

Mr Miliband has no plan for clean energy and now is told nor does anyone else

Mr Miliband spent years in Opposition preparing for the day when he could unleash his decarbonising zeal on what is left of U.K. industry. Once in office he announced a firm target of all electricity generated here being clean or carbon free by 2030. Only after this extremely expensive revolutionary pledge was made did he write to National Grid asking for urgent site of the plan to do this, and an estimate of the costs. What a disaster to have to admit he had no plan and settled for a target with no idea how much it would cost to hit it, or even whether it could be hit.

Yesterday his embarrassment should have got bigger. National Grid published a reply saying they do not have a plan either, but they will work hard to produce one. They will consult everyone who would need to do so much to bring it about and presumably include in consultation all those who would be expected to stump up the cash. To plunge the friendly knife further into Miliband's side they said they would need from the government a definition of the grand target Mr Miliband has set. Ouch!

So there we have it. An impossible target to hit unless you redefine it to allow the burning of fossil fuels in stand by generators when wind and sun let us down. A huge and unspecified budget to end all our current nuclear and gas power stations and to build enough replacement power taking account of the variability of wind and solar.

One final thought. As Mr Miliband has admitted he does not know the costs of putting in all that renewable power, how can he offer us £300 off our bills were all the money to be found to build so many windfarms.

Why do most politicians and commentators say public spending is so tight?

People have suffered in recent years thanks to the lockdowns, the Bank of England created great inflation and some tax rises. The public sector has witnessed a surge in public spending and a big increase in staffing levels. The problems in the public sector are not austerity but a big drop in productivity and massive misplaced spending.

I used to take to Chancellors and Chief Secretaries short lists of large losses by the public sector. The state has clearly have not been short of money because the Bank of England has pocketed £75 bn so far to pay its losses in the last couple of years. We have seen a £20 bn loss of productivity in public services since 2019 as they were given plenty of money to add personnel without adding output. The true figure is higher, and we now have a five year loss of any productivity gains during a period of big spending on smarter digital technology.

The public sector had billions to sign people off as permanently unable to work when more with support and training could get a job. Government tipped billions into a southern railway called HS 2, as its budget overrun more than threefold and the decision was taken that it would never get to the North which was the original big idea. The state afforded the luxury of a Post Office expensive management which ran up losses of £799 m with no one in power objecting. The new government has not queried or changed any of this.

The new government is worse. It thinks it fine to give out big pay awards with no clauses on boosting service quality and output for the extra money. We need better pay with smarter working. Whilst they say there is a shortage of cash for pensioners winter fuel there is no shortage of cash for anti driver road schemes, for welcoming more migrants who came illegally, for importing more of our energy as we close down our own oil and gas prematurely.

The public sector is not short of administrative staff and not short of money, It is not short of expensive managers. It is short of effective managers who spend wisely. It is also now short of Ministers who care about value for money and know how to get back lost productivity.

Why do most politicians and commentators say public spending is so tight?

People have suffered in recent years thanks to the lockdowns, the Bank of England created great inflation and some tax rises. The public sector has witnessed a surge in public spending and a big increase in staffing levels. The problems in the public sector are not austerity but a big drop in productivity and massive misplaced spending.

I used to take to Chancellors and Chief Secretaries short lists of large losses by the public sector. The state has clearly have not been short of money because the Bank of England has pocketed £75 bn so far to pay its losses in the last couple of years. We have seen a £20 bn loss of productivity in public services since 2019 as they were given plenty of money

to add personnel without adding output. The true figure is higher, and we now have a five year loss of any productivity gains during a period of big spending on smarter digital technology.

The public sector had billions to sign people off as permanently unable to work when more with support and training could get a job. Government tipped billions into a southern railway called HS 2, as its budget overrun more than threefold and the decision was taken that it would never get to the North which was the original big idea. The state afforded the luxury of a Post Office expensive management which ran up losses of £799 m with no one in power objecting. The new government has not queried or changed any of this.

The new government is worse, It thinks it fine to give out big pay awards with no clauses on boosting service quality and output for the extra money. We need better pay with smarter working. Whilst they say there is a shortage of cash for pensioners winter fuel there is no shortage of cash for anti driver road schemes, for welcoming more migrants who came illegally, for importing more of our energy as we close down our own oil and gas prematurely.

The public sector is not short of administrative staff and not short of money, It is not short of expensive managers. It is short of effective managers who spend wisely. It is also now short of Ministers who care about value for money and know how to get back lost productivity.

Labour makes bad policies worse and undermines good ones.

The government says it brings change. It wants national renewal without describing what this looks like or how it happens.

They promised to stop the small boats by appointing a new Border Commander. Conservatives had already done that. The Labour one will be the boss of the Conservative one, but as yet there is no legislation to give them any new powers. Meanwhile numbers arriving have gone up

They said they will set up Great British Energy and a National Wealth Fund to boost investment in renewable power. The Conservatives had set up U.K. Infrastructure Ltd and the British Business bank to do that. Ironically as they have a corporate structure and powers they have to implement the same Labour policy until the government manages to set up the renamed bodies.

They think regulating landlords more will help the housing problems. They have decided to take over the bad Conservative bill and make it worse. Their Bill will cut the supply of homes by more.

They say they are ending austerity. Instead they do the opposite, cutting pensioner benefits and threatening many with tax rises. They claim Conservatives starved public service of money when Conservatives put through huge money and real increases in NHS spending. The issue is how do you boost productivity and quality and manage the money better.

They say they inherited £22 bn of unfunded spending but refuse to itemise the bill or provide any evidence. They have increased public sector wages by £10 bn which is unfunded.

They carry on with creeping full rail nationalisation with no plan to boost fare revenue and cut the huge losses. They grant a big pay award to well paid drivers without negotiating any productivity gain.

They sound like an Opposition with a majority. They criticise what government is doing and blame past Ministers. They criticise the economy and then seem surprised when confidence falls. They criticise the public for our behaviours.

When will they show how they will stop illegal migration, slash NHS waiting lists and get the economy back to being the fastest growing of the G 7 as it was in the first half of 2024 after a slow patch.

[Confidence is always vulnerable to bad government](#)

Why didn't the PM and Chancellor see that telling us Things will get worse was bound to put people off spending and investing? Why didn't they think forward to their October 14 th Investment summit when they want to tell the world investing in the U.K. is a great idea?

Why did they think making up a large number for a deficit which they could not back up with credible numbers was going to help? In their rush to trash everything about the finances and government to blame the Conservatives why didn't they see that would alarm everyone with prospects of more taxes and spending cuts to come? When will they take responsibility for what is happening, as they can change anything they want to as quickly as they wish?

The Chancellor's speech failed because it was still looking both ways. It both said there are plenty of opportunities ahead whilst continuing to argue the government will need benefit cuts and tax rises to battle the alleged budget black hole.

If she really wants faster growth she needs to cut taxes and boost benefits to those in need. She needs to get more people into work and off benefits. She needs to tackle the disgraceful waste and bad spending in the public

sector. She could start by slashing losses at the Bank of England, the nationalised Post Office and the nationalised railway and HS 2.

It is her choice to lose billions on bonds. Her choice to continue with public sector management of rail that needed. £ 33 bn of taxpayer cash last year. Her choice to allow the public sector to charge taxpayers £20 bn more for inefficiencies on top of the inflation if wages and costs.