



**A vision for Britain**

**The  
Clean Brexit  
Movement  
Manifesto**

## CLEAN BREXIT MOVEMENT

### RESHAPING A NATION

We have lost the optimism that our children's futures can be brighter than our own. Brexit offers the opportunity to make a clean break with the European Union and set about rebuilding the engines of social mobility to drive prosperity and ensure that our children have the opportunity to build a better future for themselves. Yet we can only achieve this if we adopt the right policies.

On the 24th of June 2016, we awoke to an election result almost no-one had anticipated. The United Kingdom had voted to leave the European Union. Under the stress and strain of the refugee migrant crisis on Europe's southern borders and buffeted by the winds of globalisation, the people of Britain voted to leave the political union which many had credited with maintaining peace & prosperity across Europe. Overnight the political map had been completely redrawn.

For many across the country, particularly the millennial generation, this was not just an act of economic suicide, but an abandonment of the fundamental liberal, open values that we hold so dear. European workers across the country awoke, not just angry about the result, but fearful of the consequences for their everyday lives, would they be allowed to stay in this great country that they now call home? Car manufacturers across the North East began to realize that their whole supply chain across Europe could be broken by our withdrawal from the Customs Union.

However, for the majority of the country this was the day that the sun rose on a newly independent Britain. This was the opportunity to take back control of our borders, our laws and our money. As a £10bn net contributor to the EU, we would have this great Brexit dividend which could be invested in the NHS, schools or other austerity hit public services. Libertarian Globalists saw this as the chance to go out and rebuild our Commonwealth trade links and connect with the rest of the world. As Europe fades into economic insignificance it becomes vital for the UK to connect to the new hubs of prosperity across the globe.

We want to reach out to the other half of the country, who didn't vote to leave, to offer everybody a bold vision of how we can all attain a fairer, greener, more prosperous future outside of the EU. However, that this can only be achieved if we make a clean break with the EU and form a new mutually beneficial partnership. We hope to show, how with the right policies, prosperity can stretch from Lands End to John O'Groats and not be so concentrated in our great capital of London. How Brexit does not mean closing ourselves to Europe, but opening ourselves to the world. We will continue to have a deep and strong connection with the nation states of Europe and continue to work together to hold together the world order.

Yet in order, to build this future, we must understand the true, deep shortcomings of the European Union as it currently stands. How it is a fundamentally undemocratic institution beholden to lobbyists, which is driven by the core mission of forming a United States of Europe, regardless of the will of the people. How it has ignored Referenda time and time again, and how fundamentally the Eurocratic elite believe they can bully the UK and all other nations into line. We, the people, must realise the mindset of the Eurocracy, if we are to have any hope of negotiating the deal we and European citizens deserve.

Together we can build a greater Britain, one where our children will have far greater opportunities than us. Within we lay out a roadmap of how to leave the EU and how to build the Britain our children deserve to live in!

## CONTENTS

1. Ten Point Plan	3
2. The Deal	4
3. The Environment	8
4. Tax Reform	10
5. The Age of Innovation	12
6. Building the Infrastructure of the Future	14
7. The Social Mobility Revolution	15
8. The NHS	17
9. Immigration & Integration	18
10. Breaking the Construction Cartel	20
11. Policy Summaries	23

