



Caxton House Tothill Street London SW1H 9NAF

Telephone Direct Line 01-213 6400

Switchboard 01-213 3000

GTN 213

Rt Hon Leon Brittan QC MP  
Chief Secretary  
Treasury  
Great George Street  
London SW1

23 November 1981

*D. Leon.*YOP ALLOWANCE FOR 16 YEAR OLDS *with note (sup)*

Thank you for your letter of 16 November.

I am surprised by the MISC 62 decision. The arrangements approved by E assumed that SB would be removed from 16 year olds at the same time as the comprehensive training scheme was introduced, with the benefits of that training being adduced as a trade off for the loss of SB. Jim Prior gave the House the clear impression that we would not withdraw SB before that position was reached, both when he appeared before the Select Committee on Employment on 20 May and in debate on 24 June. He wrote as much to the Director of Youthaid in July.

To withdraw SB from 16 year olds next year before we can offer all of them places under the new training scheme would therefore be a marked change in the Government's position. It would certainly alter the public perception of our motivation in withdrawing SB. It is bound, despite the strength of our case, to be received with hostility by many of those on whom we depend for delivery of YOP and our new scheme - not just unions, but the careers service, those involved in further education, the voluntary organisations and young people themselves. Of course we risk an adverse reaction to the arrangements agreed by E, but they make a much more defensible combination. Implementing the SB decision a year earlier and carrying through the contentious legislation in the next few months rather than a year later would create a particularly unfavourable atmosphere in which to try to achieve our youth training objectives.





When you last made this proposal you will recall that I told E that to attempt to remove the SB entitlement and introduce the new low allowance for 16 year olds before we launch the new scheme in the Autumn of 1983 would be fatal. Not only would we find ourselves unable to build up to the new comprehensive scheme in time, we would risk YOP beginning to collapse on us next year through withdrawal of support. Loss of support for YOP places in industry would mean, of course, that, in order to try to maintain the guarantees, we should have to expand the more expensive forms of YOP provision such as training workshops and community service. So we could well end up worse off on the expenditure side rather than produce savings.

It is essential that colleagues should be aware of these wider implications of withdrawing SB from 16 year olds in 1982. In my view, we should stick to the E decision - with the SB change and the training scheme coming in together in 1983.

I am copying this letter to the recipients of yours.

*J Norman*



23 NOV 1987





Prime Minister

24 November 1981

✓ P.A.  
Done M/S

Agree to X below?

Policy Unit


M/S 24/11

Norman Tebbit is  
speeding to lose Britain  
& Norman Fowler's delay should  
(Tuesdays).  
little to  
know the  
result  
of  
that meeting  
not

PRIME MINISTER

BENEFITS FOR 16-YEAR OLDS

1. We understand Norman Tebbit spoke to you briefly today about his concern that the MISC 62 decision to end SB for 16-year olds ten months before the new Youth Training Scheme starts up will torpedo our policies on youth unemployment/training. (He wrote to Leon Brittan on 23 November.)
2. We think Norman Tebbit is right - and we should therefore ignore Leon Brittan's notion that the YOP allowance should also be cut earlier. If we are going to sell the comprehensive Youth Training Scheme with a much reduced allowance (only £12.75) and successfully remove the entitlement of 16-year olds to SB, we need to make these changes at the same time. Criticism and non-cooperation from young people, unions and employers may be so loud and effective that YOP places dry up during the last ten months, and the new training scheme never gets off the ground.
3. It is crucially important electorally that the new regime should be anticipated favourably, and should be seen to be operating effectively in its first six months. Its success could have a major impact on the unemployment figures during the winter of 1983/4.
4. We are in any case already concerned that the Youth Training Scheme will be unable to do all we are asking of it. We think it would be wiser to operate an expanded Walters scheme alongside it. The combined coverage and cost of the schemes could be unchanged. It is still possible to leave room for this outcome in the forthcoming White Paper on Youth Training and we will comment further when the draft is circulated.
5. The immediate issue is whether the Treasury proposal to withdraw SB sooner should go to Cabinet. We think you should act now to stop it, asking Norman Tebbit to find other savings if he can.
6. David's note below provides further important reasons for this.

  
JOHN HOSKYNs



## 10 DOWNING STREET

24th November, 1981

### PRIME MINISTER

It would appear that MISC 62 made a mistake, an understandable mistake bearing in mind that there was no representative of the Department of Employment present at the meeting. (It is less understandable that there was no representative, in view of the impact on employment and training programmes of any decision on SB).

If you agree that the decision must be reversed, it is very important that it is reversed before Cabinet. Should the matter be discussed at Cabinet and the decision changed, probably after a forceful interjection from Prior, you will achieve the worst of all worlds. Leaks to the effect that you wished to cut off SB before alternative training was in place but that you were overruled. Since you were on MISC 62 (I believe) it will be difficult for you to make clear at Cabinet that you have changed your mind, so even if you say nothing you will appear to be conceding to the weight of opinion, and the leaks will be very damaging to you personally.

If you wish to press this through Cabinet against the advice of Norman Tebbit you might consider whether it would carry through Parliament. M.P's in constituencies with high unemployment might find this measure very unpalatable until a full years training alternative was firmly in place.

D.W.