall
Mr Peace
Mr Forger

## MANUFACTURING: OUTPUT AND PAY

You commented on the disparity between recent figures for manufacturing output (up $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent 1983 on 1982) and earnings growth. (Mr Kerr's note of 14 February refers.)
2. The table below shows movements in these series for 1983 and preceding years, together with productivity and unit wage costs. The figures are full year on full year throughout.

3. Although the increase in manufacturing output last year was modest, productivity rose sharply, (employment continued to fall, by over 200,000 , or 4 per cent). The increase in earnings reflected these gains in productivity, part of which can be explained by the increase in hours worked, and in this sense were more 'affordable'. Of course any increase in unit wage costs allowed by employers is something of a self-inflicted wound. But, given higher prices, the limited rise in unit wage costs has been consistent with some rise in profitability and we expect a further improvement in the financial position of manufacturing this year.
4. Outside manufacturing earnings growth was rather slower ( $8 \frac{2}{4}$ per cent increase 1983 on 1982) but productivity also improved less rapidly. To the extent that faster growth in manufacturing earnings reflects increased output per hour (partly in the form of bonus payments) and increased hours worked, it need not necessarily be of concern in itself.


A SMITH

## Average earnings keep ahead of inflation <br> BY PHILIP STEPHENS

AVERAGE EARNINGS in Britain continued to run well ahead of inflation last year, but strong productivity gains brought the growth of unit labour costs to its lowest level for 15 years.
The Employment Department said yesterday that average earnings rose by an underlying $7 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent in the year to D.ecember, while the increase in manufacturing industries was $9 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent.

Inflation during the year was just over 5 per cent, giving a rise of about $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in real income for those in jobs.
In contrast, wages and salaries per unit of output in manufacturing rose by only 2.6 per cent in the same period, the lowest since 1968. It compared with a high of 22 per cent in 1980.

Unit labour costs for the whole economy in 1983 are not yet available but during the first nine months of the year they were running at a steady 3.5 per cent above 1982.

In international terms, however, the figures are not so favourable, with latest comparable data on unit labour costs in manufacturing showing a 2 per cent fall in West Germany and the U.S., no change in Japan and a 2 per cent rise in Canada.

In manufacturing the rise in output per person of nearly 7 per cent is split fairly evenly between increased production and lower employment.
While jobs are still being lost, the rate is slowing with employment in manufacturing falling 20,000 in the last three months of the year compared with 29,000 in the third quarter and 53,000 in the second quarter.

The department also confirmed recent ministerial statements of a rise in employment in the economy as a whole for the first time since 1979, with new jobs in services leading to

a 40,000 net increase in the third quarter.

The pace of growth in average earnings is partly explained by the continuing sturength oit economic recovery, with a sharp reduction in short-time working and a strong boost to overtime hours.

Officials estimate that these factors increased earnings iby 4 per cent in the economy as a whole and $1 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent in manufacturing, while bonus and productivity payments also increased take-home pay.
Earnings growth at that level must prove a worry for the Government in its effonts to bring inflation down to 4.5 per cent by the end of the year and, Impruve Britain's competitiveness.

The Confederation of British Industry said yesterday that pay settlements in manufacturing, which usually lag behind earnings, crept up to 5.8 per cent in the last three months of 1983 from 5.6 per cent in the previous nine months.

The pay round is still in its early stages and public sector workers are expected to lag behind the private sector,
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MANUFACTURING OUTPUT FIGURES

You were interested in following up Mr Ridley's suggestion that a written $P Q$ might be used to draw public attention to the substance of recent revisions to the manufacturing output figures.
2. The attached draft question and answer uses the revisions as a peg on which to hang details of the latest views on output growth. We have avoided references to trends because of the risk of further revisions or of a sharp change in the January figures. A more bullish 12-monthly figure could have been produced by comparing the fourth quarter of 1983 with a year earlier but the 1983 figure is still rather poorly based and the implied acceleration would not have been convincing.
3. Three relevant factors to bear in mind when deciding whether to proceed are:
(i) The press coverage of the revisions was in fact fairly favourable and the more bullish picture has already been given reasonable prominence.
(ii) The explanation about the upward revisions to the October and November figures is confidential until next Thursday.
(iii) First estimates of the output measure of GDP in the fourth quarter of 1983 - published on Monday - will show only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent growth on the third quarter despite the recovery in manufacturing.
4. We are still investigating with the CSO whether there are well-founded reasons for suspecting that output figures are subject to downwards bias in a recovery period.


JON SHIELDS

Will the Chancellor publish details of recent revisions to the official index of manufacturing output and comment on developments?

## DRAFT REPLY

Initial estimates of manufacturing output are often revised significantly. Some of the reasons for these adjustments were discussed in an article in Economic Trends in October 1983. Figures for the third quarter of 1983 have been subject to three revisions since initial publication. They now show an increase of about 1 per cent on the second-quarter, level. Estimates for October and November were rai se d this month reflecting an allowance for stockbuilding in the fourth quarter; together with the initial estimate for December they show a further rise of 1 per cent between the third and fourth quarters of 1983.
2. These adjustments have had a considerable impact upon the profile of manufacturing output. Therecovery since the hesitation in output in the middle of 1982 now looks much stronger. Manufacturing production appears to have grown by $2 \frac{1}{2}-3$ per cent between the second halves of 1982 and 1983, with most industries showing higher levels of output. These figures are much more in line with other indicators of activity in manufacturing, notably the increase seen since the summer in average weekly hours and the optimistic responses to recent CBI surveys.

[^1]BACKGROUND NOTE

1. We have assumed that this question would be a written one as suggested in Mr Ridley's minute.
2. As the draft answer suggests, revisiurs to the manufacturing output index can have a considerable impact upon estimates of the short-term trend. Revisions can take place in both directions and for this reason we would be reluctant to give too much emphasis to the most recent estimates.
3. The figures for the third quarter of last year are now fairly well established, though some of the quarterly sales returns have yet to be analysed and other minor adjustments are still possible. However, the figures for the fourth quarter are nothing like as secure, being entirely based on monthly sales indicators and a provisional estimate of the increase in manufacturers stocks. There is considerable scope for further revisions as the fourth quarter sales inquiries arrive. It is likely that the figures will also change as the results of the Annual Census of Production are analysed, although the CSO advise us that this does not usually affect the manufacturing index to any great extent.

FROM: MISS M O'MARA DATE: 22 February 1984

Mr Shields

cc PS/Chief Secretary PS/Financial Secretary PS/Minister of State PS/Economic Secretary Sir P Middleton Sir T Burns Mr Monck Mr Battishill
Mr Evans
Mr odling-Smee
Mr Folger
Mr Salveson
Mr Ridley
Mr Portillo
Mr Spencer

## MANUFACTURING OUTPUT FIGURES

The Chancellor was grateful for your note of 17 February. He is content that the written question should now be tabled and answered as you have suggested. He does not see the need for any specific press briefing.

## MosM

MISS M O'MARA

CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER

cc:
Chief Secretary
Financial Secretary
Economic Secretary
Minister of State
Sir Peter Middleton Sir Terence Burns Mr Bailey
Mr Littler
Mr Cassell
Mr Monck
Mr Battishill
Mr Evans
Mr Lankester
Mr Oding-Smee
i.Mr Scholar

Mr Sedgwick
Mr Bottrill
Mr Hall
Mr Folger
Mr Mowl
Mr Riley
Mr Hibberd
Mr Lord
Mr Ridley
Mr Portillo

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ECONOMIC REVIEW

The February issue of the National Institute Review is timed for release at $9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. this evening. In addition to the usual coverage of recent developments and prospects for the world and domestic economies in 1984 and 1985, there are short articles on: the three measures of GDP; forecasting and policy uncertainty; changes in industrial structure; and influences on public and private sector pay.
2. The London Business School Economic Outlook will be released on Sunday; a note will be submitted to you tomorrow.
3. Some interesting, if not entirely, unexpected results on the properties of the three measures of GDP over the last twenty years are revealed in a short statistical exercise in the Review. The results suggest that the output measure of GDP has tended to grow slightly slower than either income or expenditure measures. More importantly, the observed tendency for revisions to the initial estimates to be in an upward direction is confirmed. It turns out that the initial estimate of the through-the-year growth in the output measure may be the best predictor of the eventual path of the average measure - but only after a fairly large adjustment is added for bias in the initial estimate.
4. Further analysis of the inter-relationships between the measures suggests that variances of an aggregate measure of GDP will be minimised by assigning unequal weights within the aggregate to the different measures: it is recommended that over half the weight be given to the output measure, with the bulk of the remainder going to the expenditure rather than the income measure.
5. The thrust of the article is that initial estimates of the output measure probably provide the best guide to what has actually been happening to GDP "through the year". This confirms the' general emphasis on GDP(0) that NIESR has adopted in looking at recent developments. Interestingly, however, the implied bias adjustment to the initial estimate is not mentioned in the appraisal in the current Review; had it been so, the references would have had to be to recent growth rates in GDP of nearly 3 per cent rather than $2 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent p.a.

## Forecast

6. Reflecting in part the emphasis on uncorrected initial estimates of $\operatorname{GDP}(0)$, the Review maintains a more gloomy perspective than official forecasts. Output growth is expected to remain at about $2 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent p.a. in 1984 before coming to a virtual halt in
the middle of 1985. Inflation returns to a 12-month rate of nearly 7 per cent by the end of this year and approaching 8 per cent next year. The current account remains in surplus but the effective exchange rate falls to 77 by the end of 1984.
7. A broadening recovery is foreseen for the world economy. With the United States growing at 5 per cent in 1984 and some acceleration expected in Japan and West Germany, the OECD growth rate is put at $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent for 1984 and nearly 3 per cent in 1985. This is expected to be accompanied by a very modest increase in inflation and a better outlook for non-oil LDCs. The picture is thus very similar to that envisaged for the IAF/forecast in the FSBR (figures in parenthesis below relate to proposed IAF projections for the major 7 excluding the UK and to UK-weighted world trade in manufactures).

WORLD ACTIVITY AND PRICES

|  | $\underline{1983}$ | $\frac{1984}{1}$ | $\frac{1985}{2 \frac{3}{4}}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: |
| OECD growth in GDP (per cent) | $2 \frac{1}{4}(2)$ | $3 \frac{1}{2}(4)$ | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| OECD growth in consumer <br> prices (per cent) | $5 \frac{1}{4}(5)$ | $5 \frac{3}{2}(5)$ | $5\left(4 \frac{1}{2}\right)$ |
| World trade growth in <br> manufactures (per cent) | $1 \frac{1}{2}(1)$ | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |  |

8. World interest rates are expected to rise slightly in the second half of this year, with the dollar depreciating against the yen in particular. Despite some upward pressure expected also on UK interest rates, it is assumed that real interest rates will be rather lower in the UK than the US, and domestic inflation rather faster in the UK. The NIESR's equation-based approach thus leads them to expect a fall of 6 per cent in the sterling effective rate this year even though the dollar oil price falls only marginally.
9. It is this fall in the sterling rate - itself partly determined by the domestic inflation forecast - that is the main explanation of the gloomy prospects for inflation this year. The 12-month increase in the RPI is still expected to return to $6 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent by the end of this year compared to a proposed IAF projection of $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. NIESR admit privately to not paying a great deal of attention to the short-term outlook for the RPI (their equations centre on the consumers' expenditure deflator) but the Press will, no doubt, focus on this continued discrepancy of views. Other explanatory factors appear to be differences in assumptions about productivity growth and the effects of continued tight competitive conditions on margins. In 1985, the further pick-up in inflation in the Institute's forecast is also associated with higher earnings growth.
10. The difference in outlook for price inflation explains much of NIESR's slower growth in GDP and the very slow upward drift in unemployment. On the assumption of a Budget restricted solely to indexation, real personal disposable incomes are predicted to grow by 1 per cent this year and next. Although the saving ratio is now expected to fall to $7 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent by the end of this year, consumption growth is, therefore, put at 2 per cent this year and under $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1985. NIESR acknowledge their recent consistent under-prediction in this area. They now expect flat rather than declining expenditure on durables, but without a better price-volume split it would have been difficult to raise their consumption forecast further.
11. On some other components of expenditure, NIESR take a rather more bullish line. Rising profits in manufacturing have encouraged them to project a faster and much better sustained rate of growth in fixed investment than indicated by recent surveys: nearly 11 per cent in 1984 and $8 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1985. Investment in services is set to grow by nearly 9 per cent in 1984. But they think that the peak in private housing is nearly past and expect little contribution from public sector investment.
12. The main elements of the NIESR forecasts for GDP and prices are as follows, with equivalent figures proposed for the FSBR in parenthesis:

## GDP AND PRICES

|  | 1983 | 1984 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { First } h \\ & \text { of } 19 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | change | ear ear |
| GDP (NIESR - Output <br> Measure; HMT - Average Measure) | $2 \frac{1}{4}(3)$ | $2 \frac{1}{4}(3)$ | $2\left(2 \frac{1}{2}\right)$ |
| Consumers' Expenditure | $3 \frac{3}{4}\left(3 \frac{3}{4}\right)$ | 2(3) | $1 \frac{1}{2}(3)$ |
| Fixed Investment | $4 \frac{1}{4}\left(4 \frac{3}{4}\right)$ | $3 \frac{3}{4}(6)$ | $1 \frac{1}{2}(3)$ |
| Retail Prices (to 4th Qrt) | 5 | $6 \frac{3}{4}\left(4 \frac{1}{2}\right)$ |  |

13. The projections of trade growth are unexceptional: a $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent rise in exports of goods and services in 1984 and (perhaps a little pessimistic given the slower growth in final demand) an increase of 6 per cent in imports. Despite the assumed depreciation of sterling, the terms of trade move in our favour (NIESR assume a further widening in the differential between domestic and export prices) and the visible deficit is not expected to rise much over £1 billion in 1984. This gives a current account balance (before data revisions) of £1 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion compared with £2 billion proposed for the IAF.
14. The PSBR - before any fiscal adjustment - is forecast to fall from £10 billion in 1983-84 to $£ 8 \frac{1}{2}$ billion in 1984-85 and £7 $\frac{1}{2}$ billion in 1985-86. Rising real onshore tax revenues, additional North Sea receipts and slower rates of growth in social security benefits are mentioned as explanations for the declining profile, along with lower growth in public sector earnings and high asset sales.
15. Three sections in the Review deal with previous errors. An analysis of Budget-time forecasts over the past three years (February and May for NIESR, the FSBR for the Treasury) suggests that output projections were "generally fairly good" in 1981 and 1982 although there was an initial under-statement of home demand in 1983 and Treasury projections were generally better. On inflation, NIESR acknowledge a recent tendency to over-predict. They lay claim to a remarkably good record on the current account. It is worth noting that judgements about forecasting records can be very sensitive to which of an annual cycle of forecasts is chosen and the extent to which "base drift" in the data for the current year is allowed to affect the comparisons.
16. A statistical note on NIESR's inflation forecasts over a longer period reveals not dissimilar errors to those quoted for Treasury forecasts. Policy-adjusted absolute errors for inflation to the end of the year for each February forecast in the past nine years averaged about $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent; 3 per cent before policy adjustment. There was, however, a tendency to under-predict inflation.
17. An article by Andrew Britton discusses the contribution of uncertainty about fiscal policy to forecast errors. It points out the improvement in predictability that would flow from the existence and continuity of feedback rules for Budget changes.

## Line to Take

18. The imminence of the Budget forecast and the familiar flavour of the NIESR Review suggest only a low key response. The National Institute have recently been excessively gloomy about both inflation and output; recent data give no support to their projections of a sharp upturn in inflation this year or output growth considerably less than 3 per cent pea.


JON SHIELDS

DEPARTMENTS OF INDUSTRY AND TRADE
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Sir. P. Mitubleton
office circulating.
24 February 1984

I am attaching a copy of the draft Press Notice on the Current Account of the United Kingdom Balance of Payments in January. The draft was agreed earlier today at the usual interdepartmental meeting.

Publication is set for Wednesday 29 January at 3.30 pm and I should be grateful if you would arrange for the Notice to be cleared by noon Tuesday 28 January and to inform me accordingly.

A copy of this letter and draft Press Notice is being sent to Sir Peter Middleton.

Yours sincerely


W E BOYD

SECRET AND PERSONAL UNTIL RELEASE OF PRESS NOTICE
ON 29.2.84 AT 3.3OPM AND THEREAFTER UNCLASSIFIED
Copy No ..10.(14)

THE CURRENT ACCOUNT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

JANUARY 1984

The current account for January is estimated to have been in deficit by $£ 129^{\prime}$ million compared with a surplus of $£ 568^{\circ}$ million in December. Exports in January amounted to £5224million and imports to $£ 5563^{\prime}$ million so that trade in goods was in deficit by $£ 339^{\prime}$ million compared with a surplus of $£ 358$ million in December.

The invisibles account is projected at a monthly surplus of £210 million, a large surplus on the transactions of the private sector and public corporations being partly offset by a deficit on government transactions.

NOVEMBER 1983 TO JANUARY 1984

In the period November to January the current account was in surplus by $£ 719^{\prime}$ million compared with a 'surplus of $£ 360$ 'million in the previous three months. There was a surplus on visible trade of $£ 89$ million in the latest three months compared with .a deficit of $£ 449$ million in the previous period. The surplus on invisibles is projected at $£ 630$ million.

CURRENT ACCONT
TABLE 1

a In isibles are projections and subject to revision as information become available.
b One-third of the appropriate calendar quarter's eatimates monthly figures of invisiblea are not availeble.
c Information relating to credits and debits of the private sector and public corporations can be found in Table 3.
$29 / 2 / 84_{0}$ at 3.30 pm and thereafter unclassified.

The visible trade balance in January was in deficit by $£ 339^{-}$ million compared with a surplus of $£ 358$ million in December. There was a surplus on oil of $£ 719^{\prime}$ million in January compared with £901'million in December. The deficit on trade in non-oil goods of $£ 543$ million in December increased to $£ 1058$ million in January.

The value of exports in January was $£ 572^{\prime}$ million ( 10 'per cent) below the exceptionally high December figure. Exports of oil fell by $£ 190$ million and exports of aircraft by $£ 102^{\prime}$ million. Excluding the erratic items*, exports of finished manufactures fell by £146'million.

Total imports were $£ 125^{\prime}$ million ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ' per cent) higher than in December. Excluding the erratic items, imports of semi-manufactures increased by $£ 70 \frac{\text { million }}{\mathrm{b}}$ but imports of finished manufactures fell marginally as higher arrivals of intermediate goods were offset by lower arrivals of consumer goods. Imports of the erratic items were £54' million higher in January.

The terms of trade index fell by $1 / 2$ per cent as the export unit value index ircreased by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent and the import unit value index increased by 2 per cent.

RECENT TRENDS

## Visible balance

In the three months November to Janaury there was a surplus on visible trade of £O.1' billion compared with a deficit of £O.4billion in the previous three months. The surplus on trade in oil inureased from $\{1.6$ billion to $£ 2.3$ billion whilst the deficit on non-oil goods increased from $£ 2.1^{\prime}$ billion to $£ 2.2^{\prime}$ billion.

[^2]
## Exports

Exports in the three months ended January were valued at $£ 16.3^{\prime}$ billion; 7 per cent higher than in the previous three months. Exports of oil rose by 12 per cent while deliveries of non-oil goods increased by $5 \frac{1 / 2}{2}$ per cent.

The volume of total exports increased by $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the latest three months and by 8 per cent excluding the erratic items. The rise was widespread with all of the broad sectors showing a significant increase. The underlying level of non-oil export volume has increased sharply in recent months and is now higher than at the beginning of 1983.

## Imports

Imports, valued at $£ 16.2^{\prime}$ billion in the latest three months, were f0. 5 ' billion ( $3^{\prime}$ per cent) higher than in the previous three months. Imports of oil fell by $£ 0.3^{\prime}$ billion and the erratic items by $£ 0.2$ billion. There were higher arrivals in most of the remaining sectors with chemicals and intermediate goods showing the largest growth.

Import volume in the three months ended January was a little higher than in the previous three months which included the erratically high October figure. The underlying level of non-oil import volume continues to rise.

Terms of Trade (see table 4)

The terms of trade index fell by $1 / 2$ per cent in the latest three months as the export unit value index increased by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent and the import unit value index increased by 2 per cent.

Analysis by Area

The value of exports to the developed countries increased by 5 per cent in the latest three months. Exports to Western Europe rose by 9 per cent over this period principally reflecting higher oll deliveries. Over the same period exports to North America fell by 6 'per cent as lower oil deliveries offset increased exports of non-oil goods.

The increase in the value of imports in the latest three months reflects a $6 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent rise in imports from Western Europe and a $7 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent increase from North America. Arrivals from the other developed countries fell marginally and imports from the developing countries fell by $91 / 2$ per cent.

## INVISIBLES

The latest estimates of invisibles - services, interest, profits and dividends and transfers, - relates to the third quarter of 1983 when credits were $£ 8552^{\prime}$ million and debits $£ 7654^{\prime}$ million giving a surplus of $£ 898$ million in the quarter. Invisibles in the private sector and public corporations (excluding transfers) were in surplus by $£ 1769$ million. The figures relating to invisibles for October to January are CSO projections. Data for the fourth quarter are due to be released by the CSO on Thursday 8 March. REVISIONS

In addition to the normal end of year revisions, the figures for imports, and the visible balance, and current balance for 1982 and 1983 have been revised to take account of a change in the treatment of transactions in gold. Further details are given in the notes to editors.

## NOTES TO EDITORS

1

## ANNUAL REVISIONS

A number of revisions have been made to the figures since the last monthly Press Notice. These revisions mainly relate to the annual updating of seasonal factors. Although the monthly revisions are generally small in relation to the aggregate figures of exports and imports, the impact on the balance of trade can be significant.

## 2 <br> CHANGES IN PROCEDURE

Besides the above revisions, two significant changes have been introduced from January 1984.