## TEN POINT PLAN

12. Publish a no-deal Singapore-West style plan, where we threaten to undercut EU countries with corporation tax cuts, air passenger duty cuts and export subsidisation to ensure that British prosperity is protected, while industries shift from EU nations to the UK.
13. Introduce a Carbon Added Tax on all carbon consumption to raise taxes on polluting firms globally and to protect UK industry from environmental undercutting by foreign competitors.
14. Introduce the Border Adjustment Tax to stop tax evasion by multinationals and to relieve the UK export sector of taxes.
15. Subsidise PhD's across the country and invest in university industrial centres to drive productivity and scientific progress across the UK.
16. Invest in road widening upgrades across the country, not just in the prosperous south east, to prepare our transport infrastructure for driverless cars, while investing in cycle paths, to encourage healthier lifestyles outside of our dominant cities.
17. Create an international exchange year where British students at 16 or 18 spend a year immersed in a foreign language or learning programming skills. To ensure that the British population is the most prepared in the world for the global economy of the future. Foreign and programming language competency are core to enabling our children shape their own future.
18. Integrate our National Health Service and Social Care into a new National Health and Social Care Service with care commissioning becoming the responsibility of clinical commissioning groups, so that there is no longer a financial incentive to keep patients in hospital too long instead of moving them into the care service they deserve.
19. Replace our bureaucratic system where the government decides if a company needs a skilled migrant or not. To one where companies pay £5,000 a visa per year for every migrant they sponsor. Removing the incentive for companies importing low wage labour, driving up wages and boosting tax revenues by £10.2bn a year.
20. Liberalise the planning system, so that planning permits are sold rather than given away, raising £53bn a year from developers to finance tax cuts for us all. At the same time increasing the number of new homes being built to meet our growing population needs.
21. Abolish agricultural subsidies and remove EU protectionist trade barriers on foodstuffs, technologies and all other goods driving prices down and economic growth up across the UK.

## THE DEAL

### PUBLISH THE NO DEAL PLAN

We must publish a no deal plan which is both credible and damaging enough for the EU, that the EU realises it must co-operate. Below we outline, how to get the best deal for Britain!

Today 61% of our trade is either with the EU or with a country who the EU has trade agreements with. To fall out of the EU with no trade agreement would be damaging for the economy, wages and jobs. Falling back onto a WTO agreement with all our trading partners would hamper auto production, pharmaceuticals and high-tech manufacturing in this country. For services, the consequences would be far less severe, as there is no true single market in services in the European Union. Nonetheless we need a credible plan in the event of failure in these negotiations. We must have a “no deal plan”.

Many people know the old adage that if you fail to plan, you plan to fail. In the case of negotiations, if you plan for failure, you massively boost your chance of success.

So, what would a credible “no deal plan” look like?

Well the no deal plan must satisfy 2 clear criteria:

1. It must be economically beneficial for the UK, or at least good enough that it would be an acceptable outcome.
2. It must be significantly damaging to the EU, so that they see the true cost of refusing to negotiate in good faith.

Welcome to the concept of the Singapore West model. The EU is terrified by the prospect of a tax haven on or near their near border, particularly with footloose tech companies able to locate anywhere largely unaffected by trade barriers and other protectionist measures.

Rolling back regulatory red tape, abolishing air passenger duty & cutting corporation tax to 5% for all companies domiciled in the UK would lead to mass offshoring of professional services, financial services and technology firms. Introducing a new streamlined process for skilled migrant hires would remove any fears about access to talent in a newly independent Britain. This sort of model would cause a collapse in investment levels across the remainder of EU and redirect investment into the UK's booming service and hi-tech sectors. Overall, this would appear as a credible no deal plan for the UK to present in negotiations, if necessary.

Having established a credible back stop plan, we should now look to what we want to change post Brexit:

1. Control of our borders
2. Control of our laws (social, economic, environmental)
3. Ability to sign free trade deals with other nations
4. Pay less into the EU

And what we hope to keep post Brexit:

1. Full access to the single market
2. Customs free access to EU market
3. Pan-European study opportunities
4. Participation in Pan-European Research Programs
5. Visa free tourist access
6. British Citizens rights in Europe

Now of course it would be lovely to think that we could just achieve all of the above without compromise, however, we can't just have our cake and eat it. But we can get pretty close, if we begin to think what the EU wants:

1. Minimal disruption to trade
2. Ability to sell this deal to their voters as worse than EU membership
3. No change to the 4 fundamental freedoms of the single market
4. European Citizens rights in the UK
5. Net financial contributions from the UK

Initially these objectives may seem completely incompatible with the goals of the British negotiators. After all, if we take back control of our borders and kept access to the single market, surely we would be violating the 4 fundamental freedoms of the single market?

Actually, no.

