

# Slavery

I wholeheartedly condemn slavery. Today there is more work to be done to combat what is called modern slavery. There is not much specifically modern about the traffic in people who are bound to employers in low wage slavery in illegal occupations or working illegally because they did not gain legal entry to the country concerned. There is slavery and criminality behind the drug trades, the exploitation of some women and the passage of people illegally to new countries for the profit of the people traffickers. There is slavery in some illegal businesses employing illegal migrants and exploiting them over hours, pay and living conditions as they are outside the legal protections of our society. These are the slaveries we should oppose and prevent. These are the slaveries we can do something about. They are a blot on our generations.

Past slavery was horrific, but there is nothing we can do to ease the burdens or compensate the victims when they are long dead. Many past societies were slave based. The UK faced slavery and serfdom from the Romans, Normans, Barbary pirates and others, just as it worked with other countries to promote slave plantations in the eighteenth century. The UK turned from such practices with a successful anti slavery Parliament led campaign, helping the world to new standards of conduct. The Royal Navy played an important role in stopping the trade in people.

I do not expect compensation to be paid to the UK by those countries that invaded us, enslaved people, took their lands and abused them. Our attention should be on the present and future. There are too many current day abuses which we can do something about which should be our priority. We cannot put right the conduct of people who died hundreds of years ago which we condemn. Our ancestors fought against their enslavers at the time and lost. The Roman legions and Norman army were powerful oppressors. However much you want to change that you cannot.

---

## Electric Vehicles (EVs) – with credit to Facts4EU

“The team at Facts4EU.org have published a 2-part report on electric vehicles (EVs) in which I am quoted and which readers may find interesting.

Part I ([https://facts4eu.org/news/2024\\_jan\\_electric\\_scalextric](https://facts4eu.org/news/2024_jan_electric_scalextric)) is about the new law which came into effect on 03 January, about which relatively little has been written.

Part II ([https://facts4eu.org/news/2024\\_jan\\_electric\\_scalextric\\_2](https://facts4eu.org/news/2024_jan_electric_scalextric_2)) draws on

the experience of one motorist who was forced to sell his EV after just 5 months and buy a petrol car instead. Readers will recall I published this motorist's comments recently."

---

## **British food labelling**

Dear Colleague

Environment Secretary Steve Barclay yesterday announced measures to improve transparency in food labelling and make sure high-quality British food stands out from the crowd.

The plans, announced at the Oxford Farming Conference, will empower consumers to make informed decisions at the supermarket shelf and online, while backing British farmers producing food to world-leading standards of taste, quality and animal welfare.

The plans include a consultation on proposals to make food labelling clearer, such as highlighting when imported products do not meet UK welfare standards, and help ensure food produced to the highest standards is consistently labelled. The Environment Secretary will also speak with major online retailers to identify ways to better support online customers to understand the origin of their food products at the point of purchase, including the option of a Buy British Button.

Please click the following link to find more information on the measures, and to read comments from the Environment Secretary: [DEFRA News: UK Farming Schemes upgrade and Food Labelling announcements today \(4/1/24\)](#) (cloud.microsoft)

---

## **Protesters wanting a quicker green transition should praise the UK and challenge others**

All the time we have a global system of national accounting for carbon dioxide production the UK will come out well from the numbers and China and India will come out badly. UK policy has driven a lot of heavy energy using industry out of our country to force us to rely on more imports. The imports from China mean more CO<sub>2</sub> produced in China and less in the UK. The UK has stopped most of its coal based electricity production and come to rely more

on imported electricity. Given this is the approved system why don't the green campaigners rejoice at the UK's success in driving down its CO<sub>2</sub> output?

According to global figures China accounts for 30% of manmade CO<sub>2</sub> in the world and the UK under 1%. China's increase in CO<sub>2</sub> output in a typical year exceeds total UK output for that year. These numbers do tell us a truth about CO<sub>2</sub> and should encourage the campaigners to pressurise China to do far more than she is doing. They could turn their attention to the Chinese Embassies if they do not fancy trying a protest in China itself. China and India do rely on coal much more than the advanced countries to generate their power. They are opening new coal power stations and mines.

One of the reasons many people who accept the climate change theory do not do more in their own lives to buy green products is their sense of futility given the way CO<sub>2</sub> worldwide continues to expand whatever action the UK government and consumers take. Despite all the COPs, law changes in advanced countries and the resolutions in world bodies world CO<sub>2</sub> output continues to expand as the tenth anniversary of the Paris Agreement draws near. So why do Green campaigners attack our own country instead of concentrating on the sources of so much CO<sub>2</sub> growth?

---

## [Establishment economics hits a new low](#)

We live under the tyranny of the Bank of England and OBR. Politicians have given powers away to these so called independent bodies, only to discover they are unable to make accurate forecasts whilst recommending policies which lurch us from high inflation to no growth. Many of the electorate take the more traditional view that Ministers are elected to sift the advice and make good decisions. If inflation is too high or growth is too low voters blame the government. As we approach the next election voters face the problem that the main Opposition party thinks the problems of inflation and growth require more powers to be surrendered to the very bodies that have caused much of the bad outcomes so far. Why take more of the same medicine when it has proved to be harmful so far?

Over my time as an MP to date the record of the Bank of England has been poor for much of that period. The Bank along with the Treasury, the CBI and the Labour party nagged the Conservative government of the 1980s into the European Exchange Rate Mechanism. All the time I was Margaret Thatcher's economic adviser we stayed out of this system, which was obviously going to be destabilising and damaging as I set out in a booklet before the event. When they had their way it gave us first a rapid inflation as the Bank created money to try to keep the exchange rate down to the limits of the scheme, and then caused a deep recession when they had to arrest the inflation with an intense money squeeze to try to save the pound. That wrote

off the period 1988- 94 and ended the Conservative government.

In the period 2005-8 the Bank allowed a massive expansion of credit as the Treasury went for an increase of spending and borrowing at the same time. The Conservative Opposition warned the government that this was dangerous and inflationary. So it proved. Then the Bank did the opposite and squeezed money and credit too hard, threatening the solvency of the banks. I warned against such an extreme lurch, but they were determined. Only when some of the largest banks in the land were teetering on the edge of collapse did they relent. They had to undertake a very expensive bail out of leading banks brought on by their own folly. As Gordon Brown was an important influence on the thinking behind decisions he ultimately had to take it was fitting Labour were thrown out of office for the big crash of 2008.

In the response to the covid lockdowns the Bank understandably made a large amount of money available to prop bond markets and offset some of the damaging economic consequences of widespread closures. Unfortunately the Bank continued with this policy throughout 2021, recovery year, in a way that was bound to be inflationary. So it proved. Now they are trying to overcorrect by taking large losses on bonds they paid too much for and reducing the money supply.

What a pity the experts of the Bank have not yet learned from these dreadful boom/bust swings that creating too much money or allowing too much credit is inflationary, and allowing too little brings on a recession. This is a clear case where expertise needs to be challenged, and experts with better forecasting records should be listened to more.