## (i) Gold in the current account

In compiling the balance of payments accounts transactions in commodity gold are recorded in the current account; transactions in financial gold are recorded in the capital account. Underlying this convention is the idea that visible trade should exclude any gold that is held primarily as a financial asset.

In the past the distinction between financial gold and other gold has been made by reference to its ownership; that is who, in the UK, imports or exports the gold. However recent information suggests that this practise is no longer satisfactory. It has therefore been decided that the distinction between commodity gold and financial gold should now be made by reference to its end-use. Only gold which is used for industrial purposes (eg for jewellery or in the manufacture of proof
sovereigns) is to be treated as a commodity. All other gold will be regard as financial.

The revisions to the balance of trade on current account resulting from the new treatment of gold transactions for 1980 to 1983 are shown in the table below.

VISIBLE BALANCE 1980-83

|  | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| As published January ' 84 | +1233 | +3008 | +2119 | -954 |
| Net adjustment for gold | +273 | +644 | +313 | +373 |
| Other revisions | +7 | - | -48 | +81 |
| As published February ' 84 | +1513 | +3652 | +2384 | -500 |

[(ii) Silver as an erratic item

In the past the erratic items have been defined as ships, North Sea production installations, aircraft and precious stones. To these, for the first time in this Press Notice, has been added trade in silver bullion which experience suggests is subject to large and erratic movements. Figures for earlier periods have been revised accordingly.

3 STANDARD NOTES

A revised version of these notes accompanies this Press Notice. The notes, describe in detail the differences between the Balance of Payments (BOP) and the Overseas Trade Statistics (OTS) bases of compilation. The principal difference is the deduction of freight from the OTS valuation of imports. Additional copies can be obtained from the address below.

Table 16 of the Press Notice shows the value of exports, imports and the visible balance, measured on a comparable (BOP) basis, for each of the major commodity groups including manufactured goods. Monthly data at this level of detail, will be published in the monthly Review of External Trade Statistics as from the March edition.

5
MONTHLY REVIEW OF EXTERNAL TRADE STATISTICS

The Monthly Review of External Trade Statistics, prepared mainly as an internal working document, is made available publicly by the Department of Trade and Industry (price £3 a copy).

This is a monthly publication containing a commentary, charts, and tables, on topics such as the current account of the UK balance of payments, UK exports and imports of goods by commodi.ty and area and certain international comparisons. An annual supplement (No 4), price £4 a copy, provides longer historical runs for the series shown in the monthly edition and additional international data.

6

## ROUNDING

The data published in this Press Notice has been rounded to the nearest fmillion. Therefore figures may not sum to the aggregates and balances may not derive exactly from the export and import figures shown.

Enquiries about the Standard Notes, and the Monthly Review, should be addressed to S2A, Room 255, Department of Trade and Industry, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H OET, Telephone: 01-215 5703.
until release of press notice.

CURRENT BALANCE, VISIBLE TRADE AND INVISIBLES
(Balance of Payments basis)


Invisibles are projectians and subject to reviaion as more information become available. One third of the appropriate calendar quarter's estimate; monthly figures of invisibles are not available.

Percentage changer latest three monthe an previous three months.
Table 3
nvisibles ${ }^{e}$
£ million seasonally adjusted

| 1 |  | 1 | All Seetors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Private Sector and public Corporations ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | f which |  |  | I |  |  |  |  |
| I |  | 1 | Credits | 1 | Debits | 1 | Balance |  |  | 1 | Interest |  |  | , | Credits |  | Debits | Balance |
| 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | Services | 1 | Profits |  | Tranafers | 1 |  |  |  | - |
| 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | Dividends |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  | 1 |  | I |  | , |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| \| 1982 |  | 1 | 31734 | 1 | 28475 | I | + 3259 |  | + 3853 | 1 | + 1515 |  | - 2109 | 1 | 27330 |  | 20360 | + 6970 |
| \| 1981 | Q4 | 1 | 8139 | 1 | 7083 | 1 | + 1056 |  | + 1026 | 1 | + 329 |  | - 299 | 1 | 7022 |  | 5317 | + 1705 |
| 1 1982 | Q1 | 1 | 7590 | 1 | 6959 |  | + 631 |  | + 1062 | 1 | + 58 |  | - 489 | 1 | 6451 |  | 5016 | + 1435 |
| 1 | Q2 | , | 7941 | 1 | 7109 | 1 | + 832 |  | + 1037 | 1 | + 416 |  | - 621 | , | 6945 |  | 5076 | + 1869 |
| 1 | Q3 | 1 | 7887 | 1 | 7203 | 1 | + 684 |  | + 817 | 1 | + 423 |  | - 556 | 1 | 6819 |  | 5154 | + 1665 |
| 1 | Q4 | 1 | 8316 | 1 | 7204 | 1 | + 1112 |  | + 937 | 1 | + 618 |  | - 443 | 1 | 7115 |  | 5114 | + 2001 |
| I 1983 | Q1 | 1 | 8290 | 1 | 7346 | 1 | + 944 |  | + 1120 | 1 | + 356 |  | - 532 | , | 7168 |  | 5266 | + 1902 |
| 1 | Q2 | 1 | 8300 | 1 | 7802 | 1 | + 498 |  | + 1212 | 1 | - 37 |  | - 677 | 1 | 7254 |  | 56.4 | + 1640 |
| 1 | Q3 | 1 | 8552 | 1 | 7654 | 1 | + 898 |  | + 1081 | 1 | + 172 |  | - 355 |  | 7377 |  | 5608 | + 1769 |
|  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |

d ie excluding general government transactions and all transfers.
e Monthly figures of invisibles are not available.


Export unit value indax a percentage of the import unit value index.
Value and volure of exports and imports excluding the more erratic itemsg
Table 5
(Balance of Payments basis)

$g$ These are defined as ships, North Sea installations, aircraft, precious stones, and silver.

TRADE IN OIL ${ }^{h}$
(Balance of Payments basis)
seascnally adjusted

|  | \| Balance | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Imports of Oil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 of 1 | Exports of ${ }^{\text {Crude }} 0.11{ }^{\mathrm{j}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reat |  |  | 1 |  | Crude 0 il |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | I Trade 1 | Total | 1 | [SITC (REV 2) 333.0] |  |  |  |  | \| Division | |  |  | Total | 1 | [SITC |  | (REV 2) 333.0] |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Division } \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| , | i in oil |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { I million } \\ & \text { f fob } \end{aligned}$ | 1 \& | I million |  |  | $\mid$ | \| Avg value | |  |  |  | \| E | |  |  | Efobfian |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mid \\ \text { \| million } \\ \mid \text { tonnes } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \| Avg value \| } \\ & \text { I per tomne \| } \\ & \text { \& fob } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $£$nillionfob |
| 1 |  | million |  |  | 1 per |  | tome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{\square}$ |  | fob |  | fob |  |  | tomes 1 |  | £ fob |  |  | $1$ |  |  |  | fob |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| \| 1982 | $1+45561$ | 10686 | 1 | 8542 | 1 | 60.3 | , | 141.6 | 1 | 2144 | 1 | 6130 | 1 | 3861 |  | 28.3 | 1 | 136.6 |  | 2269 |
| \| 1983 | $\|+7001\|$ | 12525 | 1 | 10111 | 1 | 68.4 | 1 | 147.8 | 1 | 2414 | 1 | 5524 | 1 | 3199 | I | 22.8 | 1 | 140.4 |  | 2324 |
| \| 1982 Q4 | $1+16531$ | 3030 | 1 | 2429 | 1 | 16.3 | \| | 148.7 | 1 | 601 | 1 | 1377 | 1 | 848 | 1 | 5.8 | 1 | 145.8 |  | 529 |
| \| 1983 Q1 | $1+1801 \mid$ | 3106 | 1 | 2475 | 1 | 16.4 | 1 | 150.7 |  | 631 | 1 | 1305 | 1 | 647 | 1 | 4.5 | 1 | 146.2 | I | 658 |
| 102 | $\|+1556\|$ | 2960 | 1 | 2367 | 1 | 16.4 | 1 | 144.6 | I | 593 | 1 | 1404 | 1 | 795 | 1 | 5.8 | 1 | 137.1 |  | 609 |
| 103 | $1+1521 \mid$ | 2960 | 1 | 2361 | 1 | 16.2 |  | 145.9 | I | 598 | 1 | 1439 | I | 942 | 1 | 6.9 | 1 | 137.8 | I | 497 |
| 104 | $1+2123 \mid$ | 3500 | 1 | 2911 | 1 | 19.5 | 1 | 149.6 | 1 | 588 | 1 | 1376 | 1 | 816 | 1 | 5.6 | 1 | 141.6 |  | 561 |
| \| 1983 Jan | $1+6361$ | 1117 | 1 | 908 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 | 153.6 | 1 | 209 | 1 | 481 | 1 | 271 | 1 | 1.9 | 1 | 145.9 | I | 210 |
| 1 Feb | $1+6381$ | 949 | I | 735 | 1 | 5.0 | 1 | 146.4 | 1 | 214 | 1 | 311 | 1 | 146 | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 146.9 |  | 166 |
| 1 Mar | $1+5271$ | 1040 | 1 | 832 | 1 | 5.5 | 1 | 151.5 | 1 | 209 | 1 | 513 | 1 | 230 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 146.3 | I | 283 |
| 1 Apr | $1+5471$ | 978 | I | 843 | 1 | 5.7 | 1 | 149.2 |  | 135 | 1 | 431 | , | 228 | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 140.2 |  | 203 |
| 1 May | $1+4501$ | 993 | I | 780 | 1 | 5.5 | 1 | 142.5 | , | 213 | 1 | 543 | I | 324 | 1 | 2.4 | 1 | 136.5 | I | 219 |
| 1 June | $1+5591$ | 989 | I | 744 | 1 | 5.2 | 1 | 142.3 | 1 | 245 | 1 | 430 | , | 243 | I | 1.8 | 1 | 135.9 | 1 | 187 |
| July | $1+4641$ | 953 | 1 | 751 | 1 | 5.2 | 1 | 143.4 | 1 | 201 | 1 | 488 | 1 | 325 | 1 | 2.4 | 1 | 135.4 |  | 163 |
| Aug | $1+5321$ | 977 |  | 792 | 1 | 5.4 | , | 146.6 | 1 | 185 | , | 445 | , | 277 | , | 2.0 | 1 | 141.3 | I | 168 |
| Sept | $1+5251$ | 1031 | I | 818 | 1 | 5.6 | , | 147.6 | 1 | 212 | 1 | 506 | 1 | 340 | , | 2.5 | 1. | 137.0 |  | 166 |
| Oct | $1+5611$ | 1100 |  | 906 | 1 | 6.1 | 1 | 148.5 | 1 | 194 | 1 | 539 | , | 360 | 1 | 2.3 | 1 | 143.0 |  | 179 |
| Nov | $1+6611$ | 1117 | I | 935 | 1 | 6.1 | 1 | 154.0 | 1 | 182 | 1 | 456 | , | 261 | 1 | 1.9 | , | 138.7 |  | 195 |
| 1 Dec | $1+9011$ | 1283 | 1 | 1071 | 1 | 7.3 | 1 | 146.7 | 1 | 212 | , | 382 | 1 | 195 | 1 | 1.4 | 1 | 143.3 | I | 187 |
| 11984 Jan | $1+7191$ | 1092 | 1 | 867 | 1 | 5.7 | 1 | 151.4 | 1 | 226 | 1 | 374 | 1 | 193 | I | 1.3 | , | 150.7 | 1 | 181 |
| 1 | 1 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Aug-oct | $\|+1618\|$ | 3107 | 1 | 2516 | 1 | 17.0 | 1 | 147.6 | 1 | 591 | I | 1489 | 1 | 977 | 1 | 6.8 | I | 149.9 |  | 512 |
| I Nov-Jan | $\|+2281\|$ | 3492 | 1 | 2872 | 1 | 19.1 | 1 | 150.5 | , | 620 | , | 1211 | 1 | 649 | 1 | 4.6 | 1 | 141.6 | 1 | 566 |
| \| Percentage | 11 | , | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| I change. | 11 | + 12 | 1 | + 14 | 1 | + 12 |  | $+2$ | 1 | + 5 | 1 | - 19 | 1 | - 34 | 1 | - 33 | 1 | - $5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | + 10 |
|  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |

[^3]Grort and Personal untir relese of press node


TRADE IN GOODS OTHER THAN OIL
(Balance of Payments basis)


These are defined as ships, North Seas installations, aircraft, precious stones, and silver.
Export unit value index as a percentage of the import unit value index.

##  $29 / 2 / 846$ at 3.30 pm and tharosfter unclassified.


g These are defined ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aireraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories and-use clasaification.
EXPORTS BY COMMODITY: VOLUNE INDICES
Table 9
(Overseas Trade Statistics basis)
INDICES $1980=100$, seasonally adjusted

| Total ! |  | Food | 11 |  |  | Menufactures excluding erratics9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% |  | \| Semi-menufactures |  |  |  | Finished manufactures excluding shipe, |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | bever-\| Basic | |  | Total |  | \| excluding precious | |  |  | North Sea installations and aircraft |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ages | \| Mater- | Fuels | Manufac- |  | stones | \& silve | (PS) 1 | (SNA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | and | \| ials | |  | tures | \| Total | |  | 1 |  |  | Pass-1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | tobacca | 1 | 1 |  |  | Total | Chemi- | Other I | Total I | enger 1 | Other |  | Inter- |  | Capital |
|  |  |  | , | 1 |  |  |  | cals I |  |  | Motor 1 | Consume |  | mediat |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1658 | 2521 |  | 141 |  | Cars 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SITC | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | \| $5-8$ \| | $5+6$ 1 |  | 61 | 7+8 | I |  |  |  |  | - |
| (REY 2) | $\mid 0-91$ | $0+1$ | \| $2+41$ | 3 | 5-8 | $\mid$ less \| | less 1 | 51 | Less 1 | less. | $k$ | k |  | k |  | $k$ |
|  | 11 |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\mid$ SNAPS 1 | PS. 1 |  | PS. 1 | SNA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weights | 11000 | 69 | 31 | 136 | 735 | $167{ }^{69}$ | 2661 | 112 | 1541 | 406 | 18 | 71 |  | 170 |  | 147 |
| 1982 | \| $102.0 \mid$ | 107 | 1941 | 1331 | 96 | 1.981 | 99 | 106 \| | 93 | 97 | 941 | 94 |  | 99 |  | 98 |
| 1983 | \| 102.2 | | 110 | 101 \| | 148 \| | 93 | 1941 | 102 | 1131 | 93 | 90 | 861 | 96 |  | 89 |  | 87 |
| 1982 Q4 | \| 103.9 | | 113 | \| 97 | | 1431 | 96 | 961 | 96 | 106 \| | 89 | 951 | 971 | 91 |  | 96 |  | 97 |
| 1983 Q1 | $\|102.1\|$ | 118 | \| 104 | 145 \| | 93 | 931 | 100 | 111 | 91 | 89 | 85 | 96 |  | 88 |  | 89 |
| Q2 | \| $100.0 \mid$ | 105 | 1991 | 1431 | 92 | 931 | 101 | 110 | 94 | 87 I | 701 | 92 |  | 87 |  | 87 |
| Q3 | 199.11 | 105 | 1951 | 141 | 92 | 1921 | 100 | 113 | 89 | 87 1 | 801 | 93 |  | 86 |  | 86 |
| Q4 | \|107.6| | 112 | \| 106 | | 163 | 97 | 1001 | 108 | 119 \| | 100 | 95 | 107 | 105 |  | 95 |  | 88 |
| 1983 Nov | \| $105.2 \mid$ | 112 | \| 102 | | 155 \| | 96 | 991 | 108 | 120 | 98 | 94 | 99 | 106 |  | 92 |  | 90 |
| Dec | \| 114.1 | | 118 | $\mid 111$ \| | 178 | 102 | 104 | 122 | 121 | 106 | 991 | 118 | 112 |  | 97 |  | 93 |
| 1984 Jan | \|101.6| | 117 | 1100 | 153 | 92 | 97 | 105 | 116 | 97 | 92 | 7521 | 99 |  | 94 |  | 88 |
| Aug-Oct | \| 101.4 | | 107 | 1971 | 1461 | 93 | 1941 | 15. | \| 114 | | 91 | 891 | 941 | 95 |  | 88 |  | 85 |
| Nov-Jer | \| 106.9 | | 116 | \| 105 | | 162 | 97 | \| 100 | | 108 | \| 119 | | 100 | 951 | 961 | 105 |  | 94 |  | 90 |
| Percent- |  |  | 1 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ge | $1+5 \frac{1}{2}$ | $+9$ | $+7 \frac{1}{2} 1$ | + 111 | $+3 \frac{1}{2}$ | $+7$ | $+7 \frac{1}{2}$ | $+4$ | $+11$ | $+7$ | + 2 交 1 | + 11 |  | $+7$ |  | $+5 \frac{1}{2}$ |

9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792)
precious stanes (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Ecenomic Categories end-use classification.

EXPORTS BY COMIDITY: UNIT VALUE DNDICES
(Overseas Trade Statistics basis)

NDICES $1980=100$ not seasonally adjusted

|  | I |  | I |  |  | I |  |  |  |  | Msnufactu | ures | ud | ati |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | Food | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | S | Semi-man | nufact | tures I | Finish | hed manu | facture |  | luc |  | ips, |
|  | 11 | bever- | \| Besic |  |  |  | Total | 11 | excludin | ing prec | scious ! | North | Sea | alla |  | and |  |  |
|  | \| Total | | ages | \| Mater |  | uels |  | Manuf |  | stones | \& silv | ver(PS) \| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11 | and | \| ials |  |  |  | tures | \| Total | |  |  |  |  | \| Pass-1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11 | tobaceo |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | Total | Cheai- | - Other I | Total I | 1 anger | Other |  | Inter |  | Capita |
|  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 11 |  | cale 1 | 1 |  | $\mid$ Motor $\mid$ | Consum |  | modia |  |  |
|  | , |  | , | 1 |  | 1 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  | - Cars 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| IC | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 5-8 | $5 \times 6$ |  | 6 | 74,8 |  |  |  |  | , |  |
| (REV 2) | \| 0-9 | | $0+1$ | $2+4$ | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5-8 | less I | leas I | 51 | less 1 | lees I | 1 k | k |  | k |  | k |
|  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | \| SNAPS | | PS 1 |  | PS 1 | SNA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weights | 11000 | 69 | 31 | 113 | 136 | 1 | 735 | 1672-1 | 266 1 | 112 \| | 1 154-1 | 406 | 18 | 71 |  | 170 |  | 147 |
|  | 1 \| |  | 1 | 1 |  | I |  | 16581 | 25\%1 |  | 141 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | \| 116.5 | | 115 | 1 102 |  | 132 | 1 | 115 | 115 | 1101 | 112 | 109 \| | 1181 | \| 126 | 114 | I | 120 | I | 117 |
| 1983 | \| 126.5 | | 122 | \| 112 |  | 140 | 1 | 125 | 124 | 1171 | 119 | 115 | 129 | 1144 | 122 |  | 132 |  | 128 |
| 198244 | \| 119.4 | | 116 | 1100 | 13 | 139 | 1 | 117 | 117 | 1111 | 113 | 109 | 121 | 130 | 117 |  | 124 | , | 120 |
| 1983 Q1 | \| 123.5 | | 119 | 1 104 | 14 | 141 | 1 | 122 | 121 | 1141 | 116 | 113 | 126 | 137 | 119 |  | 129 | 1 | 124 |
| Q2 | \| 125.6 | | 122 | \| 111 |  | 138 | 1 | 125 | 1124 | 1161 | 118 | 115 | 129 | 146 | 121 |  | 132 | I | 127 |
| Q3 | \| 127.9 | | 123 | \| 115 | 13 | 139 | 1 | 127 | \| 126 | 1181 | 120 | 116 | 131 | 147 | 123 |  | 134 | I | 129 |
| Q4 | \| 129.2 | | 125 | \| 117 |  | 142 | 1 | 128 | 127 | 1191 | 121 | 117 | 132 | 144 | 125 |  | 134 |  | 131 |
| 1983 Nov | \| 128.91 | 125 | 116 |  | 143 | 1 | 128 | 126 | 1181 | 120 | 117 | 131 | 143 | 125 |  | 134 | 1 | 130 |
| Dec | \| $130.2 \mid$ | 125 | 1120 |  | 144 | 1 | 129 | 128 | 1201 | 122 | 118 | 133 | 147 | 126 |  | 135 |  | 132 |
| 1984 Jan | \| 132.2 | | 126 | 1121 |  | 144 | 1 | 132 | 1130 | 1221 | 125 | \| $120 \mid$ | 135 | 153 | 128 | 1 | 138 | 1 | 135 |
| Aug-Oct | \| 128.4 | | 124 | I 116 |  | 140 | 1 | 128 | \| 126 | 1181 | 120 | \| 117 | 131 | 1145 | 124 |  | 134 |  | 129 |
| Nov-Jen | \| $130.4 \mid$ | 125 | 1119 | 14 | 143 | 1 | 129 | \| 128 | | 1201 | 123 | \| 118 | | \| 1331 | \| 148 | 126 |  | 135 |  | 132 |
| Percent- |  |  | 1 | I |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| age | $\left.1+1 \frac{1}{2} \right\rvert\,$ | + $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | $1+3$ | $1+$ | +2 | 1 | $+1 \frac{1}{2}$ | + $\left\|\frac{1}{2}\right\|$ | + $1 \frac{1}{2} 1$ | + 2 | $\left.1+1 \frac{1}{2} \right\rvert\,$ | $\left.1+1 \frac{1}{2} \right\rvert\,$ | $1+2$ | + $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | +1 |  | + 2 |
| change |  |  |  |  |  | $i$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

g These are defined ahipe, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Baeed on the United Nations Broad Economic Categoriee and-uee classification.
EXPORTS BY AREA
Teble 11
(Overeses Trade Statistice besis)
£ million, fob, seasonally adjustec


SEPET and Personal untir relesse of press notice
ce 29/2/84. at 3.30 pm and thereafter unclassified.


9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792)

## precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).

$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use classification.
IMPORTS BY COMNODITY: VOLUNE INDICES
Table 13
(Overseas Trade Statistics basis)
INDICES $1980=100$ seasonally adjusted

(Overseas Trade Scatistics basis)

g These are defined ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use clsesification.
Table 15
IMPORTS BY AREA
(Overseas Trade Statistics basis)


COMADDITY MNALYSIS OF VISIBLE TRADE ${ }^{m}$
(BLlance of Payments basis)
£ million, seasonally adjusted


|  | Semi-Menufactures |  |  |  | 1 | Finished Manufactures |  |  |  |  |  | Total Menufactures |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SITC (R2) | $5+6$ |  |  |  | 1 | $7+8$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5-8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Exports | Imports | 1 | $V$ Visible | 1 | Exports | I | Imports | 1 | Visible |  | Exports | 1 | Imports | $1$ | Visible |
|  | fob | fob. | 1 | Balance | 1 | fob | 1 | fob | 1 | Balance |  | fob | 1 | fob | $1$ | Balance |
|  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 1982 | - 14112 | 12972 | 1 | + 1140 | 1 | 23218 | 1 | 21855 | 1 | + 1363 |  | 37330 | 1 | 34827 | 1 | + 2503 |
| 1983 | 15927 | 15736 | 1 | + 190 | 1 | 24111 | 1 | 26420 | 1 | - 2309 |  | 40038 | 1 | 42156 | 1 | - 2119 |
| 1982 Q1 | 3512 | 3205 | 1 | + 307 | 1 | 5786 | 1 | 5027 | 1 | + 758 |  | 9298 | 1. | 8232 | 1 | + 1066 |
| Q2 | 3558 | 3372 | 1 | + 186 | I | 5922 | I | 5635 | 1 | + 287 |  | 9480 | 1 | 9007 | 1 | + 474 |
| Q3 | 3370 | 3104 | 1 | + 266 | 1 | 5653 | 1 | 5521 | 1 | + 132 |  | 9024 | , | 8625 | 1 | + 399 |
| Q4 | 3671 | 3291 | 1 | + 380 | 1 | 5857 | 1 | 5673 | 1 | + 185 |  | 9528 | , | 8963 | 1 | + 565 |
| 1983 Q1 | 3863 | 3712 | 1 | + 151 | 1 | 5799 | 1 | 6386 | 1 | - 587 |  | 9662 | , | 10098 | 1 | - 436 |
| Q2 | 3923 | 3942 | 1 | - 20 | 1 | 5924 | 1 | 6507 | 1 | - 583 |  | 9847 | 1 | 10449 | 1 | - 603 |
| Q3 | 3901 | 389\% | 1 | + 87 | 1 | 5988 | 1 | 6546 | 1 | - 558 |  | 9968 | 1 | 10440 | , | - 472 |
| 04 | 14160 | 4188 | 1 | - 28 | 1 | 6400 | 1 | 6981 | 1 | - 581 |  | 10560 | 1 | 11169 | L | - 609 |

Monthly data for comodities on a balance of payments basis are not available.
cc PS/Chief Secretary PS/Financial Secretary
PS/Minister of State PS/Economic Secretary Sir P Middleton Sir T Burns Mr Bailey Mr Littler Mr Cassel Mr Monck Mr Battishill Mr Evans Mr Lankester Mr Odling-Smee Mr Scholar Mr Sedgwick Mr Bottrill Mr Hall Mr Folder Mr Mow Mr Riley Mr Hibberd Mr Lord Mr Ridley Mr Portillo

MR SHIELDS

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE ECONOMIC REVIEW

The Chancellor has seen your minute of 23 February. Commenting on the National Institute's study of GDP measures, he has remarked that he himself has long thought that a simple average of the output and expenditure measures would be better than an average of $\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{E}$ and I. He would be interested to know what views the CSO hold.

# H M Treasury <br> Parliament Street London SWIP 3AG <br> Switchboard 01-233 3000 <br> Direct Dialling 01-233 $.87,84$ 

Sir John Boreham KCB
Central Statistical Office
Great George Street
London
SW 1
28 February 1984

Dew Sir John,
MEASURES OF GDP
The article about GLP measures in the latest NIESR Review has caught the Chancellor's attention (see the attached minute from the Private office and my note on the Review).
2. You might like to consider replying directly to the Chancellor on this issue. The substance is of course relevant to Sir Peter Middleton's meeting on 1 March.
Your sincanely

## trader copies


cc Sir Peter Middleton Sir Terence Burns Mr Evans Mr Ste Mr Hibberd Miss O'Mara

## EMBARGOED UNTIL OO.01 HOURS FRIDAY 2 MARCH 1984



FROM: NEIL MACKINNON
DATE: 29 FEBRUARY 1984
2. CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER
Chief Secretary
Sir Terence Burns
Mr H P Evans
Mr Battishill
Mr Shields
Mr Page
Mr Hall
Mr A Smith
Mr Lord
Mr Ridley
Mr Portillo

PHILLIPS AND DREW MARCH FORECAST

## MAIN POINTS

PD's latest forecast will be released on Friday, 2 March 1984. They remain at the optimistic end of the range of outsiders. This year GDP grows by almost 3 per cent (consistent with the IAF in the Autumn St atement) but slows down to an annual rate of $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1985. The 1984 inflation forecast has been revised downwards slightly, nevertheless the year on year RPI increase rises from 5 per cent at 1984 Q4 to $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent at 1985 Qt. (See attached tables).
2. MAIN ECONOMIC AND POLICY ASSUMPTIONS
(i) World trade grows by 3 per cent in 1984 and 1985 with some slowdown through next year as US activity moderates. OECD inflation rises gradually over the next 18 months to reach a peak of 7 per cent by mid-1985. Oil demand is sufficient to support the present $\$ 29 / \mathrm{bl}$ Saudi marker price until end -1985, thereafter the official price rises in line with OECD inflation.
(ii) Government economic policy adheres to the broad thrust of the MTFS as out in the 1983 FSBR. In the medium-term the Government aims to maintain "disinflationary pressure within a framework slightly more accommodative (SIC) to growth".
(iii) The Spring 1984 Budget is expected to be "broadly neutral" in order to achieve a PSBR of about £ $7 \frac{1}{2}$ billion ( $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent of GDP) for 1984-85. A target range of $4-8$ per cent is announced for the narrow monetary aggregates with "MO probably superseding Ml as the priority target in this area". Personal tax allowances and excise duties are overindexed in the personal sector while the corporate sector receives an additional tax burden eg higher capital transfer tax.

## 3. MAIN POINTS FROM THE FORECAST

(i) GDP (A) grows by almost 3 per cent this year mainly reflecting a "much improved picture" for exports, investment and stockbuilding. These factors partially offset a slowdown in consumer spending from $3 \frac{1}{2}-4$ per cent growth in 1983 to $2-2 \frac{1}{2}$. per cent in 1984 (the savings ratio remains constant at $8 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent throughout the forecast period).
(ii) Retail price inflation stays within a $5-5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent range this year and next. Growth in average earnings moderates slightly from $7-7 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the present "pay round" to about $6 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the 1984-85 round.
(iii) The PSBR outturn for 1983-84 is expected to be $\begin{aligned} & \text { ( } 9-9 \frac{1}{2} \\ & \text { billion }\end{aligned}$ as the final months of this fiscal year benefit from a slowdown in public spending growth and an increase in indirect tax revenues. There is little scope for a fall in interest rates during 1984 as the authorities maintain "positive real short-term interest rates as a means of depressing inflation expectations further."

EMBARGOED UNTIL OO.O1 HOURS FRIDAY 2 MARCH 1984

|  | GDP (A) |  |  | RPI (Q4) |  | CURRENT ACCOUNT (£bn) |  | PSBR ( f bn) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1984 | 1985 | 1984 | 1985 | 1983-84 | 1984-85 |
| IAF (November) | 2.8 | 2.8 | - | 4.5 | - | 0 | - | 10.0 | 8.0 |
| P\&D (November) | 3.2 | 1.9 | $1.0(\mathrm{Q2)}$ | 6.3 | 5.8 (Q2) | 0.1 | $0.2(\mathrm{HI})$ | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| P\&D (February) | 2.8 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 0.4 | - 1.1 | 9.5 | 8.5 |
| P\&D (March) | 2.9 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 1.0 | $-0.3$ | 9.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.0 \text { (pre } \\ & \text { Budget) } \end{aligned}$ |

# Monetary Bulletin 

The Budget's restructuring of corporate taxation will continue to affect capital markets for some time. It will also bring forward a substantial volume of fixed capital investment to take advantage of the phased reduction in first year capital allowances. This, together with a number of other developments, will put pressure on corporate cash flow in the second half of the coming financial year, temporarily raising bank lending and affecting the growth of the money supply.

The Chancellor's short term real economy forecasts look broadly plausible, and his inflation forecast up to mid-1985 seems at most only a little optimistic. In the longer run there threatens to be some tension between the projected monetary growth and the rate of wage inflation.

The 1984/5 PSBR target looks attainable, while the projections for the four following years have more in-built flexibility than some commentators have acknowledged.

The statement on monetary targets was much as expected and the absence of an explicit assignment of the narrow and broad aggregates to particular aspects of financial policy is welcome.

Finally, and separate from the Budget, Wednesday's cut in base rates is consistent with the recent behaviour of the monetary aggregates.

## The Budget Measures and the Corporate Sector

Mr. Lawson's first Budget will have permanent historical significance. His breadth of vision in changing the tax structure and his powerful re-affirmation of the commitment to the Medium Term Financial Strategy are admirable.

By far the most significant aspect of the Budget for financial markets is the restructuring of corporate taxation. This will have a very complex series of effects, some affecting markets immediately, others operating in the medium term and still others being influential in the long term.

Mr . Lawson's proposals have lowered the average effective rate of tax on companies, i.e. the nominal corporation tax rate after adjusting for the various tax shelters. This obviously yields a once and for all windfall gain in post-tax profits on the existing stock of industrial assets and has contributed to the rise in the equity market. In the longer run, there are likely to be significant changes in the volume and quality of

| R.H. Lawson <br> G.T. Pepper <br> C.E Frappell <br> The Lord Annaly <br> J.A. Rickards <br> L Gooderham | T. Quinn M.T. Higgins <br> D. G. Thomson <br> H.N. Seely <br> T.G. Wakeley <br> J.F.R. Hammond | J. Wigglesworth <br> E. J. Fenton <br> AJ. Bonner <br> N.S. King <br> G.P.P. Stewart <br> K. P. Joseph | A.G.P. Davidson <br> P.D. Jones <br> R.L Thomas <br> K.C. Brown <br> J.C. Finch <br> S.J.D. Posford | R.W. Walker W.E.A. Bain R.M. Harvey R. B. Pomphrett M.R.F. Wonfor A.L Bucknall | M.S. Jaskel P.B. Lilley A. J. E. O'Sullivan G. R. Addison K.M. Feeny |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSOCIATED MEMBERS | Graham H. Greenwell <br> P. G. E. Greenwell <br> P.H. Beaufrere | J. B. Lake <br> L Maddy <br> R.J.M. L. Ottley | S.H. Wamsley I.S. White | Managers <br> P. Horsman W.J.M. Mahoney J. G. Matthew | Senior Dealers <br> A F. Cansell K. Gankerseer A lago |

fixed investment, but the precise impact will not be apparent for some time. What is clear, however, is that the Budget proposals will have an important effect on the timing of fixed investment decisions over the next two years. This in turn is likely to have a significant impact on financing patterns and financial markets.

The Chancellor has announced major changes in first year capital allowances. On plant and machinery, for example, these will be cut in three annual steps from $100 \%$ to $25 \%$. Combined with the staged reductions in corporation tax, from $52 \%$ to $35 \%$, the Chancellor has given a very major incentive to companies to bring forward their fixed capital invoctment decisions.

The precise impact will depend on the end date of a company's financial year. For a company with a December year-end, the discounted net cost of an investment in plant and equipment will be reduced by $15 \%$ if it is brought forward from April 1985 to December 1984. For a company with a March year-end, the benefit from moving the investment forward by one month to March 1985 is as great. The saving from bringing forward investment by a whole year, say from March 1986 to March 1985, is much less, perhaps only some $2 \%$ plus the benefit from avoiding inflation over the intervening year. This suggests that little investment is likely to be brought forward by as much as a year. In general, we would expect substantial amounts of investment to be brought forward into the final two quarters of the 1984/5 financial year. The scale of this is difficult to gauge but there is some guidance from the late 1960's. Higher investment grants, announced as temporary, were given for capital expenditure in 1967 and 1968. It is estimated that these caused some $10 \%$ of investment in plant and machinery to be brought forward into the fourth quarter of 1968, mainly from the first quarter of 1969.

The Chancellor's present proposals offer an even greater incentive than those of 1968. In our view, companies will bring forward at least £lbn of investment into the fourth quarter of 1984 and the first quarter of 1985 . It should be noted that this effect will take place at a time when fixed investment is forecast to be rising for other reasons. It will, therefore, be difficult to estimate the underlying rate of fixed investment around the end of the present calendar year.

The higher rate of investment will have to be financed. It will also be taking place at a time when there are two other pressures on corporate cash flow. First, corporation tax payments on the much higher corporate profits of 1983/4 will be due in January 1985, and will amount to some £l $\frac{1}{4}$ bn more than in January 1984. Secondly, the Budget proposal that VAT on imports will be paid earlier, will become operational from the fourth quarter of this year; this will bring in an extra £l.2bn tax revenue. It is likely, therefore, that there will be significant temporary financing pressures starting in the last quarter of 1984.

How will the financing be done? Again, the Budget proposals have implications. First, the reduction in first year capital allowances will eventually sharply diminish the attractiveness of leasing, although significant benefits will remain in the year to March 1985 with first year allowances at $75 \%$. Secondly, the sequence of cuts in the rate of corporation tax will substantially reduce the incentive that companies have had to finance themselves through borrowing rather than by raising equity capital. Under the imputation system of corporation tax, interest paid is offsetable in full, but dividends can be offset only in part (currently, ACT is $30 \%$ ). As the corporation tax rate comes closer to the income tax rate, equity finance will become more attractive relative to borrowing. This effect, however, will only be small for dividends paid in 1984; its full effect will not, benefit companies until 1986.

Finally, the exemption from capital gains tax of corporate bonds issued after Budget Day, if they are held for more than a year, places these bonds on a similar tax basis to gilt-edged stock. Further, the clarification of the tax treatment of deep discount bonds removes a source of uncertainty which previously acted as a deterrent to their issue, as discussed in our Special Monetary Bulletin in November 1982. While these measures make new issues more attactive to private individuals and net funds, they are unlikely on their own to lead to an immediate significant revival in the corporate bond market. The main barrier remains the current height of nominal and real interest rates. Without a further fall in bond yields it is difficult to forsee a steady stream of these issues.

Summarising, the Budget proposals should have a significant long run impact on the way in which industry raises its finance. For the pressures which we envisage appearing around the end of this year, however, bank borrowing or leasing seem to be the most relevant.

This will imply a boost to sterling M3 and the other broad monetary aggregates in the second half of the 1984/5 financial year, and may very well make interpretation of the aggregates difficult. The surge may be only temporary, and should be reversed in the following financial year, but the market could become unsettled in the expectation of a reaction from the authorities.

## The real economy in the short term

The Chancellor is forecasting GDP growth of $3 \%$ for 1984 over 1983. Is this reasonable? Our preferred starting point in answering this question is to look at recent rates of growth of the real money stock. The broad picture here is that the year on year rates of growth peaked in mid-1983 and have fallen significantly since. The latest figures show relatively moderate growth in all the aggregates except PSL2. This pattern is strongly reinforced on a six month basis, where Mo and sterling M3 have grown in real terms by 1\% p.a., and PSL2 by 5\% p.a., as shown in Table I.

Table I - Real Monetary Growth to mid-February

| \%p.a. | Last 6 months |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mo | 1 |  |
| Mrcvious 6 months |  |  |
| Currency | 0 | 1 |
| Retail M1 | 0 | 0 |
| M1 | 3 | 5 |
| Sterling M3 | 1 | 9 |
| PSL1 | 0 | 8 |
| PSL2 | 5 | 8 |

These developments justify the recent cut in base rates and give no support for the view that the economy is growing too fast and a large upsurge in inflation is imminent. On the basis of recent trends in the real monetary aggregates, we believe that 3\% GDP growth in 1984 is probably attainable. In view of the sharp deceleration in the rate of real monetary growth, however, this might require a further cut in base rates.

Turning to the components in the Chancellor's forecast, shown in Table II, we are offered the alluring prospect of a sustained recovery based on higher investment and exports rather than accelerating private and government consumption. To some, this must seem too good to be true. In our view, with some relatively minor qualifications, it is very reasonable, at least for 1984.

Table II - The Treasury's Real Terms Forecast

| percentage change | 1982 to 1983 | 1983 to 1984 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| GDP | $3 \%$ |  |
| Consumers' expenditure | $3 \frac{1}{2} \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| General government consumption | $2 \frac{1}{2} \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Fixed investment | $4 \frac{1}{2} \%$ | 0 |
| Exports | $\frac{1}{2} \%$ | $6 \frac{1}{2} \%$ |
| Imports | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Change in stocks (\% of GDP) | $\frac{3}{4} \%$ | $7 \%$ |
|  |  | $\frac{1}{2} \%$ |

Consumers' expenditure has so far been sustained by a falling savings ratio. Rising real earnings and higher disposable incomes have now taken over and should continue to underpin consumption for the next year. The forecast of no increase in general government consumption might seem optimistic, especially after a year in which the original forecast of a $\frac{1}{2} \%$ rise must be compared with the outturn of a $2 \frac{1}{2} \%$ rise. Against that, last year's excess growth occurred around the end of the 1982/3 financial year, after which the government seems to have re-established greater control over spending. The outturn for 1984 may well be only a little more than the forecast.

We have already indicated that the Budget measures should substantially affect the timing of private sector fixed investment over the next two years, and some of this should materialise in calendar 1984. With corporate cash flow very substantially up, industrial confidence continuing to return and economic expansion underway, the stage was anyway set for an upturn in investment. The Treasury forecasts for fixed investment for 1984 and the first half of 1985 could well be an understatement.

The forecast for exports rests heavily on the predicted increase in world economic activity but in one respect may be a little low. The forecast assumes that sterling's effective exchange rate in 1984 "will be near to its average last year", whereas it is currently somewhat lower. The import forecast is more problematic. Stockbuilding cannot be expected to be buoyant, especially with the abolition of stock relief; the payment of VAT on imports, however, might bring some imports forward, as might accelerations in fixed investment stimulated by the Budget measures. The Government's forecast of a £2bn current account surplus in 1984 could well be too high.

## Inflation

On inflation the Chancellor is forecasting a rise in the RPI of a little above $5 \%$ p.a. in the first half of 1984, slowing to $4 \frac{1}{2} \%$ p.a. by the fourth quarter 1984 and $4 \%$ p.a. by the second quarter of 1985. It should be recalled that the Treasury's forecast of inflation last year was originally received with considerable scepticism, as being optimistically low. In the event it was $1 \%$ too high. This year the only substantial inflationary worry is the behaviour of earnings, currently increasing by $7 \frac{3}{4} \%$ p.a. Productivity is continuing to rise fast, however, so that the Treasury's inflation forecast for 1984 seems only a fraction low.

Looking further into the future, the rate of inflation will depend on the growth in the money supply. This is discussed in some detail below but the projected illustrative target ranges in the new MTFS, showing an annual one percentage point fall in both ranges over the next five years, underline the Government's commitment to a sustained fall in inflation. The longer run difficulty facing the Government is the distinct possibility of tension between these target ranges and increases in average earnings. If productivity continues to rise rapidly, high earnings increases pose no great inflationary threat. But the expectation is that productivity increases will shortly begin to taper off. Unless the rate of increase in average earnings responds in a similar way the Government will be faced with the difficult choice between relaxing its monetary growth path and tolerating further unemployment.

## PSBR

The PSBR forecast for $1984 / 5$ is now $£ 7 \frac{1}{4}$ bn, or $2 \frac{1}{4} \%$ of GDP. This looks achievable, although our central estimate is a little higher. In comparison to this time last year, there is a much more substantial contingency reserve (£2.7bn as against £l.1bn), no assumption of a shortfall in public expenditure (as against £l.6bn last year) and no gross lack of expenditure control going into the new year.

There is, however, some concern that the quality of the factors reducing the PSBR in 1984/5 is poor, in that they include both a once-and-for-all acceleration of VAT on imports of $£ 1.2 \mathrm{bn}$ and higher asset sales of $£ 1.9 \mathrm{bn}$. It is likely that much of the former will be financed through the banking system and some of the latter by lower purchases of government debt. The reduction in the PSBR from these measures will not, therefore, have as large an offset on monetary growth as normal.

A second point concerns fears of a rebound in the PSBR in 1985/6 given that there will no longer be a benefit from the acceleration of VAT on imports. The "full year" effect of the Budget measures in isolation is to raise the PSBR by £l.7bn more than in 1984/5. The Treasury's projection for $1985 / 6$ is, however, for a PSBR of $£ 5$ bn before "fiscal adjustment". The reason for this low figure is higher revenue from the forecast 3\% growth in economic activity at a time when the Government plans to hold public expenditure unchanged in real terms. Further, receipts of corporation tax will rise because they will be based on the higher profits currently being earned.

The Chancellor's PSBR projections for later years allow for regular "fiscal adjustments". These are the amounts forecast to be available to absorb overruns in public expenditure, to compensate for lower real growth than assumed when making the projections or to provide for tax cuts over and above indexation adjustments, all while keeping to projected PSBR levels. In 1985/6 the fiscal adjustment is put at $£ 2 b n$, while the cumulative adjustment by $1988 / 9$ reaches $£ 13 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{bn}$; this is equivalent to $8 \%$ of public expenditure or an extra $2 \%$ p.a. In addition, the Chancellor has provided for successively larger contingency reserves, up from $£ 2 \frac{3}{4}$ bn in 1984/5 to $£ 4 \frac{3}{4} b n$ in 1986/7.

The tax changes announced in the Budget are likely to make the profile of the PSBR during 1984/5 rather unusual. The accelerated VAT payments will be largely received in the three months from November, and the major asset sales are not expected until the autumn. This means that, in comparison with the normal seasonal factors, the PSBR will be tending to run at a higher rate in the first half of the year and a lower rate thereafter.

Our conclusions are that the Chancellor has built into his medium term PSBR arithmetic a substantial degree of flexibility and that his PSBR projections look attainable. His ability to cut taxes, however, will depend on his success in keeping down the growth in public expenditure. Recent history provides few grounds for optimism here.

## Monetary Targets

The importance of the MTFS is to continue. The Chancellor envisages a gradual decline in the monetary target ranges through to 1988/9. This is designed to achieve consistency between monetary and fiscal policy and to confirm the discipline of the Government's overall approach.

As expected, Mo has replaced Ml as the target aggregate for narrow money, while for broad money only sterling M3 has been retained. M2 appears to have been considered as an alternative to Mo, but, since it is a relatively new aggregate for which seasonal adjustments are not yet available, it needs to be interpreted with particular care. The Chancellor stressed that, as in previous years, the growth of other aggregates will be taken into account. M2 will supplement Mo and PSL2 will supplement sterling M3. General financial conditions, the rate of inflation and other available evidence, especially the exchange rate, will continue to be influential.

The target ranges for broad and narrow money will no longer be the same, reflecting the fact that in the longer run the narrow aggregates tend to grow more slowly than the broader aggregates. The recent Treasury Working Paper, to which we referred in last month's Bulletin (No. 155), highlighted the slower growth in Mo. For the fourteen months from mid-February 1984 the target ranges for Mo and sterling M3 are 4-8\% p.a. and $6-10 \%$ p.a. respectively. "Illustrative ranges" which fall by $1 \%$ a year have been given for successive years up to 1988/9, but the actual targets will be decided nearer the time.

One particularly relevant omission from both the MTFS and the Budget speech is the point made by the Chancellor in his Mansion House speech last October, to the effect that "there is some presumption that the narrower aggregates might have particular relevance for short term interest rates while the broader aggregates might be more relevant for decisions about fiscal and funding policy". Instead he now says that Mo and sterling M3 "will have an equal importance in the conduct of policy" and does not explicitly propose to assign either aggregates any special function.

The Chancellor did, however, stress that "the use of Mo as a target variable will not involve any change in the methods of monetary control". The implications are that a supply-side monetary base control regime is not being introduced.

A statistical change is being made in the Mo series. Although bankers' balances at the Bank of England account for less than 2\% of Mo, they are subject to erratic short term fluctuations. In order to obtain a series which is easier to interpret, a new method of calculation is to be used. Up to now all the monetary series have measured the aggregates at the end of each banking month; but weekly data for each Wednesday are available from the Bank of England's weekly return for the main components of Mo. A new monthly series for Mo has been produced based on the average weekly levels on the Wednesdays within a banking month. Over more than a few months, the growth of the old and new series is very similar. For example, over the year to mid-January the growth rates were $5.7 \%$ p.a. and $6.0 \%$ p.a. on the old and new series respectively.

## Monetary Growth in the Month to Mid-February

The seasonally adjusted data for the four weeks to 15 th February are as follows:-

|  | £m. | p.a. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 20 | $2 \%$ |
| Currency | 91 | $10 \%$ |
| Retail M1 | 144 | $6 \%$ |
| M1 | 287 | $8 \%$ |
| Sterling M3* | 110 | $1 \%$ |
| PSLl | -69 | $-1 \%$ |
| PSL2 | 1,973 | $14 \%$ |
| Bank lending in sterling <br> $\quad$ to private sector | 1,032 | $12 \%$ |
| * New Basis |  |  |

Monetary growth remained generally modest in the month to mid-February. The above table has already switched to the new definition for sterling M3, which excludes public sector deposits. On the old definition, sterling M3 would have fallen in the latest month by $£ 16 \mathrm{~m}$, but over the latest three, six and twelve months the growth rates would have been almost exactly the same at $7.9 \%$ p.a., $7.1 \%$ p.a. and $9.7 \%$, respectively.

Bank lending in sterling to the private sector rose by $£ 1,032 \mathrm{~m}$ in the month but this was after a fall of $£ 120 \mathrm{~m}$ in bills held outside the banking system; this suggests an underlying increase of only some $£ 900 \mathrm{~m}$.

Two other counterparts were unusual in the month to mid-February. First, sterling M3 was reduced by a near-record $£ 1,044 \mathrm{~m}$ rise in banks' non-deposit liabilities, which include errors and omissions as well as banks' retained profits and proceeds from capital issues. Secondly, although the external counterpart reduced sterling M3 by £577m, this was a smaller reduction than expected after the exceptional £l, 334 m positive contribution in the previous month. These two factors, however, to some extent offset each other. The errors and omissions element of banks' non-deposit liabilities most frequently reflect errors in the counterparts, especially the external counterpart, rather than in sterling M3 itself. It is, therefore, more helpful to consider the sum of the two factors together. They reduced sterling M3 by an unusually large $£ 1,621 \mathrm{~m}$ in the month to mid-February. Over the last three months, however, sterling M3 was reduced on average by $£ 399 \mathrm{~m}$ by these two factors, which was about the same as in the previous nine months.

## Monetary Growth to mid-February



The above table shows that the growth of the narrow monetary aggregates has been decelerating, and that the growth of sterling M3 and PSLI has been steady during the last six months at around the bottom of the old target range. PSL2 is the only aggregate to have shown buoyancy. If PSL2 is ignored, the behaviour of the aggregates justifies the recent reduction in base rates.

Looking ahead to the month to mid-March, data for Mo on its new average weekly basis are available for only the first four of the five weeks of the banking month. The indications are that Mo will rise by about $\frac{1}{2} \%$ in the month. This would reduce the three, six and twelve month growth rates to mid-March to $4 \%$ p.a., $5 \%$ p.a. and $5 \frac{1}{2} \%$ respectively. This should be compared with the new target range of $4-8 \%$ p.a. The justification for the cut in base rates is confirmed.

## MONETARY GROWTH <br> In Nominal Terms

## Percentage

 annual ratesChanges in year to:

| 1983 | Mar. | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Apr. | 6 |
|  | May | 7 |
|  | June | 6 |
|  | July | 6 |
|  | Aug. | 1 |
|  | Sept. | 6 |
|  | Oct. | 7 |
|  | Nov. | 6 |
|  | Dec. | 7 |
|  | Jan. | 6 |
|  | Feb. | 6 |

Changes in 6 months to: 1983 Sept.

Oct.
Nov.
Dec.
1984
Jan.
Feb.
Currency Retail M1 M1 M2 Sterling M3 PSL1 PSL2

6
7
7
8
7
7
7
8
8
7
6
5

| 11 | 14 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 11 | 15 |
| 12 | 16 |
| 11 | 16 |
| 11 | 15 |
| 10 | 14 |
| 9 | 12 |
| 8 | 13 |
| 8 | 12 |
| 9 | 12 |
| 9 | 11 |
| 8 | 11 |


10
11
11
11
12
11
10
11
10
11
11
10

10
11
10
11
11
11
9
10
10
11
10
9

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 10 | 10 | 12 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 9 | 7 | 9 |
| 8 | 7 | 9 |
| 8 | 7 | 9 |
| 7 | 7 | 9 |
| 7 | 5 | 10 |

Changes in 3 months to:

| 1983 | Dec. | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1984 | Jan. | 5 |
|  | Feb. | 4 |

Changes in year to:

## 1983 Mar.

Apr.
May
June
July
Aug.
Sept.
Oct.
Nov.
1984
Jan.
Feb.

| 2 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 8 |
| 4 | 7 |
| 3 | 7 |
| 3 | 6 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 4 |
| 0 | 3 |


| 6 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| 8 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| 7 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| 7 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 9 |
| 6 | 9 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 9 |
| 4 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 |
| 3 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
| 4 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 8 |
| 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |

Changes in 6 months to:
1983 Sept.
Oct.
Nov.
Dec.
1984
Jan.
Feb.

| 5 | 4 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 0 | 5 |

Changes in 3 months to:

| 1983 | Dec. | 0 | -2 | 7 | 10 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1984 | Jan. | 0 | -3 | -1 | 3 |
|  | Feb. | -2 | -3 | -1 | 3 |


| 3 | 6 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 6 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 |
| -1 | 3 |
| 0 | 3 |

0
1
1
-1
0
0
6
6
4
3
3
3

| 12 | 11 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 8 | 6 |
| 8 | 5 |

11
11
14

## In Real Terms

Chart 1 - Monetary Growth in NOMINAL Terms (\% p.a.)

W. GREENWELL \& Co-Monetary Bulletin


Chart 3 - Components of Monetary Growth (bns )

W. GREENWELL \& Co-Monetary Bulletin

STATISTICS
reprinted from Bank of England, Banking Statistics

$\pm$ mullons

|  | Notes and coin in circulation with public | UK private sector sterling sight deposits <br> Non-interest- <br> bearingia]$\| \begin{aligned} & \text { Interest- } \\ & \text { bearing }\end{aligned}$ |  | Money stock M, (b] |  | UK UK <br> private public <br> sector sector <br> steriing stering <br> ume deposits <br> deposits[c]  |  | Unadjusted | stock <br> $\mathrm{M}_{3}[\mathrm{~b}]$ <br> Seasonally adjusted | UK residents' deposits in other currencies [c] | Unadjusted | stock <br> b] <br> Seasonally adjusted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 |  | 8 | 9 |  |
| Month ended 1983 Feb. 16 Mar. 16[d] Apr. 20 | 10.965 11,103 11,194 | 17,327 17.962 18.609 | 9,869 9,668 10,319 | 38,161 38,733 40,122 | 38,760 39.210 39,660 | 51.584 51.503 52,994 | 2.251 2,154 2,103 | 91,996 92.390 95,219 | 92,950 93,880 95,450 | 13,498 13,823 13,562 | $\begin{aligned} & 105,494 \\ & 106,213 \\ & 108,781 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106,440 \\ & 107,700 \\ & 109,010 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { May } & 18 \\ \text { June } & 15 \\ \text { July } & 20 \end{array}$ | 11.263 11,328 11.601 | 18,415 18.564 18,978 | 10,656 11.102 10,714 | 40,334 40.994 41.293 | 40,210 41,140 40,960 | 53.261 53.803 55.029 | 1,989 $\mathbf{2 , 4 6 3}$ $\mathbf{2 , 7 6 6}$ | 95.584 97.260 99.088 | 95.950 97.520 98,300 | 13,357 13,550 13,767 | 108,941 110.810 112,855 | 109,310 111.070 112.060 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Aug. } & 17 \\ \text { Sept. } & 21[\mathrm{~d}] \\ \text { Oct. } & 19 \end{array}$ | 11,507 11,477 11,473 | $\begin{aligned} & 18,785 \\ & 18,876 \\ & 19,369 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,902 \\ & 10,601 \\ & 11,172 \end{aligned}$ | 41,194 40,954 42,014 | 41,290 41.200 41,810 | 55,579 55,944 56,133 | 2,324 2,173 2,165 | 99,097 99.071 100,312 | 98,420 98,020 99,440 | 13,767 13,829 14,392 | 112,864 112,900 114,704 | 112.180 111.850 113.830 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Nov. } & 16 \\ \text { Dec. } & 14[\mathrm{~d}] \\ 1984 \mathrm{Jan.} & 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.531 \\ & 12,119 \\ & 11,467 \end{aligned}$ | 19.264 19.990 19.319 | $\begin{aligned} & 11,352 \\ & 11,466 \\ & 11,911 \end{aligned}$ | 42.147 43.575 42.697 | 42,040 42,690 42.580 | 55,755 56,234 56,609 | 2.485 2.376 2.694 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.387 \\ & 102.185 \\ & 102.000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.000 \\ & 101,540 \\ & 102.180 \end{aligned}$ | 14,776 16.101 16,402 | $\begin{aligned} & 115.163 \\ & 118.286 \\ & 118,402 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114,770 \\ & 117,640 \\ & 118.580 \end{aligned}$ |
| Feb. 15 | 11,531 | 19,017 | 11,944 | 42,492 | 42,830 | 56,076 | 2.572 | 101,140 | 102,180 | 17,075 | 118,215 | 119,260 |

Money stock: changes $[$ [ $]$

[a] After deducting $60 \%$ of net debit transit items (see additional notes to Table 6 of the Quarteriy Bulletin).
[b] $M_{1}$ equals columns $1+2+3$. Stering $M_{3}$ equais $M_{1}+$ coiumns $5+6 . M_{3}$ equais steriing $M_{3}+$ column 8 .
[c] Including certificates of deposit.
[d] Changes in the monthly-reporting population occurred in these months. See also the additional notes to Tabie 3 in the Quarteriy Bulletin, and, for December 1983 , footnote [b] to Tabie 3 on page 5 .
[e] Changes in the money stock may differ from those which can be caiculated by reference to amounts outstanding. (See additional notes to Table 11 of the Quarterly Bulletin.)
[f] See additional notes to Tables 6 and 11 of the Quarterly Bulletin.

| £ millions |  |  | Public sector barrowing requirement <br> (surpius -) |  | Purchases ( - ) of public sector debt by UK private sector (Other than baniks) |  |  |  | External and foreign currency finance of public sector (increase -) |  | Banks' sterling lending | External and foreign currency transactions of UK banks (b] |  |  |  | Net depo liabili | Money stock sterling M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Central government borrowing requirement | Other pubiic sector contri- bution | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Other } \\ & \text { pubiic } \\ & \text { sector } \\ & \text { debt }\end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Central go } \\ & \text { debt } \\ & \text { British } \\ & \text { govern- } \\ & \text { ment } \\ & \text { stocks }\end{aligned}\right.$ | mment <br> Other |  | Purchases of British government stocks by overseas sector | Other | 10 UK private sectoria) | Steriing deposits from. net of market ioans to. banks abroad (increase -) | Other overseas sterling deposits (increase -) | Other sterling lending to overseas sectors[ c ] | Banks <br> net <br> foreign <br> currency <br> deposits <br> liabirities <br> (increase -) | (increase - | ( ${ }^{\text {(columns }} 1$ |
|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| Month ended <br> (unadjusted) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 |  | 16 | - 142 | + | 8 | - 408 |  |  | - 284 | - 204 | +1.074 | - 367 | - 35 | + 202 | - 41 | + 267 | - 216 |
|  | Mar. | 16 | + 634 |  |  | - 41 |  | 250 | $+\quad 399$ | - 211 | + 545 | + 16 | - 322 | + 428 | + 592 | - 705 | + 371 |
|  | Apr. | 20 | + 3.561 | + |  | - 113 |  |  | - 405 | - 79 | + 687 | - 72 | - 304 | + 233 | + 434 | - 848 | + 2.829 |
|  | May | 18 15 | $\begin{array}{r}+1.799 \\ +\quad .225 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 601 514 | $-\quad 769$ $-\quad 748$ |  |  | - 287 | $+\quad 145$ $+\quad 80$ | + 693 | - 121 | - 157 | $+\quad 47$ $+\quad 234$ | $+\quad 289$ $+\quad 25$ | - 436 | + 385 |
|  | July | 20 | + 1.373 |  | 335 | - 1.018 |  | 159 | - 209 | + 76 | + 2.011 | - 237 | $-\quad 149$ | $\begin{array}{r}+\quad 37 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | + 108 |  | +1.676 +1.828 |
|  | Aug. | 17 | + 1.396 |  |  | - 1.082 |  |  | - 102 | $+\quad 77$ | + 299 | - 237 | - 401 | + 146 | + 133 | - 25 | + |
|  | Sept. | 21 19 | $+\quad 797$ $+\quad 955$ |  |  | - 1.747 | - | 442 | - 55 | - 118 | + 1.410 | + 63 | - 46 | + 230 | $+\quad 259$ | - 900 | - 101 |
|  | Oct. | 19 |  |  |  | - 394 |  | 434 |  | + 50 | +2.017 | - 506 | - 143 | + 277 | - 104 | - 177 | +1.241 |
|  | Nov. | 16 | + 1.001 |  |  | - 1.143 |  |  | + 46 $+\quad 86$ | - 34 | + 820 | + 20 | - 616 | + 66 | + 280 | - 176 | + 75 |
| 1984 | Dec. | 14 | $\begin{array}{r}+1.786 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  | - $\quad 572$ |  |  | +86 $+\quad 164$ | - 178 | + 605 | - 152 | $-\quad 57$ <br> $\quad 135$ | $+\quad 267$ $+\quad 891$ | + 285 | - 32 | +1.593 |
|  | Feb. | 15 | - 208 | + 1 | 110 | - 1.106 | - | 6 |  | 113 | +1.251 | - 72 | - 463 | + 25 | - 70 |  |  |
| Month ended <br> (seasonaily adjusted) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Feb. Mar. | 16 16 | +1.382 +1.954 | - 7 |  | - 408 | - 4 |  | $-\quad 284$ $+\quad 399$ | - 209 $-\quad 216$ | + +1.098 $+\quad 635$ |  |  |  |  | -267 -797 | $\begin{array}{r}\text { + } \\ +\quad 623 \\ +\quad 945 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  | Apr. | 20 | +1.742 + + |  | 773 44 | - 113 |  |  | $+\quad 389$ $+\quad 405$ | - $\quad 160$ | + $+\quad 639$ $+\quad 199$ |  |  |  |  | - 97 $+\quad 68$ | + +1.577 |
|  | May | 18 | + 1.668 | - 5 | 596 | - 769 |  |  | - 287 | + 140 | +1.087 |  |  | 85 |  | - 591 | + 540 |
|  | June | 15 | + 1.285 | - 4 | 432 | - 748 | - | 85 | - 13 | + 74 | +1.553 |  |  |  |  | + 234 | +1.611 |
|  | Juiy | 20 | + 1.763 |  | 275 | - 1.018 |  | 74 | - 209 | - 82 | + 305 |  |  |  |  | +211 | + 796 |
|  | Aug. | 17 | + 825 |  |  | - 1.082 |  | 36 | - 102 | $+\quad 71$ | +1,187 |  |  | 313 |  | - 110 | + 157 |
|  | Sept. | 21 | + 827 | + 6 | 643 | - 1.747 | - 3 | 388 | - 55 | - 124 | +1.160 |  |  | 434 |  | -1.210 | - 460 |
|  | Oct. | 19 | + 1.203 | - 6 | 620 | - 394 | - 4 | 404 | - 5 | + 44 | +1.554 |  |  | 515 |  | + 552 | + 1.415 |
|  | Nov. | 16 | $+1.490$ |  |  | - 1.143 |  |  | + 46 | - 40 | $+1.138$ |  |  | 244 |  | - 448 | + 551 |
|  | Dec. | 14 | + 580 | + | 78 | - 572 | - 1 | 150 | + 86 | - 184 | +1.747 |  |  | 324 |  | - 583 | + 1.326 |
| 1984 | Jan. | 18 | + 157 | - 4 | 433 | - 738 |  | 400 | - 164 | + 52 | +1.254 |  |  | . 446 |  | - 554 | + 620 |
|  | Feb. | 15 | + 1.864 | + | 14 | - 1.106 | - 1 | 199 |  | 18 | + 1.032 |  |  | 459 |  | -1.044 | - 16 |

[a] Including net purchases of commercial bills by the Issue Department. and holdings of sterling certificates of deposit issued by building societies.
[b] A seasonaily-adjusted breakdown of these transactions is not available.
[c] Inciuding net purchases of ECGD-backed promissory notes by the issue Department.



UK monetary sector: transactions in liabilities and assets[a]
£ millions


[a] The monetary sector comorises all banks inciuded in Tabie 3 in the Quarterly Bulletin together with the discount market. Interbank items are excluded and adijustmenis made :o allow for transit items
(see additional notes to Tabie 6 in the Ouarteriy Buletin). see additional notes to Tabie 6 in the Quarteriy Bulletin).

NL.
I.in sorry to bone you once ryim with Gardon Peppleis vioss. Bur en ym witt cee, thas is as in portort meritios poiat or italent, bowere as a fainy logiun-y nor tritilly convinciay line frondm abort th Buithing Loricties decision.

This was nor alivesest we in a bectoring or the athing ruanuer

$$
A_{1013}
$$

Personal delonaigental.

NOTE OF CONVER SATION WITH
CMRDON DEPPER : MARLH $q^{\text {Hh }}$.
Some of thin wes a rehearsal of his familiar coricism of the attion taken to tox eviring sociction. Bur these were some furtes powits whon he LS nor malcelefine, t whoth Inow recors:
(1) It the Registrar a Revence wers conclones about bs gilt aticity, then shans litter hare womed the $Y_{2}$ doz exce e.g. Le Gcieties isvolves; or toxes Htore societifonly exumpliity englar yeais dealings. In bith cacs it wond hire been Measonccule to do so, on the "over. Italing"blasis.
(a) Is is hor crenclewers that morring to the "stom intode" prisciple te applyingit to all excietios ltrough tes 51 m
 - the tur moving bciction wo hare dealt activecyl- \&hewo Halisel alar of their reunt gims doendy-generally munages to muloas thein storbs at deunt pioss;

- the shegier Londan - bases ones sols bos our itier

- He smallerel Herre-all poviscial borieties whoc dealing, hui rlay logely been kent gen to criticiom ton thites for the mar pat to sell er all, thin lone v, heavim So the jurthare been pumisher nijghtily, ettormijut hare
largely gor anoty force.
(3) All of thi wooves thore wa foroor wher the cost. appeen to betrying to to. LID hase nowrecreatly there wis be no sach gualtor graturtom fintures to avort treaking oncorms in budger, whith ke fuis he is streto smportv. stronghy in broatems.

Ans thetes there cume the sting is to tair. He wames ttat his senior primen, who hare keen supporthing the PH, private Aftix tinancially (I anume in praticie helpiry Hefrey Alm Wahkm (eqpeneto) are so vexcerby the Builuing Lacicties decision, ther is of war then mill nor be likely to wout to renew their supfort.
$-M 2 / 3184$
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## Great George Street, London swim 3AQ Telephone oi-233 6ıi7

From the Director: Sir John Boreham, к.c.b.

Our reference: D4/17
14 March 1984


AVERAGE MEASURE OF GDP
Commenting on the NIESR study of GDP measures, you invited CSO views on whether an average of the output and expenditure measures ( $O$ and $E$ ) would behave better than the average of $O, E$ and the income measures, I. I have had this tested and found that it would not provide a significantly different result.

The published simple average of $E, I$ and $O$ is essentially neutral and does not constrain interpretative advice. There appears to be a real need for an alternative measure, for internal briefing, which incorporates all the information the CSO has on known economic distortions and technical measurement problems. Such a measure would better represent the underlying trend in activity. We hope that the work currently in hand in CSO on analysis of revisions, etc, will lead to the development of this additional aid.


JOHN BOREHAM

The Chancellor of the Exchequer
HM Treasury
Parliament Street
LONDON
SW

ECONOMIC SECRETARY
$c c: ~ P P S-$
PS/CST
PS/FST
PS/MST
Mr Battishill
Mr Monck
Mr Hall
Mr Folder
Mr Allen
Mr Macrae
Mr Ridley
Mr Lord

ECONOMIC PROGRESS REPORT - BUDGET ISSUE

I attach copies of drafts of articles intended for the Budget issue of Economic Progress Report, which is due to be published on Wednesday 28 March. This is a joint issue for March and April. Copy will be sent to the printer by lunchtime on Tuesday, 20 March.
2. The drafts have been cleared by divisions in the Treasury and, wherever necessary, in the Inland Revenue and Customs and Excise.
3. The drafts include a general article on the Budget and its underlying strategy, including an account of the updated MTFS; a more detailed article on the tax measures; the usual slightly abbreviated version of the Industry Act forecast (which has been cleared with Mr H Evans, not copied to all); and a short account of the Green Paper on long-term public expenditure trends. There will also be the usual article on the North Sea revenues and contribution to GNP, which will consist mainly of the Budget day press notice. I attach a copy of the press notice, together with the table and note on the contribution to GNP, which is added for Progress Report purposes (not copied to all).


## A Radical Tax-Reforming Budget

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr Nigel Lawson, made his first Budget statement in the House of Commons on 13 March. This article describes the Budget strategy, giving the main points from the statement, setting out the economic background, and putting the main measures in the context of continuing Government policies. The details of the tax measures are not given in this article but in the article beginning on page

## Themes of the Budget

The Chancellor noted that the Budget would set the Government's course for this Parliament, and was based on policies which had been followed consistently since 1979. The Budget has two main themes: the further reduction of inflation; and a series of tax reforms designed to make the economy work better. The Chancellor described these as reforms to stimulate enterprise, set British business on the road to profitable expansion and help to create new jobs.

It contains a major restatement of the medium-term financial strategy (MTFS) extended to cover the five years to 1988-89, which sets out the approach for bringing inflation down through steady reduction in the rate of increase in the money supply, supported by firm control of public spending and a continuing decline in public borrowing (see page ).

The tax reform will help to create a simpler, more efficient system, which will be more broadly based, with fewer special reliefs, but lower rates of tax. The tax changes include various measures to reduce discriminatory tax treatment of different types of saving and investment, a major reform of business taxation, including a phased restructuring of the main capital allowances in parallel with a progressive reduction in the main corporation tax rate and an immediate reduction in the rate for small businesses, abolition of stock relief, the abolition of National Insurance Surcharge, the raising of basic income tax allowances by more than twice the rate of inflation, and the broadening of the coverage of VAT.

## Economic background

Inflation has fallen steadily since the 1980 peak of over 20 per cent, with retail prices in 1983 up only about $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent on 1982, the smallest increase since the 1960 s. It is expected to remain low, edging down to about 4 per cent by the middle of 1985. Interest rates have come down.

Falling inflation and interest rates, the Chancellor said, had led to an economic recovery whose underlying strength was beyond dispute, springing from sound finance and honest money, and benefiting industry, business and consumer confidence alike. With growth of 3 per cent, Britain's economy grew faster than any other in the European Community in 1983. Three per cent growth was expected to continue this year.

Productivity has continued to improve rapidly. During 1983 productivity in manufacturing grew by 6 per cent, and unit labour costs are likely to show the smallest annual increase since the sixties, with consequent benefits for profitability. However, three of Britain's major competitors, the US, Japan and West Germany, were yet more successful in keeping labour costs down. Job prospects would be considerably better if lower pay rises were to make a bigger contribution to our performance on costs.

The employed labour force went up by about 80,000 between March and September last year. The loss of jobs in manufacturing has slowed down, while jobs in services rose by approaching 200,000 in the first nine months of 1983.

Home demand has played a major part in the economic recovery. Personal consumption went up by over $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1983, while fixed investment rose rather faster than consumption. Investment in housing and in services was especially strong. Investment overall is expected to rise by 6 per cent in 1984.

With world trade moving ahead, by the end of last year manufacturing exports had started to increase substantially. For 1984 total exports are expected to rise by 5 per cent and imports by 7 per
cent, with the current account of the balance of payments forecast at a £2 billion surplus, as for 1983. Overseas prospects are better than for some time, with US output expected to grow strongly this year, and recovery spreading to the rest of the world.

The size and growth of the US budget deficit, and its effects pose risks for world economic progress. However, the Chancellor said that despite these risks there was a growing sense throughout the industrialised world that the recovery this time was one which could be sustained. The essential requirement was the continued pursuit of prudent monetary and fiscal policies.

## The medium-term financial strategy

The Chancellor said in his statement that the NTFS would continue to be the cornerstone of monetary and fiscal policy. It provides a disciplined financial framework for the conduct of policy, and makes the Government's policy guidelines clear to industry and the financial markets. The aim is to keep monetary conditions consistent with a continuing downward trend in inflation. The MTFS figures are set out in tables 2 and 3.

## Monetary policies

A continuing downward trend for monetary growth is projected over the next five years. The public sector borrowing requirement (PSBR) path takes account of important influences such as the pattern of fr rom North sqa ail and the leved of sules of publiz assers in the privisatom programme
revenues/ and provides for a further reduction of public borrowing as a proportion of gross domestic product (GDP). Adjustments to the indicative figures may be needed as circumstances change, but as in the past these will not be allowed to affect the main thrust of the policy.

Table 2 shows the monetary growth ranges. Those for 1984-85 are targets, applying to the annual rate of growth over the period from mid-February 1984 to mid-April 1985. Targets for the later years will be fixed nearer the time. Sterling M3, which includes all UK residents' sterling deposits with the banks, and is regarded as a measure of liquidity, continues to be
the range used for＇broad＇money．MO（the monetary base），which consists of notes and coin together with the banks＇holdings of cash and working balances of the Bank of England，and is regarded as a suitable measure of money used directly for transactions， will be the target aggregate for＇narrow＇money．It replaces Ml， which has become increasingly difficult to interpret owing to the growing proportion of interest－bearing accounts which it now contains．

Over the past two years，conditions have allowed a single range for broad and narrow money．In general，however，the narrow aggregates tend to move more slowly than the broad ones，and separate ranges are now considered more appropriate，especially as the period of the MTFS has been extended．Broad and narrow money will be of equal importance in the assessment of monetary conditions．The Government will also c甜inue to pay attention to other measures of money as well as more general evidence of financial conditions，including the exchange rate．（Definitions of the various monetary aggregates appear on page 2 of the November 1983，and page 3 of the December 1983，issues of Economic Progress Report．）

In funding the borrowing requirement，National Savings will continue to be important．This year＇s target of $£ 3$ billion is likely to be reached．The target for next year will be held at $£ 3$ billion．

## Public sector borrowing

Following the 1981 Budget the PSBR came down to about $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent of GDP in 1981－82－well below the $5 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent average in the preceding two years．Since then it has fallen only slightly，and is estimated at $£ 10$ billion， $3 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent，for 1983－84．This is about £l⿳亠丷厂⿰㇒⿻土一⿱⿴囗十一 1983 Budget，and would have been higher still had it not been for the measures taken to hold back the expenditure total in July 1983 （see Economic Progress Report，August 1983）．

The Chancellor said it was necessary to secure a further marked fall in borrowing, so that interest rates could continue to decline as monetary growth slowed down. UK interest rates were influenced by US interest rates but this made it more, rather than less, necessary to curb domestic pressures and lessen the effect of high dollar interest rates. Last year's MTFS suggested a PSBR for 1984-85 of $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent of GDP, or about $£ 8$ billion. The Chancellor believed it would now be prudent to provide for a PSBR of $2 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent of GDP, or $£ 7 \frac{1}{4}$ billion.

The Chancellor gave a warning in his Autumn Statement of 17 November 1983 (see Economic Progress Report, December 1983) that he might have to increase taxes slightly in this Budget, to secure a 1984-85 PSBR of $£ 8$ billion. The latest forecasts of more buoyant tax revenue in the coming year meant that he would now need no overall net increase in taxation. The measures announced in this Budget, which are broadly neutral in their effects on revenue in 1984-85, on the indexed base, will reduce tax next year by over £1. 8 billion.

The MTFS suggests that there should be room to cut taxes in 1985-86 and later years of the MTFS period (see table 3), provided firm control of public spending is maintained. The actual scope for reductions will of course depend on the pace of improvement in economic performance over the period.

## Prospects for public spending and taxation over the longer term

The Government published on Budget day a Green Paper on the prospects for public spending and taxation over the next ten years. This is a Government contribution to the current debate about the level of public expenditure in the long term and its effects on the burden of taxation. It does not attempt decisions, but sets out a framework for discussion based on reasonable assumptions about economic growth and the course of public borrowing. The figures in the paper underline the need to keep firm control of spending in order to bring the burden of tax back to tolerable levels.

The Chancellor said in his statement that for too long public spending had been growing faster than the economy as a whole. As a result the tax burden had steadily increased and income tax had extended lower and lower down the wage scale. The Green Paper concludes that to avoid past problems, it is necessary for spending to fit the financial resources available, not the other way round. The burden of taxation will be reduced by the 1990s lo the levels of the early 1970s only if public spending is kept broadly stable in real terms.

See page for an account of the Green Paper.

Tax changes

The wide ranging tax changes announced by the Chancellor represent a major set of reforms leading to improved economic performance and a fairer, simpler tax system - affecting taxation of savings and investment, of business, and of personal income and spending. For details of the individual measures see the article beginning of page .

The tax changes the Chancellor is making are broadly neutral in revenue terms in 1984-85, when calculated from an indexed base, in which 1983-84 excise duty rates and the main personal income tax thresholds and allowances are increased in line with retail price inflation over the previous year ( 5.3 per cent). But because the economic effect of the changes builds up slowly, and the change in VAT on imports only affects revenue in the first year, in 1985-86 the increases will reduce taxation by well over $£ 1 \frac{3}{4}$ billion. Table l sets out the effects on revenue in 1984-85 and in a full year on both the indexed andnon-indexed bases. There may be scope for further tax cuts in later Budgets, providing public expenditure can be held broadly flat in real terms (see table 3).

The Budget proposals in this context are aimed at improving the direction and quality of both savings and investment and increasing competition in the financial sector. The Chancellor said they would contribute further to the creation of a property-owning and share-owning democracy, in which more decisions are made by individuals than by institutions.

These measures include the withdrawal of life assurance premium relief, removing a bias towards investment via institutions rather than directly by individuals; the abolition of the investment income surcharge, removing another discrimination against individual savings and investment; the halving of stamp duty on house purchase and share transactions; the introduction of a composite rate for bank interest, providing more equal treatment of banks and building societies; and improvements in the tax treatment of share option schemes.

## Income tax

On personal tax the Chancellor said that the right course for this coming year was ' to use every penny I have in hand, within the framework of a revenue-neutral Budget, to lift the level of the basic tax thresholds..... It makes very little sense to be collecting income tax from people who are at the same time receiving mean-tested benefits. Moreover low tax thresholds worsen the poverty and unemployment traps, so that there is little, if any, financial incentive to find a better job, or even any job at all.'

This is the third successive Budget making real increases in the basic personal income tax allownaces. In 1984-85 these will now be 16 per cent higher in real terms than they were in 1978-79. The real increases in 1982 to 1984 more than make up for the ground lost when there was no indexation in 1981.

The proposed changes in corporation tax constitute a major programme of reform, phased over a period of years, in which first year and initial capital allowances for plant and machinery and industrial building are to be abolished and corporation tax rates substantially reduced (to 35 per cent eventually for the main rate and 30 per cent with immediately effect for the small companics rate). Sluck relief and the national insurance surcharge are also to be abolished.

The Budget measures directly affecting business will reduce its tax burden, taking 1984-85 and 1985-86 together, by about £900 million. In 1984-85, when the overall effect of the Budget is expected to be broadly revenue-neutral, business will pay up to $£ 500$ million more tax, compared with an indexed base. However, this will be outweighed in the succeeding year by a gain of about £l,400 million. The measures referred to here include the changes in corporation tax and the abolition of NIS, together with the North Sea. tax changes, earlier payments of VAT on imports from next October and the halving of stamp duty.

The broad aim of the corporation tax measures is to reduce the tax bite on profits and reduce discrimination in the sy ${ }^{5 / t}$, between capital and labour, between different kinds of investment, and between borrowing and equity financing.

Reduction of the tax subsidy on certain types of capital investment is expected to stimulate more productive investment which will bring the economy a higher rate j, and combined with the removal of NIS should encourage employment. Once the series of changes concerning corporation tax are fully implemented, British rates of capital allowances for most plant and machinery will be comparable with those in most other countries, while the rate of tax will be lower. Higher profits after tax will leave room for current expenditure on innovation in all its forms.

Stock relief was introduced as a rough and ready measure to counter the impact of high inflation. Its value and the need for it have declined with the fall in inflation. The effect of withdrawing it is more than offset by the other measure affecting business.

In the early years of transition, as the changes to business tax come into effect, there will be some losers among individual businesses though the majority will benefit. This is inevitable in any major measure of tax reform. But when the changes have fully worked through, companies will enjoy very substantial reductions in the tax they pay.

Table 1 - Direct effects of tax changes
£ million at current prices

|  | Effect in 1984-85 |  | Effect in full year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Change from indexed vase | Change from nonindexed base | Change from indexed base | Change from nonindexed base |
| Income tax allowances and threshold | -940 | -1 820 | -1 470 | -2 610 |
| Corporation tax rates, stock relief and capital allowances | -280 | - 280 | - 250 | - 250 |
| Other income tax and other direct taxes | +190 | + 175 | + 450 | + 395 |
| Stamp Duty | -450 | - 450 | - 460 | - 460 |
| National Insurance Surcharge* | -335 | - 335 | - 865 | - 865 |
| Value Added Tax | +375 | + 375 | + 650 | + 650 |
| Excise Duties | +200 | + 835 | + 215 | 860 |
| VAT: withdrawal of postponed accounting arrangements | +1 200 | +1 200 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | -40 | - 300 | -1 730 | -2 280 |

* Figures exclude public sector payments of $£ 120$ million in 1984-85 and £485 million in a full year. Public expenditure will be reduced accordingly.


## Notes

The figures in the Table are estimates of the direct effects of the measures on public sector transactions; they are not estimates of the net effects of all the changes in public sector transactions, both direct and indirect.

The direct effects of tax changes are generally estimated by applying the new and old tax rates and allowances to the taxable income and expenditure in the economic forecast (see p ), in certain cases including estimates of the immediate effects of the change on taxpayers' behaviour. For instance the estimates of the Customs and Excise taxes allow for the changes in taxation resulting from both substitution by consumers between goods and the change in real incomes.
+/- indicates an increase/decrease in revenue.

|  | MONETARY GROWIH RANGES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(1) Weekly averages
(2) Now excluding public sector deposits

Table 3 Public Sector Borrowing (')
£ billion, cash


## (1) Further details for 1989-84 and 1984 - wo provided in Table 6.5

( Means lower taxes or higher expenditure than assumed in lines 1 and 2.
(2) From 1984-85 onwards, the definition of the PSBR and its cc mponents exclude changes in public sector deposits and certain other short-term assets of a similar nature.
F ( Average measure.
Constituent items may not sum to totals due to rounding to nearest $£_{\frac{1}{2}}$ billion.

This article describes the Budget measures in more detail. The main proposed tax changes and their forecast revenue effects are set out in table 5 on page . Forecasts of public sector receipts, expenditure and borrowing for 1984-85, and estimates for the current year are in table 6 on page . All changes are subject to Parliamentary approval.

A series of radical tax reform measures are introduced in the Budget. Substantial changes are made in the areas of both business taxation (see Box on page ) and the taxation of savings and investment (see Box on page ). In addition there are large increases in the main income tax allowances. The aim of these changes is to improve overall economic performanc while at the same time making life simpler for the taxpayer.

The reforms particularly those on business taxation are designed to take effect over a number of years. They will significantly reduce the overall burden of tax. The medium term financial strategy indicates that there should also be scope for further reductions in tax in subsequent Budgets if firm control of public expenditure is reinforced.

## Personal Taxes

Income tax relief is concentrated on the raising of thresholds. The main personal allowances - married and single - will be increased by about $12 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, more than double the statutory indexation requirement of 5.3 per cent (the increase in the RPI between 1982 and December 1983). The single person's allowance will be increased by £220 from £ 1,785 to $£ 2,005$ and the married allowance by £360 from £2,795 to £3,155.

This is the third successive year in which there has been a real increase in basic personal allowances. A further step has thus been taken toward the long term objective of raising tax thresholds to more sensible levels. As a result work incentives will be improved and the poverty and unemployment traps will be reduced. Altogether more than 850,000 fewer people will pay tax in 1984-85 than if thresholds had remained at present levels. Weekly tax reductions for a basic rate taxpayer will be £2.08 a week for a married person (new threshold of $£ 60.47$ ) and £1.27 for a single person (new threshold of $£ 38.56$ ).

Other allowances and thresholds are increased in line with the statutory 5.3 per cent requirement. The single age allowances will rise from $£ 2,360$ to $\mathcal{E} 2,490$ and the married age allowances from £3, 755 to £3,955. The first higher rate threshold of 40 per cent will apply when income reaches £15,401 a year and the top rate of 60 per cent to taxable income of over £38,100.

The changes will be seen in pay packets on the first pay day after 10 May.

Table 1 shows the proposed increases for 1984-85 compared with 1983-84 in personal allowances, the age allowances, and the additional personal allowance. The increases in tax thresholds and bands for 1984-85 compared with 1983-84 are shown in Table 2.

Other personal tax changes:
*Company car and car fuel benefits - scales which determine the cash equivalent of these benefits will be increased by 10 per cent for 1985-86.
*Foreign earnings relief - those working abroad will have the tax free portion of their salaries and profits reduced from 25 per cent to $12 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in $1984-85$ and thereafter the concession will be withdrawn.

The 50 per cent relief, reducing to 25 per cent after nine years, for foreign employees working for foreign employers in this country will be removed for all newcomers. For existing claimants the 25 per cent relief will be withdrawn from 6 April and the 50 per cent relief phased out over the five years to 5 April 1989.
*Capital Gains Tax - The exempt amount is increased in line with statutory indexation from $£ 5,300$ to $£ 5,600$. The limit for retirement relief is doubled £100,000 backdated to April 1983.

## Social Security

Following legislation last year to return to the historic method of uprating benefits by reference to the Retail Price Index of the previous May there is no announcement of new rates in the Budget. The Secretary of State for Health and Social Security will announce new rates of social security benefits in June.

## VAT

There is no increase in the 15 per cent VAT rate but the base of the tax will be broadened to raise extra revenue to help ease the direct tax burden. Two areas that have previously been zerorates will now have VAT charged on them.
*Alterations to existing buildings and civil engineering works To allow reasonable time for existing commitments to be completed this change will be deferred until 1 June. It will also apply to buildings such as garden sheds and garages. It will not apply to new buildings generally.
*Hot Take-Away Food and Drink - This brings take-away food in line with restaurant food and a range of other items such as ice cream and soft drinks, with which it competes.

The payment of VAT on imports is brought into line with the system generally used by our main competitors in the European Community. VAT will now be payable either at the ports or on the same deferred basis as customs payments within about a month of importation. This will come into force from 1 October. At present VAT is only payable on sale, giving importers on average three months free credit at the taxpayer's expense whereas purchasers from domestic suppliers have to finance VAT themselves. This has put UK industry at a competitive disadvantage to our European partners but it will now be able to trade on an equal footing. The UK system does have advantages and the EEC Commission has proposed that it be adopted by the Community. If this is agreed the UK will be prepared to revert to the original method of collection of VAT on imports.

## Alcohol and Tobacco

Following a European Court of Justice ruling, the Government has altered the balance of taxation between beer and wine. The adjustment made is the minimum needed to comply with the judgment and maintain revenue. This will mean a $2 p$ increase on a pint of beer and an 18 p reduction on a bottle of wine. Cider, which competes with beer but attracts a lower duty, will go up by $3 p$ a pint. Spirits, sherry and port and sparkling wine will rise by about 10p a bottle.

In order to raise revenue and in the light of representations made to the Chancellor on health grounds tobacco duty increases will put 10p on a packet of twenty cigarettes with similar increases for cigars and hand rolling tobacco. The duty on pipe tobacco is not increased. Table 4 sets out the changes in excise duties. Overall these changes will produce about the same extra revenue as raising duties in line with prices.

Taxes on petrol and derv will increase pump prices by $4 \frac{1}{2} p$ and $3 \frac{1}{2}$ p respectively. Duty on Kerosene, used by many pensioners in paraffin stoves and in domestic central heating, is abolished.

## Vehicle Excise Duty

Vehicle excise duty on cars and light vehicles is raised by £5 to £y0. Duty will be decreased by $9-13$ per cent for the lightest lorries. There will be no duty increases for $12-13$ tonne lorries and 7 to 9 per cent increase for heavier lorries.

## BUSINESS TAXATION

A major reform of the structure of company taxation has been undertaken. As a result over the next two years there will be a significant reduction in the burden of taxation borne by industry. Corporation tax will be substantially reduced overall while at the same time many reliefs and allowances are being phased out.

Corporation tax will be reduced on a phased annual basis starting with a 2 per cent cut in the main rate from 52 per cent to 50 per cent for profits earned in 1983-84. The rate will be cut further to 45 per cent for 1984-85 profits, to 40 per cent for 1985-86 profits, and for profits earned in 1986-87, 35 per cent. All these changes will be included in this year's Finance Bill.

The great majority of companies do not pay the main corporation tax rate but the small companies rate. This rate is reduced from 38 per cent to 30 per cent for profits earned in 1983-84 and after.

Current rates of corporation tax are seen as too high, penalising profit and success and blunting enterprise. The substantial cuts in this tax are aimed at improving efficiency and the fixing of rates for the years ahead will aid future business planning.

Special reliefs will be phased out. Many of the reliefs reflect economic circumstances which have long vanished and simply distort investment decisions and financial choices. With inflation down to 5 per cent and set to go lower the time is clearly right to review reliefs.

Stock relief will be abolished for accounting periods starting on or after 13 March 1984. The relief was introduced to help businesses cope with high inflation which they no longer face.

Tax incentives for investment have encouraged projects with low or even negative pre-tax profitability. The quality of investment has suffered. Uneconomic investment has been supported at the expense of jobs.

These incentives for plant and machinery and industrial building will be reduced in three annual stages. After 13 March 1984 the first year allowances for plant and machinery will be reduced from 100 per cent to 75 per cent, to 50 per cent after 31 March 1985, and after 31 March 1986 there will be no first year allowance and all expenditure on plant and machinery will qualify for annual allowances on a 25 per cent reducing balance basis. For industrial buildings, initial allowances will fall from 15 per cent to 50 per cent from 13 March 1984, be reduced to 25 per cent from 31 March 1985 and after 31 March 1986 the initial allowance will be abolished and expenditure written off on an annual 4 per cent straight line basis. These changes in the rates of allowances will not apply to payments under binding contracts entered into on or before 13 March 1984 provided that the expenditure is incurred within the next three years.

The above measures should in the short-term bring some investment forward over the next two years to take advantage of the benefit of higher capital allowances. The underlying effect, however, will be to encourage genuinely profitable ventures and discourage uneconomic investment.

## Other business measures

*National Insurance Surcharge - will be abolished as from 1 October 1984. This will save private sector employers almost $£ 350$ million in 1984-85 and getting on for El billion in 1985-86.
*VAT registration threshold for small business is increased from £18,000 to $£ 18,700$.
Business Expansion Scheme (introduced in 1983 Budget) is designed to encourage equity investment in new or expanding high risk companies. Companies which own farm land clearly do not fall into this category. In future, such companies will not therefore be eligible.
*Corporate borrowing - The new arrangements for deep discount stock and the reliefs for companies issuing eurobonds and convertible loan stock which were announced but not enacted last year, are going ahead. Most corporate loan stock held for more than one year will be exempt from capital gains tax. This will make the tax treatment of private sector borrowing in the corporation finance market virtually the same as for government borrowing in the gilt edged market.
*North Sea Oil Tax
The main business tax changes reduce the marginal rate of tax on existing North Sea fields from 89.5 per cent to 85.8 per cent. The tax position of additional investments in existing fields will be reviewed with any resulting changes backdated to Budget Day. Two measures are being taken to prevent unjustified loss of tax in the North Sea. The petroleum revenue tax (PRT) and corporation tax cost of farmouts will be curtailed. And the provision allowing Advance Corporation Tax to be repaid where corporation tax is reduced by PRT will be abolished.

## SAVING AND INVESTMENT

Changes in the taxation of personal savings and investment simplify the existing tax regime and encourage property and share ownership.

Stamp Duty is halved from 2 per cent to 1 per cent in respect of both land and buildings and share transactions. The threshold at which duty is paid on housc sales is raised from $£ 25,000$ to $£ 30,000$.

The cutin the cost of buying shares will encourage share ownership, reduce the cost of raising new equity finance and help to maintain the international competitiveness of the UK stock market.

The reduction in the cost of home buying will make it easier for people to move house to new jobs. Raising the threshold will mean 90 per cent of first time buyers will not now be liable for stamp duty.

Investment income surcharge - is abolished. This removes an element of discrimination against direct savings and investment which bore particularly heavily on pensioners. In most cases it was a tax on savings which had been made out of hard earned and fully taxed income.

Life assurance premium relief - is abolished.

> This relief only
favours institutional rather than direct investment and encourages a multiplicity of tax management schemes. Greater freedom of choice will now be given to investors by removing a financial distortion in favour of life policies. Existing policy holders will not be affected at all. The change will only apply to new or newly enhanced policies.

A composite rate for bank interest is introduced. This allows the banks to tax at a special rate to the Inland Revenue and allows the depositors to recieve credit for income tax paid at the full basic rate. The Change will simplify the position of most taxpayers since tax liability is accounted for at source. It brings the tax treatment of bank and building societies closer together and allows them to compete on more equal terms in the marketfor personal deposits. It will enable the Inland Revenue to make staff savings of up to 1,000 civil Servants.

Under the composite rate scheme tax is not reclaimable by non-taxpayers but they will be able to continue to receive interest gross should they so wish to by putting money into National Savings.

Higher rate tax payers will still be liable for the higher rates although their basic rate liability will be met under the composite rate. The scheme does not apply to non-residents, nor to corporate or other non-individual depositors.

Share options - share options generally will, subject to certain conditions, be taken out of income tax, leaving any gain to be charged to capital gains tax when the shares are disposed of. This will apply to options granted from 6 April. The monthly limit on contributions to savings related share option schemes is increased from £50 to £100. Tax free limits under the concession on long service awards will be doubled, and extended to cover the gift of shares.

Capital Transfer Tax - the highest rate of 75 per cent is reduced to 60 per cent and the rate for lifetime gifts lowered across the whole scale to half the rate for deaths. This will be of particular help to those running family businesses not quoted on the Stock Exchange. Details of the new rates are shown in Table 3.
*Development Land Tax - threshold is increased by $£ 25,000$ from $£ 50,000$ to $£ 75,000$. This will reduce the numbers affected by the tax bymore than one third.

## Allowances




Band of :hargeable value £'000
0-64

64-85
85-116
116-148
148-185
185-232
232-285
over 285

CAPITHCTRMEERTAX-WHN SCMEDGES

| Rate on <br> death <br> per cent |
| ---: |
| Nil |
| 30 |
| 35 |
| 40 |
| 45 |
| 50 |
| 55 |
| 60 |

Lifetime
rate
per cent
Nil
15
17 $\frac{1}{2}$
20
22 $\frac{1}{2}$
25
$27 \frac{1}{2}$
30

## TABLE 4

Table 4 Approximate direct effect of changes in Duty Rates us Cartein product prices
(A/I except VED inclusive of 15 per cent VAT)

Spirits duty
Beer duty
Wine duty
Fortified wine duty
Cider duty
Petrol duty
Derv duty
Tobacco duty
Vehicle excise duty
+10 p on a bottle of whisky
$+2 p$ on a pint of beer of average strength
$-18 p$ on a bottle of table wine
$+10 p$ on a bottle of sherry
+3 p on a pint of cider
$+4 \frac{1}{2} p$ on a gallon of petrol
$+3 \frac{1}{2} p$ on a gallon of derv
+10 p on a packet of 20 cigarettes
$+£ 5$ on a car licence
£ million
Forecast for 1984-85

Forecast for a full year (a)

## INLAND REVENUE

## Income tax

Increase in single allowance of $£ 220$ and married allowance of $£ 360$
Increase in additional personal allowance and widow's bereavement allowance of £140
Increase in age allowance of $£ 130$ (single) and $£ 200$ (married) and income limit of $£ 500$
Increase in basic rate limit of $£ 800$ to $£ 15,400$
Increase in further higher rate thresholds
Abolition of investment income surcharge
Abolition of life assurance premium relief for new policies
Fringe benefits-car and car fuel scales
Withdrawal of relief from foreign earnings
Withdrawal of relief from foreign emoluments
Compacito rata cohamo for hank intoreot

| Withdrawal of relief from foreign earnings Withdrawal of relief from foreign emoluments | +15 +7 $+\quad$ NiL | $\begin{aligned} & +60(e) \\ & +15(f) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Incrase in limit_on-contributione-to-enwinge-related-ohare-option | NW |  |
| Extension of instalment period for unapproved share options granted before 6 April 1984 Exclusion of farming from the "Business_Expansion_Scheme" | Negligible Nealigihle | -5 |
| Minor life assurance ehengoc. Application of mortgage interest relief limit-bridgindorms mployee secondments to charities | Nogligitte <br> Negligible <br> Negligibla <br> Nogligible | Negligibl <br> Negligibl <br> Negligibl <br> Negirnald |
| *Extension of mortgage interest relief to certain borrowers <br> *Limit-fer accoeomont-of apportionod-income | Negligible ${ }^{-6(i)}$ | logligiblo- |
| *Capital and income bonds | NiI | Nil |
| *Offshore life assurance | Nil | NiI |
| *Relaxation of interest relief for employee buy-outs | -1 (i) | -2 |
| *Fringe-bonefite oobolarehipe |  | Nogligitle |

## Income tax and corporation tax

Abolition of stock relief
Reduction in rate of first year allowance for machinery and plant
Reduction in rate of first year allowance for machinery and plant
Reduction in rate of initial allowance for industrial buildings and assured tenancies
Further reductions in rates of first year and initial allowances
Northern Ireland corporation tax relief grant and other grants
Application of Schedule B
thimito-relating to friondly-society-lifo-mecuranop
*Extension of stock relief for housebuilders for 1983-84
*Payment of Eurobond interest without deduction of tax
*Offshore and overseas funds

| Nil | $+900(j)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Nil}(k)$ | $+375(j)(k)$ |
| $\mathrm{Nil}(k)$ | $+15(j)(k)$ |
| Nil | $(1)$ |
| Negligible | -2 |
| Negligible | -2 |
| Negligible | Nogligible |
| Negligible | -1 |
| Negligible | -2 |
| Negligible | $+60(m)$ |
| Neegligible | Negligible |

Income tax, corporation tax and capital gains tax
Relief for housing associations in Northern Ireland
Negligible
*Reliefs for furnished holiday lettings
-2
Negligible
Negligible
$-15(n)$
*Deep discount securities

## Income tax and capital gains tax

Changes in employee share option reliefs
Nil
(0)

## Corporation tax

Reduction in main rate for financial year 1983

| -190 | $-330(p)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Nil | $-1050(p)$ |
| Nil | $(l)$ |
| -90 | -160 |
| -1 | $-30(q)$ |
| Negligible | $-10(r)$ |
| Nil | -5 |
| Negligible $(i)$ | -1 |
| Nogligible | Negligiblo- |
| Negligible | -5 |
| Negligible | $+10(r)$ |
| Nil | $+25(s)$ |

Reduction in main rate for financial year 1984
Reduction in main rate for financial years 1985 and 1986
$-90$
(I)

Reduction in "small companies" rate
Extension of carry back period for advance corporation tax
Extension of consortium relief
*Treatment of TSB's as bodies corporate
*Relief for discounts etc on bills of exchange
Negligible (i)
thooidontal-cocte-of-obtaining loan finance
Megngible
*Change in arrangements for setting off advance corporation tax and double taxation relief
Negligible
$+10(r)$
*Provision against avoidance through group etc relief
*Charge to tax in respect of controlled foreign companies
Nil
+25 (s)

## Corporation tax and capital gains tax

Exemptinn of certain_corporate fixed_interest_stock

## INLAND REVENUE (continued)

## Capital gains tax

| Indexation of annual exempt amount | Nil (b) | $-15(b)(v)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abelition-of roll-over-roliof for maintenanoe fundo | Angligibla | Mopiligiblo |
| *Increase in limit for retirement relief | -4 | -10 |
| *Increase in other monetary limits | Negligible | -1 |
| APoliof-fortrancactionethrough ovarsoas bank accounts | Negligible | Nagligihlo |
| *Deferment of payment of tax assessed on beneficiaries of non-resident trusts | -3 | Negligible ( $w$ ) |
|  | Negligihle | Negligihle |

## Development land tax

Increase in annual exempt amount
Deferment of the charge on deemed disposals

- Roliof-fer-howoing accociationc-atc
*Extonoion-ofinstalmont-poriod
*Disposals by non-residents

Capital transfer tax
Increase in thresholds and changes in bands
-19 (b)
$-1$
$-1$
Maliala
Nagligiblo
$+2$
-19 (b)
Other-ohangee
$-9(x)$
$-4$

## 

* Items so marked were announced before Budget Day (see paragraph 4.01).
(a) The direct effects of tax changes are generally estimated by applying the new and old tax rates and allowances to the taxable income and expenditure expected in the economic forecast in Part 3, in certain cases including estimates of the immediate effects of the changes on taxpayers' behaviour. For example, the estimates for Customs and Excise duties allow for the effects of relative price changes on the composition of consumers' expenditure; those for taxes on profits now allow for changes in investment behaviour following from the changes in capital allowances and stock relief; and those for stamp duties now allow for changes in the volume of transactions following from changes in rates. Eor the meaning of full yoar see the noto page-9- the Einancial Statement and Budget Doper 1081 A fuller descrintion of tho ectimetien of the drrect effects of expendituptax changon in Marel $10 \%$ m
 thresholde, the eapitelginetax exempt amount and the capital transfer tax threshold and bands by reference to the increase in the gene al infor retail prices between December 1982 and December 1983 ( $5 \cdot 3$ per cent), rounded in accordance with the statutory nevisions,

(c) The full year yield is the amount of relief which would have been due on a full year's premiums for policies commencing in 1984-85. The eventual effect will be substantial (the cost of premium relief in 1983-84 was $£ 700$ million).
(d) Effective from 1985-86; the yield in 1985-86 will be $£ 30$ million.
(e) Withdrawal of the relief will be fully effective from 1985-86; the yield in 1985-86 will be some $£ 55$ million.
(f) Withdrawal of the relief will be completed by 1989-90; the eventual yield will be some $£ 100$ million.
 of all depositors concerned. Deduction at source will however ensure that the full amount of tax due is collected rimetating tax which fo pne reason or another is not collected under present arranqements. Thic should-men-me udtronar Exchequer yield, although thig qnnot be quantified. On the other frant, in 1985-86 there is the possibility of transitional net cash flow loss to the Exchoquen mainy b. cause triks will beable get earlier set off of tax deducted fiominierestry reetve.
(h) Costs will not arise until 1989-90. The yield from taxation of gains arising in respect of rates of contribution in 1984-85 above the previous limit might approach $£ 5$ million.
(i) Includes some delayed costs for 1983-84.
(j) Represents the difference, at the pre-Budget rates of corporation tax, between the effect of the relief or allowance on tax liability in 1984-85 before the change (that is, at the levels of stocks and fixed capital formation expected before the change) and the effects on tax liability after the change (that is, at the levels of stocks and fixed capital formation expected as a result of the change).
(k) Effect after taking into account the abolition of stock relief.
(l) The changes in tax liabilities in later years resulting from the proposed further reductions in the main rate of corporation tax will be affected by the proposed further reductions in capital allowances. The precise net effects of the combined changes will depend on the levels of profits and investment at the time.
( $m$ ) Based on the estimated holdings by United Kingdom taxpayers in the funds in September 1983.
(n) Effect on tax liabilities for 1984-85; over a period of years there will be some deferment of tax liabilities. This estimate is highly uncertain.
(o) Highly uncertain, since revenue effects depend upon exercise of options and their value. The cost in respect of 1989-90 (the first year in which qualifying options granted in 1984-85 could be exercised) might be some $£ 35$ million.
(p) Represents the difference between tax at the pre-Budget rates for financial year 1982 ( 52 per cent and 38 per cent) and tax at the rates proposed on the chargeable profits now expected in 1984-85. The amounts covered by this footnote and footnote ( $j$ ) above broadly represent, in total, the difference between the tax liabilities in respect of 1984-85 (in both cases including the second-round effects on the level of profits) expected before and after the changes in rates of corporation tax, stock relief and capital allowances.
(q) Tax liabilities for accounting periods ending in 1978-79 and later will be reduced. The cost in 1985-86 is tentatively estimated at $£ 30$ million, and there will be some continuing costs thereafter.
( $r$ ) These estimates are highly uncertain.
(s) The yield will be some $£ 25$ million in $1985-86$, building up to $£ 100$ million in later years.
( $t$ ) This figure is very uncertain as it depends on companies' future distribution policy.
(u) This figure is very uncertain, as it will depend on the level of future farm-outs. Protection against a possible substantial loss of PRT through acceleration of reliefs for past expenditure was also announced on 13 September 1983.
(v) The cost in 1985-86 will be $£ 5$ million.
(w) Payment of some $£ 35$ million due in 1983-84 will now be deferred.
(x) The cost in 1985-86 will be $£ 4$ million.
(y) The estimated duty on additional transactions expected to follow from the reduction of the rate is taken into account. It is subject to a wide margin of error.
(z) Components will not necessarily sum to the totals because of rounding. In the full year, no figures are included for the changes covered by footnotes $(g),(h),(l)$ and ( $o$ above.
(aa) The yield from withdrawing the zero rate from hot food and drink is $£ 125$ million in $1984-85$ and $£ 200$ million in a full year; the yield from withdrawing the zero rate from building alterations is $£ 250$ million in 1984-85 and $£ 450$ million in a full year.
(bb) There will be a continuing reduction of Government debt interest.
(cc) Figures exclude public sector payments of $£ 120$ million in 1984-85 and $£ 485$ million in a full year. Public expenditure will be reduced accordingly. See Table 5.1.
(dd) Bus fuel grants are included in the figures for excise duties in Part 1.

$\left.{ }^{( }\right)$See Table 6.8 for taxation and Table 6.5 for other items.
$\left.{ }^{(2}\right)$ Total taxes on income, expenditure and capital on a national income accounts basis as in lines 1,2 and 9 of Table 6.5.
${ }^{(3)}$ Comprises total interest payments by nationalised industries (and other public corporations treated similarly for public expenditure planning) and the tradirg income of the remaining corporations.
${ }^{4}$ ) Comprises other miscellaneous receipts and adjustments from the definition of public expenditure used in the national income accounts to that used in Cmnd. 9143.


## ${ }^{5}$ ) See Table 5.2.

$\left.{ }^{( }\right)$Figures in the first column are from Table 5.5 in the Financial Statement and Budget Report 1983-84 translated from Cmnd. 8789 to Cmnd. 9143 definitions.
(') See Table 5.1.

EPR DRAFT

## Taxation and public spending: looking ahead

The Government believe that public debate on the future of public spending and taxation is of the first importance.

A Green Paper, "The Next Ten Years: Public Expenditure and Taxation into the 1990s" was published on Budget Day as a contribution to that debate.

It argues that powerful forces were at work driving public expenditure upwards over the last 20 years; and that this rise has necessarily led to a corresponding rise in taxation. The Government believe that it is necessary to reverse this and should process, to decide first what can/be afforded, then to set expenditure plans for individual programmes consistently with that decision.

The Green Paper supplements both the 1984 Public Expenditure White Paper (Cmnd 9143) and the 1984-85 MIFS (see page O), but looks further ahead - over the next ten years.

## The past

Over the last 20 years public spending has grown, after allowing for inflation, by an average of 3 per cent a year, while real GDP grew by 2 per cent a year - a 90 per cent rise in real spending, but one of only 50 per cent in real GDP.

Rising expectations about the help the Goverrment should give to the less well-off were one force behind this. Another was the hope that a stimulus to demand would encourage econamic growth and jobs.

[^4]The inflation and recession brought by the oil shocks of the 1970s themselves led to higher expenditure; while, at the same time, "rising expectations of public services continued unabated, notwithstanding the greatly increased difficulty of financing higher spending."

The rise in public spending over the past 20 years has necessarily led to a corresponding rise in the taxes needed to pay for it.

Taxes and rates plus national insurance contributions were some 29 per cent of GDP in 1963-64. They rose to over 37 per cent by the end of the 1960s.

The proportion fluctuated during the 1970s but the total tax burden on the economy, excluding North Sea output and revenues, has risen further since 1978-79 from $34 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent to an estimated 38 per cent in 1984-85.

One important result of these trends has been that more people on low incomes are now paying tax. The tax threshold for a married man fell fram 45 per cent of average earnings in 1963-64 to about 33 per cent in 1983-84.

The low starting-point for tax means not only that large numbers of low-paid people have been brought into tax for the first time, but also that the average rate of tax paid by those above the threshold, who may be on average earnings or less, has increased.

A married man, without children, on average earnings, paid about 13 per cent of his income in income tax in 1963-64. He pays 20 per cent today.

A further result is that increasing numbers of people on low incomes have become subject to tax and entitled to means-tested benefits at the same time. If their incomes rise they suffer both an increase in tax and a withdrawal of benefits (the poverty trap), so that their marginal rate of tax can be higher than if they had an
income of $£ 50,000$ a year. For same people, income in unemployment has become a high proportion of, and can even exceed, net income in work (the unemployment trap).

## The Future

The plans in the public expenditure White Paper published in February (Cmnd 9143) show the level of total public spending over the next three years. Given the likely prospects for inflation, the Government expect the total level to remain broadly constant in real terms up to 1986-87. And the MTFS assumes a further two years of a total constant in real terms up to 1988-89, although decisions for those two years have yet to be taken.

The Green Paper next discusses the likely pressures for higher spending in such areas as social security, defence, health and education beyond 1988-89. One notable pressure is that of population changes (demography), especially the likely numbers of the very elderly - the number of people over 75 is expected to increase fram 3.3 million in 1981 to 3.9 million in 1991.

A key passage makes the Government's view clear on how decisions should be taken: "There will be same who will argue that it makes little sense to consider, still less to decide upon, public spending totals without a clear idea of the implications for individual programmes.
"The Government believe that such thinking has been largely responsible for the upward drift of public expenditure over many years. It is necessary to turn the argument round the other way, to decide first what can and should be afforded, then to set expenditure plans for individual programmes consistently with that decision.
"This Green Paper is primarily concerned with this major issue. It does not, accordingly, attempt to make detailed projections of individual expenditure programmes so far ahead in the future. But it is possible now to discern some of
the pressures for still higher public spending.


#### Abstract

"It is in the nature of the public services that demands are literally limitless, because they are not restrained by the price mechanism which forces those making demands to balance them against costs."


and sensible
"Wherever it is possible/to do so, the Government are seeking to transfer the provision of services into the market sector."
"In other areas it may be possible to use charges as a more direct way of testing demand, even within the public sector.!

There may, too, be a case for 'hypothecating' (or 'earmarking') revenues to individual expenditure programmes, particularly in the social field, in order to bring home the costs. "But over a wide range of services the only means of controlling the cost is for the Government to limit the supply."

Where the Green Paper does make projections is on the possible consequences for the tax burden (excluding the effects of North Sea output on both GDP and revenue) of different future levels of public expenditure.

## Illustrations

Among illustrations of effects on the basic burden are these:
planning total
If the public expenditure/is held flat in real terms and GDP grows by an average 1988-89 $2 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent a year as assumed in the MIFS (see page 0), the burden of tax/will be lighter than in 1983-84, but still slightly heavier than in 1978-79.

Any further reduction in tax burden after that will depend on what happens to public spending.

If the planned total is not allowed to grow at all, the tax burden should be down to $31 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent by 1993-94, given GDP growth of 2 per cent a year after 1988-89.

If an extreme assumption is made that the whole benefit of this reduction in tax burden were passed on in higher personal income tax allowances, then sameone on average earnings would pay 13 per cent of his pay in tax instead of the present 20 per cent.

If, on the other hand, public spending were to grow by an average 1 per cent a year for the five years and GDP grew by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent a year, the tax burden would come down only to 34 per cent of GDP, much the same as in 1978-79.

Conclusion
It is difficult to escape the conclusion, the Green Paper says, "that there is an inbuilt tendency for spending to rise; and an inbuilt resistance to expenditure reductions.
> "The inevitable consequence has been that the taxes required to pay for this broadly spending - taxes on people and on the firms they work for - have risery in step, except forlimited periods when Governments/their borrowing. Such borrowing, however, has to be repaid by a tax on future generations.

- 

"These increases in taxation have, in the Government's view, had a serious impact on Britain's economic performance over many years. Since lower growth has not led to lower demands for public services, the outcome, year after year, has been still higher taxation to finance ever higher public expenditure.

[^5]"The Government and Parliament must reach their judgement about what public expenditure in total can be afforded, then contain individual programmes within that total. If the public discussion of these important issues leads to a wider underStanding of this fact - that finance must determine expenditure, not expenditure finance - the discussion will have served a useful purpose."

The Government look forward to a continuing debate on the fiscal prospects in the longer term. They hope that the main theme of this Green Paper will remain at the centre of the debate: "that to break away from the debilitating pattern of the past in which public spending and taxation took an ever-larger share of our national product, we must establish a clear view of what can be afforded; set our spending plans accordingly; then stick to those plans."


FROM: MISS M O'MARA
DATE: 21 March 1984
cc PS/Chief Sccretary PS/Financial Secretary PS/Minister of State Mr Battishill Mr Monck Mr Hall Mr Folger Mr Allen Mr Macrae Miss E Edwards Mr Ridley Mr Lord

## PS/ECONOMIC SECRETARY

## ECONOMIC PROGRESS REPORT - BUDGET ISSUE

The Chancellor has seen the draft articles attached to Miss Edwards' minute of 16 March. He has commented that the discussion of share options should appear with the other business tax measures and not, as at present, under savings and investment.

## Mon

MISS M O'MARA

## CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER


cc Chief Secretary Financial Secretary Economic Secretary Minister of State Sir P Middleton Sir T Burns Mr Byatt Mr Cassell Mr Battishill Mr Evans Mr Culpin Mr Robson Mr Shields o.r. Mr Page Mr Salveson (for No.10) Mr A Smith o.r. Mr Mansell CSO Mr Lord Mr Portillo Mr Ridley

## GDP (OUTPUT MEASURE) IN FIRST QUARTER 1984

The CSO will publish the preliminary estimate for this, together with some revisions to the data for the second half of 1983 , on 21 May. An advance copy of their press release is attached.

## First quarter figures

2. $G D P(O)$ is estimated to have been broadly unchanged between $Q 4$ (index 103.3) and Q1 (103.5). Compared with a year earlier, $\operatorname{GDP}(\mathrm{O})$ is up 3 per cent.
3. Leaving aside the direct effects of the coal strike, the increases in the quarter and over a year earlier would have been about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent respectively. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is broadly in line with the kind of quarterly increase seen through 1983.) These figures from which the effects of the strike itself are immediately obvious -are not given in the Press Notice, which makes only an incidental reference to the dispute.
4. A significant positive contribution to growth came from the catch-all "other services" category. Communications output was also up but most other categories were estimated level at best.

5. In line with the upward revisions to estimates of manufacturing output made earlier in the spring, CSO have taken this opportunity to publish increases in their estimates of GDP(O) for Q3 and Q4 1983. These have the effect of raising the estimated end-year level by over $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Year on year growth rates for $\operatorname{GDP}(O)$ now become $2 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent for Q3 and $3 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent for $Q 4$, ie rather closer to the rates of growth of the expenditure and income measures of GDP.

## Assessment

6. These figures suggest that, through the second half of 1983 and into the first quarter of 1984 , the underlying growth rate of GDP(O) has been consistent with the Budget-time forecast of a 3 per cent rise in GDP (on the average measure) for 1984. The eventual effect of the coal strike on 1984 GDP will obviously depend on its duration: the Q1 figures do not mean much in themselves.

## Suggested line to take

7. Figures show healthy year on year growth rate for GDP(O), consistent with Treasury forecasts of 3 per cent rise in output for 1984.
[If pressed on the coal strike: effects on first quarter figures slight, being restricted to direct effect of lost coal output. Estimated growth in year to first quarter a healthy 3 per cent, despite any strike effects.]


CONFIDENTIAL
until 2.30pm Monday 21 May

CSO(84) 46
21 May 1984

## GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (OUTPUT-BASED) - FIRST QUARTER 1984

Preliminary estimates suggest that output of the whole economy was broadly unchanged between the fourth quarter of 1983 and the first quarter of 1984. Output of the production industries showed little change, with the reduction in coal output offsetting an overall increase elsewhere. Distribution output fell slightly from its recent buoyant levels, but there were small increases elsewhere within the service sector. The preliminary output-based estimate of gross domestic product (GDP) in the first quarter, from which this assessment has been derived, is 103.5 (seasonally adjusted at constant prices, with $1980=100$ ).

The output-based measure of GDP in the first quarter is estimated to have been 3 per cent above the level of a year earlier. As can be seen from the Table, the expenditure, income and output measures of GDP have been moving differently in recent periods, the output series having tended to grow more slowly on the year-on-year comparisons.

GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT AT CONSTANT FACTOR COST
Seasonally adjusted

(1) Income data deflated by the implied index of total home costs der ived from expenditure data
(2) Revised estimate
(3) Preliminary est imate

## DEPARTMENTS OF INDUSTRY AND TRADE

## - COMMON SERVICES - STATS 2

## 1 Victoria Street London SW1H OET

Telephone Direct Line 01-215 3055
Switchboard 01-215 7877

```
J Kenr Esq
PrIncipal Private Secretary
Chancellur of the Exchequer
H M Treasury
Parliament Street
LONDON
SW1P 3AG 23 May 1984
```

I am attaching a copy of the draft Press Notice on the Current
Account of the United Kingdom Balance of Payments in April.
The draft was agreed earlier today at the usual interdepartmental
meeting.

Publication is set for Tuesday 29 May at 3.30 pm and $I$ should be grateful if you would arrange for the Notice to be cleared by noon Friday 25 May and to inform me accordingly.

A copy of this letter and draft Press Notice is being sent to Sir Peter Middleton.

Yours sincerely
k. R. Bogor.

W E BOYD

THE CURRENT ACCOUNT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

APRIL 1984

The current account for April is estimated to have been in deficit by $£ 588^{\prime}$ million compared with a revised surplus of $£ 23^{\prime}$ million in March. Exports in April amounted to $£ 5370^{\prime}$ million and imports to £6207 million so that trade in goods was in deficit by $2038^{\prime}$ million compared with a deficit of $£ 227^{\prime}$ million in March.

The invisibles account is projected at a monthly surplus of $£ 250^{\prime}$ million, a large surplus on the transactions of the private sector and public corporations being partly offset by a deficit on Government transactions.

FEBRUARY TO APRIL 1984

In the period Feoruary to April the current account was in surplus by $£ 177^{\prime}$ million compared with a surplus of $£ 577^{\prime}$ million in the previous three months. There was a deficit on visible trade of $£ 573^{\prime}$ million in the latest three months compared with a surplus of £104million in the previous three months. The surplus on invisibles is projected at $£ 750$ million.

TABLE 1
Cunerent Account


## VISIBLE TRADE IN APRIL 1984


#### Abstract

The visible trade balance in April was in deficit by £838 million compared with a deficit of $£ 227$ million in March. There was a surplus on oil of $£ 370^{\prime}$ million compared with $£ 776$ million in March. The deficit on trade in non-oil goods of $£ 1003^{\prime}$ million in March increased to $£ 1208$ million in April.

The value of exports was $£ 321^{\prime}$ million ( $5 \frac{1}{2}$ 'per cent) lower than in Maroh. Expuris of oil fell by £252 million and exports of the erratic items* by £12 million. Excluding these, exports of non-oil goods rose by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent reflecting higher deliveries of chemicals and other semi-manufactures.

Total imports were $£ 290$ million ( 5 per cent) higher than in March. Excluding the erratic items which fell by $£ 155$ million, imports of non-oil goods increased by £ $301^{\prime}$ million and imports of oil by $£ 143^{\text {- }}$ million.

The terms of trade index was virtually unchanged as the export unit value index increased by 1 per cent and the import unit value index increased by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent.


## RECENT TRENDS

## Visible balance


#### Abstract

In the three months ended April there was a deficit on visible trade of $£ 0.5^{\prime}$ billion compared with a surplus of $£ 0.1$ billion in the previous three months. The surplus on trade in oil fell by £O. 3 billion $\ln$ f2. $0^{\prime}$ billion and the deficit on trade in non-oil goods increased by $\left\{0.4\right.$ billion to $£ 2.5^{\prime}$ billion.


## Exports

Exports in the three months ended April were valued at $£ 17.0$ billion; $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than in the previous three months. Exports of oil increased by $£ 0.1^{\prime}$ billion ( $2^{\prime}$ 'per cent) while exports of nonoil goods increased by $£ 0.7$ billion ( 5 per cent). Excluding the erratic items, exports of manufactures rose by $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent with chemicals increasing by 7 per cent and finished manufactures by 3 per cent.

[^6]SECRET AND PERSONAL UNTIL RELEASE OF PRESS NOTICE AT 3.3OPM ON 29 MAY 1984 AFTER WHICH UNCLASSIFIED

Total export volume was 3 per cent higher in the latest three months than in the previous three months and $7 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than a year ago. The underlying level of non-oil export volume which increased strongly during the second half of last year, may have begun to level out in recent months.

## Imports

Imports were valued at $£ 17.6$ billion in the latest three months; £1. 4 billion ( $8 \frac{1}{2}$ per cént) higher than in the previous three months. Imports of oil increased by $£ 0.4$ billion and imports of the erratic items by £0.3 billion.

Imports of non-oil goods, excluding the erratic items, rose by £0. 7 billion ( 5 per cént). Imports of passenger motor cars fell by 5 per cent in the latest three months and imports of capital goods were virtually unchanged. All of the other broad sectors experienced some increase in the latest three months.

Total import volume in the three months ended April was $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than in the three months ended January and 12 por oent higher than a year ago. The underlying level of non-oil import volume continues to rise.

Terms of trade (see table 4)

The terms of trade index fell by $1 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the latest three months as the export unit value index rose by 2 pér cent and the import unit value index rose by $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

## Analysis by Area

Exports to the developed countries increased by 7 per cent in the three months ended April with exports to North America increasing

SECRET AND PERSONAL UNTIL RELEASE OF PRESS NOTICE AT 3.3OPM ON 29 MAY 1984 AFTER WHICH UNCLASSIFIED
by 16 per cent and exports to Western Europe by 5 per cent. Imports from the developed countries and developing countries increased by $7^{\prime}$ per cent and 16 'per cent respectively. Imports from the oil exporting countries were $23^{\prime}$ per cent higher than in the previous three months and imports from the other developing countries were $14^{\prime}$ per cent higher.

## INVISIBLES

The latest estimates of invisibles - services, interest, profits and dividends and transfers - relate to the fourth quarter of 1983 when credits were $£ 8.6^{\prime}$ billion and debits were $£ 8.3^{\prime}$ billion giving a surplus of fo. $3^{\prime}$ billion in the quarter. Invisibles in the private sector and public corporations (excluding transfers) were in surplus by $£ 1.6^{\prime}$ billion. The figures relating to the first four months of this year are CSO projections.

## NOTES TO EDITORS

## 1 REVISIONS

Figures relating to the first three months of 1984 have been revised owing to further information becoming available.

## 2 STANDARD NOTES

The standard notes which were issued with the January Press Notice describe in detail the differences between the Balalle of Payments (BOP) and the Overseas Trade Statistics (OTS) bases of compilation. The principal difference is the deduction of freight from the OTS valuation of imports. Additional copies can be obtained from the address below.

## 3 VISIBLE TRADE BALANCES BY COMMODITY (BALANCE OF PAYMENTS BASIS)

Table 16 of the Press Notice shows the value of exports, imports and the visible balance, measured on a comparable (BOP) basis, for each of the major commodity groups including manufactured goods. Monthly data at this level of detail, are published in the Monthly Review of External Trade Statistics.

## 4 MONTHLY REVIEW OF EXTERNAL TRADE STATISTICS

The Monthly Review of External Trade Statistics, prepared mainly as an internal working document, is made available publicly by the Department of Trade and Industry (price $£ 3$ a copy).

This is a monthly publication containing a commentary, charts, and tables, on topics such as the current account of the UK balance of payments, UK exports and imports of goods by commodity and area and certain international comparisons. An annual supplement of which a revised issue (No 5), has just been published, price $£ 4$ a copy, provides longer historical runs for the series shown in the monthly edition and additional international data.

## 5 ROUNDING

The data published in this Press Notice has been rounded to the nearest £million. Therefore figures may not sum to the aggregates and balances may not derive exactly from the export and import figures shown.

Enquiries about the Standard Notes, and the Monthly Review, should be addressed to S2A, Room 255, Department of Trade and Industry, 1 Victoria Street, London SWIH OET, Telephone: 01-215 5703.

on 29/5/84. 203.30 pm and tinereafter unctassind.
CURRENT BALANCE, VISIBLE TRADE AND INVISIBLES
(Balance of Payments basis)

a Invisibles are projections and subject to revision as more information becomes available.
b One third of the appropriate calendar quarter's estimate; monthly figures of invisibles are not available.
c Percentage change: latest three months on previous three months.
Table 3
INVISIBLES ${ }^{\text {e }}$
£ million seasonally adjusted

d ie excluding general government transactions and all transfers.
e Monthly figures of invisibles are not available.


Export unit value index as a percentage of the import unit value index.
VALUE AND VOLUME OF EXPORTS AMD IMPORTS EXCLUDING THE MORE ERRATIC ITEMSG
Table 5 (Balance of Payments basis)


[^7]
## TRADE IN OIL ${ }^{h}$

(Balance of Payments basis)
seasonally adjusted

| I |  | \| Balance 1 | Exports of Oil 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Imports of Oil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | of I |  | 1 | Crude Oil ${ }^{\text {j }}$ |  |  |  |  | \| Rest of | |  |  |  |  | Crude Oil |  |  |  | Rest of |
| I |  | I Trade I | Total | 1 | [SITC | C (REV 2) | 333 | 3.0] |  | Division | 1 | Total | 1 | [SITC | (REV 2) |  | $33.0]$ |  | Division |
| 1 |  | \| in oil | |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 33 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |
| I |  | 1 £ l | £ | 1 | £ | 1 I |  | vg value |  | £ | I | £ | 1 | £ |  |  | Avg value | I | £ |
| 1 |  | I million | millio |  | llion | I million | \| pe | er tonne |  | million |  | illion |  | million \| | I million |  | per tonne |  | million |
| 1 |  | 1 fob | fob | 1 | fob | \| tonnes | |  | £ fob | 1 | fob | 1 | fob | 1 | fob | 1 tonnes | 1 | £ fob | 1 | fob |
| 1 |  | 1 l | I | I |  | I | I |  | I |  | I |  | I |  | I | 1 |  | , |  |
| \| 1982 |  | $1+4556 \mid$ | 10686 | 1 | 8542 | 60.3 | 1 | 141.6 | I | 2144 | I | 6130 | 1 | 3861 | 28.3 | 1 | 136.6 |  | 2269 |
| \| 1983 |  | $1+70011$ | 12525 | 1 | 10111 | 160.4 | , | 147.8 | 1 | 2414 | I | 5524 | 1 | 3199 | 22.8 | 1 | 140.4 |  | 2324 |
| \| 1983 | Q1 | $\|+1801\|$ | \| 3106 | 1 | 2474 | 116.4 | I | 150.7 | 1 | 6312 | 1 | 1305 | 1 | 647 | 4.4 | 1 | 146.6 | , | 658 |
|  | Q2 | $1+1556 \mid$ | 12960 | 1 | 2366 | \| 16.4 | I | 144.7 | 1 | 5934 | 1 | 1404 | 1 | 795 | 5.8 | 1 | 137.5 | 1 | 609 |
| 1 | Q3 | $\|+1521\|$ | 2960 | 1 | 2361 | 116.2 | 1 | 145.8 | 1 | 5989 | 1 | 1439 | I | 942 | 6.8 | 1 | 137.8 | 1 | 497 |
| 1 | Q4 | $\|+2123\|$ | 13500 | 1 | 2910 | 119.5 | , | 149.6 | 1 | 5889 | 1 | 1376 | 1 | 816 | 5.8 | 1 | 141.9 | I | 561 |
| \| 1984 | Q1 | $\|+2316\|$ | \| 3654 | 1 | 2951 | \| 19.1 | 1 | 154.2 | 1 | 7013 | 1 | 1338 | 1 | 643 | 4.3 | 1 | 148.6 | 1 | 645 |
| \| 1983 | Apr | $1+5471$ | 1 978 | 1 | 843 | 15.7 | 1 | 149.1 | 1 | 1396 | 1 | 431 | 1 | 228 | 1.6 | 1 | 140.5 | I | 203 |
|  | May | $1+4501$ | 1993 | 1 | 779 | 15.5 | 1 | 142.5 | 1 | 213 | 1 | 543 | 1 | 324 | 2.4 | 1 | 136.6 | 1 | 219 |
| 1 | June | $1+5591$ | - 989 | 1 | 744 | 15.2 | 1 | 142.3 | 1 | 245 | 1 | 430 | 1 | 243 | 1.8 | 1 | 136.0 | 1 | 187 |
| 1 | July | $1+4641$ | 1953 | 1 | 751 | 15.2 | 1 | 143.3 | 1 | 2012 | 1 | 488 | 1 | 325 | 2.4 | 1 | 135.5 | I | 163 |
| 1 | Aug | $1+532 \mid$ | 1 977 | 1 | 792 | 15.4 | 1 | 146.6 | 1 | 185 | 1 | 445 | I | 277 | 2.0 | , | 141.3 | 1 | 168 |
| 1 | Sept | $1+5251$ | \| 1031 | 1 | 818 | 15.6 | 1 | 147.4 | 1 | 2113 | 1 | 506 | 1 | 340 | 2.5 | 1 | 137.2 | I | 166 |
| 1 | Oct | $1+5611$ | 1100 | 1 | 905 | 16.1 | 1 | 148.4 | , | 1945 | 1 | 539 | 1 | 360 | 2.5 | 1 | 142.9 | I | 179 |
| 1 | Nov | $\|+661\|$ | 1117 | , | 935 | 16.1 |  | 154.0 | 1 | 182 | 1 | 456 | 1 | 261 | 1.9 | 1 | 139.3 | 1 | 195 |
| 1 | Dec | $1+901$ \| | 1283 | I | 1070 | 17.3 | 1 | 147.0 | I | 212 | 1 | 382 | 1 | 195 | 1.4 | 1 | 143.5 | I | 187 |
| \| 1984 | Jan | $1+7191$ | \| 1101 | 1 | 874 | 15.8 | 1 | 151.8 | 1 | 226 | 1 | 382 | 1 | 205 | 1.4 | 1 | 151.1 | 1 | 177 |
| 1 | Feb | $1+821 \mid$ | \| 1277 | 1 | 1019 | 16.5 | 1 | 156.2 | 1 | 258 | 1 | 456 | 1 | 226 | 1.5 | 1 | 149.7 | 1 | 230 |
| 1 | Mar | $1+7761$ | \| 1276 | 1 | 1058 | 6.9 | 1 | 154.2 | 1 | 218 | 1 | 500 | 1 | 212 | 1.5 | 1 | 145.1 | 1 | 288 |
| 1 | Apr | $1+3701$ | 11014 | 1 | 809 | 15.2 |  | 155.9 | 1 | 205 | 1 | 643 | 1 | 355 | 2.4 | 1 | 147.2 | 1 | 288 |
| 1 Nov-J |  | $\|+2281\|$ | 13500 | 1 | 2879 | 119.1 | 1 | 150.7 | I | 621 | I | 1220 | 1 | 661 | 4.6 | 1 | 144.1 | 1 | 558 |
| 1 Feb-A |  | $\|+1968\|$ | \| 3567 | 1 | 2886 | \| 18.6 |  | 155.64 |  | 681 | 1 | 1599 | 1 | 793 | 5.4 | 1 | 147.4 | 1 | 807 |
| \| Perce | entage | 1 I | 1 | 1 |  | I | I |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | , |  | 1 |  |
| 1 Chang |  |  | $1+2$ |  | - | $\|-3\|$ |  | $+3$ | 1 | $+9 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $+31$ | 1 | + 20 | $1+17$ | 1 | $+2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $+44$ |

h Trade in petroleum and petroleum products. These figures differ from those published by the Department of Energy which are on a time of shipment basis (see paragraph 7 of the standard notes).
j Not seasonally adjusted.

TRADE IN GOODS OTHER THAN OIL
(Balance of Payments basis)

$g$ These are defined as ships, North Seas installations, aircraft, precious stones, and silver.
f Export unit value index as a percentage of the import unit value index.

## SECRET and Personal until relesse of prua notw 



9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use classification.

## EXPORTS BY COMMODITY: VOLUNE INDICES

Table 9
(Dverseas Trade Statistics basis)
INDICES $1980=100$, seasonally adjusted


9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792)
precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Brosd Economic Categories end-use classification.


9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use classification.
EXPORTS BY AREA
Table 11
(Oversess Trade Statistics basis)
£ million, fob, seasonally adjusted

|  |  | Developed Countries |  |  |  |  | Developing Countries |  |  | Centrally |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Total | European Community | Rest of W Europe | North America | Other I | Total \| | Oil exporting countries | 1 Other \| | planned economies |
|  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 555581 | 413931 | 23124 | 6681 | 8353 1 | 32351 | 130531 | 6445 | 1 6608 | 974 |
| 1983 | 605341 | 465081 | 26516 | 7516 | 9342 1 | 31331 | 127831 | 6122 | \| 6661 | 1112 |
| 1983 Q1 | 14781 \| | 112331 | 6584 | 1901 | 2077 \| | 6711 | 3221 \| | 1564 | \| 1656 | 277 |
| Q2 | 14687 \| | 11190 \| | 6313 | 1814 | 2296 \| | 7671 | 30281 | 1490 | \| 1539 | 274 |
| Q3 | 14831 \| | 114931 | 6386 | 1777 | 2496 \| | 8351 | 32021 | 1540 | \| 1662 | 290 |
| Q4 | 16234 \| | 12592 \| | 7234 | 2025 | 2473 | 8601 | 33321 | 1528 | \| 1804 | 271 |
| 1984 Q1 | 168591 | 132401 | 7427 | 2197 | 2703 I | 9121 | 32631 | 1477 | \| 1786 | 340 |
| 1984 Feb | 59871 | 4771 | 2501 | 833 | 1108 \| | 3281 | 1169 \| | 512 | 1 657 | 116 |
| Mar | 5685 \| | 4469 1 | 2573 | 680 | 9001 | 3151 | 1063 \| | 500 | 1 563 | 124 |
| Apr | 5412 \| | 4191 1 | 2421 | 673 | 815 1 | 2821 | 1017 \| | 445 | 1572 | 122 |
| Nov-Jan | 16248 \| | 125261 | 7161 | 2079 | 2428 I | 859 \| | 32901 | 1525 | \| 1765 | 286 |
| Feb-Apr | 17084 | 134311 | 7495 | 2187 | 2824 I | 9261 | 32491 | 1457 | \| 1793 | 362 |
| Percentage |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Change | $+51$ | $+71$ | + 41 | $+5$ | $+16 \quad 1$ | $+81$ | -11 | - $4 \frac{1}{2}$ | $\left\|+1 \frac{1}{2}\right\|$ | + 27 |

## SECRET and Personal untir release of press nothen

 on 29.515 .58 at 3.3 pm and hereater uncassified.£ million cif seasonally adjusted


9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use classification.

IMPORTS BY COMMODITY: VOLUNE INDICES
Table 13
(Overseas Trade Statistics basis)
INDICES $1980=100$ seasonally adjusted


- 9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious atones (667), and silver (681.1).
k Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use classification.


## IMPORTS BY CONADDITY: UNIT VALUE INDICES <br> (Overseas Trade Statistics basis)



9 These are defined as ships, North Sea installations (together comprising SITC (REV 2) 793), aircraft (792) precious stones (667), and silver (681.1).
$k$ Based on the United Nations Broad Economic Categories end-use classification.
Table 15

## IMPORTS BY AREA

(Overseas Trade Statistics basis)


SECRET and Personal unitir reases of pross note
a $29 / 5 / 84$ ts 330 pn and thereafter unclassified.

| SITC (R2) | Food Beverages and Tobacco |  |  | Basic Materials |  |  | Fuels |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 0 |  |  | $2+4$ |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
|  | Exports | Imports | Visible | Exports | Imports |  | \| Exports | Imports | I | Visible |
|  | fob | fob | Balance | fob | fob | Balance | $1 \text { fob }$ | fob | 1 | Balance |
|  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | I |  |
| 1982 | 3936 | 6613 | 1-2676 | 1354 | 3315 | - 1961 | \| 11237 | 7193 |  | + 4043 |
| 1983 | 4221 | 7196 | 1-2975 | 1610 | 3983 | - 2373 | \| 13126 | 6743 | I | +6383 |
| 1982 Q2 | 991 | 1684 | 1-693 | 361 | 826 | - 464 | 12595 | 1824 |  | + 771 |
| Q3 | 962 | 1637 | $1-675$ | 320 | 781 | - 452 | I 2989 | 1792 | 1 | + 1197 |
| Q4 | 1043 | 1629 | $1-586$ | 338 | 811 | - 472 | 3165 | 1636 | 1 | +1529 |
| 1983 Q1 | 1114 | 1765 | 1-651 | 380 | 920 | - 539 | 3260 | 1589 | 1 | + 1672 |
| Q2 | 987 | 1740 | $1-753$ | 393 | 1017 | - 624 | 3121 | 1707 | 1 | + 1414 |
| Q3 | 1017 | 1758 | $1-741$ | 394 | 960 | - 566 | 13086 | 1717 | 1 | +1369 |
| Q4 | 1103 | 1934 | $1-831$ | 442 | 1086 | - 644 | 13658 | 1730 | 1 | +1928 |
| 1984 Q1 | 1178 | 2026 | $1-849$ | 443 | 1156 | - 712 | 13805 | 1751 | 1 | + 2054 |



[^8]
## CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER

cc Chief Secretary Financial Secretary Sir P Middleton Mr Bailey<br>Sir T Burns<br>Mr Cassell Mr Battishill<br>Mr H P Evans<br>Mr Lankester<br>Mr Scholar<br>Mr Culpin<br>Miss Peirson Mr Shields<br>Mr Page<br>Mr A Smith<br>Mr MacKinnon<br>Mr Lord<br>Mr Ridley<br>Mr Portillo JD/02

## PHILLIPS AND DREW JUNE FORECAST

1. P\&D's latest assessment will be released on Friday, 1 June. Their forecasts are summarised in the attached note. The main changes from last month's forecast include a reduction in the balance of payments current account surplus from $£ 1 \frac{1}{2}$ bn to $£ 800 \mathrm{~m}$ as oil imports increase in response to the coal strike. Their views on output growth for this year remain unchanged and broadly in line with the Treasury view. However inflation increases slightly to reach $5 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent by $1985 Q 4$.
2. $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{D}$ have taken the opportunity, in their accompanying press notice (copy attached), to start a hare about the case for "a package" similar to the July $1983 £ 1$ billion of public spending reductions. It is not clear whether they would see this as aimed at the current year (as the July 1983 package was) or covering later years too. (In their forecast they speak of a possible overshoot on public spending in 1985-86.) The reasoning for their recommendation is obscure - though they speak loosely of "a credibility gap" having "arisen whether justified or not between the Government's pres umed intentions and its actions". They suggest that "domestic inflation expectations are now probably rising."
3. Suggested line to take:

On the forecast Output and inflation forecasts broadly in line with Budget forecast for 1984. Balance of payments figure is lower but subject to large error, just as official forecasts are.

Basis of forecast rise in inflation in 1985 not at all clear.
on a "package" (as discussed with GEP)
(i) suggestion of rising inflationary expectations not well-founded. Note that Gavyn Davies of Simon and Coates, (bulletin to be issued 4 June) reported in FT on 31 May as seeing underlying rate of increase of producer output prices as having fallen so far this year. That is consistent with Budget forerast of RPI inflation edging down through the year.
(ii) recent statistics give no reason to suppose that fiscal and monetary position out of line with Budget forecast:
(a) target monetary aggregates have recently been growing at rates within 1984-85 target ranges
(b) PSBR expected to be heavily front-end loaded and April PSBR ( $£ 2.4$ billion) has to be interpreted in that content.
(c) [IF PRESSED] government's supply spending in April distorted by new carry-over arrangements, in particular carry-over of $£ \frac{1}{4}$ billion of defence spending. So provides no reason to believe 1984-85 spending limits are threatened.

Nè Mackinnon
pp MTFOLGER

## PHILLIPS AND DREW (JUNE) FORECAST

Latest assessment continues to remain close to the Treasury view on output and inflation this year. 1984 GDP increases at a similar rate to last year (about 3 per cent) but with stronger contributions from exports and investment. Retail price inflation falls to about 5 per cent by end-1984, rising slightly to $5 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent by end-1985.

## ASSUMPTIONS

- OECD real GNP grows by $4 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent this year reflecting continuation of strong growth in USA and accelerating activity in Europe and Japan. As a result UK export markets expand by 4-5 per cent this year and, despite a slowdown in US growth, 4 per cent in 1985. OECD inflation rises steadily over the next two years to peak at $7 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in mid-1985: the impact of increasing activity is partly offset by the effect of high unemployment on earnings. Total non-oil commodity prices (in constant currency terms) rise by 2 per cent from end -1983 to end -1984 and by 3 per cent in the following year. The official crude oil price remains at $\$ 29 / \mathrm{bl}$ up to end-1985.


## POLICY ASSESSMENT

- Argued that fiscal policy is procyclical because PSBR target of $£ 7 \frac{1}{4}$ bn for 1984-85 is higher than what might have been expected once nature of Budget measures, asset sales and cyclical position are taken into account. This indicates "a shift in policy emphasis "away from concentrating on the anti-inflationary bias to policy towards concern over unemployment."

Positive fiscal adjustments are assumed to be limited to $£ 1$ bn pa upto 1988-89 (amounting to less than a third of the planned cumulative fiscal adjustment of $£ 13 \frac{1}{2}$ bn in the new MTFS) reflecting real increases in public expenditure and "balance of payments constraints on growth and inflation." Claimed that "credibility gap" has arisen over government's anti-inflation objectives; a firm policy move (similar to last year's package) is required to dampen domestic inflationary expectations.

## FORECAST DETAILS

- Little change is expected in the saving ratio but rpdi grows by 3 per cent this year and next. This underpins growth in consumer spending of $2 \frac{1}{2}-3$ per cent in 1984 and about $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1985.
- Budget measures expected to bring forward investment expenditures. As a result manufacturing investment (inc. leased assets) rises by $10-12$ per cent this year compared to $6 \frac{1}{2}-7$ per cent pre-budget. Total fixed investment grows by $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent in 1984.
- Rising OECD activity sees export volumes expanding by almost 6 per cent this year while non-oil export volumes expand by 4 per cent. The current account shows a surplus of £0.8bn for 1984 (down on their previous forecast) but moves into virtual balance in 1985.
- Average earnings grow by 7-7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the current round with slightly lower settlements offset by higher wage drift. Inflationary pressures remain subdued and retail price inflation moves slowly up to $5 \frac{1}{2}-6$ per cent by end-1985.


## KEY INDICATORS

(May forecast in brackets)

|  | GDP(A) <br> $(\%$ chg on prev yr) $)$ <br> $(\%$ chg on prev <br> year-Q4) | Unemployment <br> (UK adults-Q4) <br> millions | Balance of payments on |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| current account (£bn) |  |  |  | | PSBR |
| :---: |
| (£bn -fiscal |

## PRESS INFORMATION

Embargo: 00.01 hours Friday 1 June 1984
Further information: Dr. Paul Neild 01-628 4444 Night: 0480-65993

## TROUBLES IN PERSPECTIVE

When confidence is undermined it is easy to lose a sense of perspective regarding underlying economic trends. The large US budget deficit, US banking difficulties, Latin American debt and the response of the Federal Reserve to escalating US inflation expectations have combined to weaken confidence in the world economy. Simultaneously, a perception that the UK Government has diluted its anti-inflation stance has meant that the credibility of the Government's own economic strategy has been put into doubt at home. However, it is necessary to put these developments in perspective.

The US economy is in fundamental imbalance. This is serious. The budget deficit keeps interest rates higher than otherwise, which boosts capital inflows and underpins the dollar. The resulting uncompetitiveness of US production fosters a massive trade deficit. An upturn in activity on this basis cannot be sustained beyond the point at which inflation expectations begin to escalate. This point has been reached. The US represents $40 \%$ of free-world output. It is difficult for the UK to insulate itself from nearly half the world. This can only be done if there is absolute confidence in policies at home.

Unfortunately, this is no longer the case. A credibility gap has arisen, no matter whether justified or not, between the Government's presumed intentions and its actions. The Government's intention is presumably to keep inflation at worst on a stable path and at best on a downward path. The latest (April) output price and retail price figures have left a feeling of uneasiness that neither of these objectives is being attained. Meanwhile, the well-known front-end loading of the PSBR in conjunction with strong private sector lending has put the Government's £M3 guideline potentially in jeopardy, even though it is not being exceeded at the moment. Hence domestic inflation expectations are now probably rising, along with those in the US.

Contd/....

The first point to make here is that the UK Government is in a much better position to deal with this escalation than is the US Administration. UK fiscal and monetary policies are in much better balance. The second point to make is that, as in the US, actual cost pressures, as opposed to potential pressures, are being largely contained. A firm policy move now can stop the rather more pessimistic expectations from being turned into reality.

The Government has already accepted higher base rates. Last July the Chancellor introduced a $£ 1 b n$ package aimed at reducing public sector net spending. Circumstances were different then in that we had a new Chancellor operating in a post-Election environment. It is no doubt more difficult for a Chancellor to accept that similar action may be needed this year, when the ink on his first Budget is hardly dry. Yet such a package would go a long way towards restoring confidence in what is basically a much more soundly based economic revival than the example provided by the United States.

Failure to act may still see the present difficulties overcome. But it cannot be guaranteed to do so.

CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER $12 \mid 2$

cc Sir Peter Middleton
Sir Terence Burns Mr Battishill Mr Evans Mr Odling-Smee Mr Culpin Mr Fugger ur. Mr Shields Mr Horton Mr Lord Mr Portillo Mr Ridley HE/ 13


You asked, when we met to discuss last month's first order Questions, for a note on what it would take for the CSO's cyclical indicators to define a peak in the current increase in activity and hence a subsequent "downswing".
2. I attach a factual note, based on advice from CSO, which explains how the cyclical indicators are applied. The short answer to your question is that a peak is defined when the level of activity, as defined in the composite coincident indicator, shows its maximum divergence from its long term trend value. This is illustrated in the chart also attached. It is important to note that a cyclical peak, as defined, can occur without the level of activity dropping at all. Indeed GDP can go on growing through the downswing (as it did 1964 to 1967, for example).

## The next peak

3. In considering the timing of the next peak there are several specific points to note given the recent and possible future path of activity:
(i) In the absence of shocks, it could well be that the next peak -however defined and dated - will not be followed by a fall in the level of output over the "downswing" as a whole. A 1960's style "growth recession" seems more likely.
(ii) Preliminary assessments of the current 'trend' involve extrapolations of recent centred moving averages of actual growth rates. This means that the trend is only slowly moving up to the recent actual rate of increase of 3 per cent. If growth merely
now stays at about 3 per cent pa the effect will be to show a flattening-off in the indicator, but no peak.
(iii) A peak will, however, be registered if the growth rate falls below 3 per cent pa. for a sustained period - whatever the reason. Thus, a decline in North Sea output (or even a reduction in its contribution to GDP) could contribute to a downswing being registered even if utilisation rates in the onshore economy remain unchanged.
4. The possible sensitivity of the cyclical indicators to structural change has always been of concern. EA have raised with CSO the issues both of the impact of changes in North Sea output on the coincident indicator and the weight attached to manufacturing sector series in the leading indicators. Further discussions should help, at the least, in establishing a solid defensive line on briefing if what seems to be an 'inappropriate peak looks like being registered.

## Conclusions

6. Clearly, further discussions with CSO about the significance of the points above will be useful, in advance of any warning signs from the leading indicators.
7. More immediately, one lesson seems to be that, save for specialised audiences, we should avoid talking about present growth as an "upswing". Otherwise we shall be hooked onto calling the post-peak phase a "downswing" or "recession" when from the lay point of view it may well be more sensible to talk of a period of "moderating growth". It would be helpful to have your views on that, please.


## Definition of cyclical peak

1. A peak in the business cycle is defined by the CSO as the time at which when economic activity (as assessed in their cyclical indicator system by the three measures of GDP at constant prices, retail sales and the output of the production industries) reaches the maximum deviation from a calculated long-term trend (a centred 5 year moving averaye growth). This is shown schematically in the chart attached.
2. Identification of a peak and subsequent downswing does not imply that the level of activity will necessarily start to fall, merely that its rate of growth will change from being above that of long-term trend to being below. Peaks may therefore occur because growth slackeņs off; in some previous cyclical 'downswings', economic activity continued to rise, though at a slower rate.

## Prediction and confirmation of cyclical peaks

3. The CSO cyclical indicators also give advance warning of peaks and troughs in the business cycle (as defined above). The longer and shorter leading indicators exhibit peaks and troughs on average about 12 and 6 months respectively in advance of, and the coincident indicator at about the same time as, the business cycle. However, because the most recent values of the cyclical indicators, based on partial information, are subejct to revision and because the measures themselves can behave erratically, peaks and troughs in the indicators are typically only identified positively around 3 to 6 months after they have occurred. Irregularity in the movement of the indicators caused by industrial disputes, weather conditions and other seasonal influences may make more difficult and could delay the final confirmation of, a cyclical peak (and give rise to 'local' turning points).
4. The first stage in identifying a peak is tentative identification of a peak in the longer leading indicator. It will normally be some 3 to 6 months after a peak in this indicator has occurred before it can be confirmed, thus giving on average around 9 to 6 months' effective warning of a peak in the business cycle. On average, about six months later, the shorter leading indicator should also be exhibiting a peak and the coincident indicator about six months after that. (There can be considerable variation about the average lead times of the indicators but, at each successive stage, confidence in the identification of a cyclical peak increases and the range of most likely dates for the peak is narrowed.)

## LOCATION OF CYClical peak



FROM: DAVID PERETZ
DATE: 13 June 1984
cc Sir P Middleton
Sir T Burns
Mr Battishill
Mr Evans
Mr Odling-Smee
Mr Culpin
Mr Folder or.
Mr Shields
Mr Horton
Mr Lord
Mr Portillo
Mr Ridley
Mr Lomas - CSO

MR SMITH

## CYCLICAL PEAKS

The Chancellor was grateful for your note of 12 June.
2. On your conclusions, he has noted, and agrees with, paragraph 6.
3. On paragraph 7, he thinks we must clearly talk of the "recovery" rather than the "upswing", and (when the time comes) say something about the pace of recovery slowing down.
4. He has also asked how long a "sustained period" (your paragraph 3(iii)) would be (miners strike? ) And he has noted that the CSO terminology could easily produce a complete nonsense, as below:



[^0]:    F.E.Leonard C. H. Eaves FCA D.H.T.Bates A.R.L.Pearson R.L.Lawrenc G.R. Gray T. F. Brown FCA P.J.Williams W.T. Hoimes T.W. Buckland W.T.Seward

[^1]:    * This explanation is confidential until publication of the stockbuildingsfigures on 23 February.

[^2]:    *These are defined as ships, North Sea installations, aircraft, precious stones and silver bullion.

[^3]:    h Trade in petroleu and petroleve procucts. Theee figurwe differ froie thoee published by the Departmant of Energy which arte on time of shipment besis (see paragraph 7 of the stmilard notes).
    j Not seesenally adjuated.

[^4]:    "At the same time there has all too often been over-optimism about the prospective growth in total national output."

[^5]:    "As public spending takes a larger and larger share of GDP, so the public sector steadily encroaches on the rest of the economy. This is a process which could not be allowed to go on indefinitely."

[^6]:    These are defined as ships, North Sea installations, aircraft precious stones and silver bullion.

[^7]:    g These are defined as abing, Mnrth Sea installations, aircraft, precious stones, and silver.
     $29 / 5 / 84$ at 3.30 pm and thereafter unclassified.

[^8]:    1. Menthly date-for commodities on-belance-of paynents hasis are nat availabler-