We cannot stay in the single market in order to satisfy the "red lines" of both sides, however there is nothing whatsoever preventing some form of comprehensive market access agreement. Just for a recap, the following bullets explain the differences between the European Union Customs Union, the European Economic Area and the European Free Trade Association.

EUCU (European Union Customs Union):

1. No taxes on goods traded across borders within the EUCU
2. Standardised tax on goods sold into the EUCU from outside

EEA (European Economic Area, aka the "Single Market"):

1. Freedom of movement of goods
2. Freedom of movement of services (although only some services)
3. Freedom of movement of labour
4. Freedom of movement of capital
5. EEA wide identical regulations (environment, goods, services, labour & capital)
6. Gold plating/extra regulation allowed in countries (environment, services & labour)

EFTA (European Free Trade Association):

1. Tax free trade of EFTA countries goods across borders within EFTA
2. If outside of EUCU, need to prove origin of goods to prevent countries evading the Common External Tariff

## **The negotiation**

Negotiations are always iterative. So, the structure of the negotiation affects the shape of the final deal and therefore whoever sets the structure of the negotiations will gain the

upper hand. The EU did this by announcing that no negotiation on the future trade deal was possible until our outstanding financial obligations or "Brexit Bill" is agreed and the rights of EU citizens in Britain is accepted. With the "Brexit Bill" and rights of EU citizens provisionally agreed, it is vital that we strengthen our hand to temper the excessive demands of the EU.

### **Strengthening our hand**

The reality is that the EU represents an economic block 5 times larger than the UK individually. The damage of a collapse in trade would be more severe for the UK than for the EU. Therefore, it is vital alongside the "Singapore West" model detailed above, that the UK prepares the mother of all stimulus efforts to let the UK economy ride over the uncertainty. Fortunately, the Treasury has already prepared the ground for this by pushing back the deadline for a balanced budget to 2022. So, with so much uncertainty over tariffs, regulation and market access, how on Earth can the UK government provide companies certainty?

Through 3 simple policies:

1. Guarantee to pay all EUCU tariffs for UK exporters until 2022 if we are forced into trading on WTO rules
2. Match all EU research funding for UK projects unconditionally until 2025
3. Announce a new regional infrastructure fund equal to the current EU regional aid budget available until 2025

This simple set of policies would cost the treasury at most £7.6bn annually for 6 years. However, the great thing about these policies is that they will, likely, never have to be implemented and combined with the threat of a "Singapore West" plan, they would push the EU back to the negotiating table.

Vitally we would publish these plans to the British people. By publicly declaring the plan for a "no deal" Brexit, the threat would become credible. In response to the predicted outpouring of criticism from European leaders and threats of UK financial services being banned from operating anywhere in the EEA. We would simply respond that "We have no wish to implement these plans and hope to work with the EU constructively to find a plan which suits both sides, but it would be both irresponsible and foolish to not plan for such an outcome. Furthermore, we only make this public announcement in response to the EU's request for openness, this is no threat merely our openness."

Exploiting the strategy described above, we can achieve a deal outside of both the Customs Union and the single market, but with extensive market access and no continuing payments to EU institutions.

### **What about Northern Ireland and Gibraltar?**

Northern Ireland and Gibraltar do present unique problems in regard to the final settlement that we will come to with the EU. Unfortunately, these two regions are far more tied into the economic fabric of the European Economic Area and are far more dependent on other European nations for their economic livelihoods. However, the solution for each will need to be different due to the reality that the European Union has stated that the final deal will not apply to Gibraltar, unless Spain acquiesces. Which, in light of the police state crackdown in Cataluña, seems increasingly unlikely. Nonetheless, I will first confront the issue of Northern Ireland and the "invisible border" with the Republic of Ireland.

Since the Good Friday agreement of 1998, we have had almost 20 years of peace in Northern Ireland. No civilised person wants to go back to the dark days of the troubles and Remainers are completely fair to raise objection to a "Clean Brexit" over concerns for the peace of Northern Ireland. It would be abhorrent to me if my vote for independence from Europe led to the explosion of instability in Northern Ireland. However, how do we keep an invisible border in Northern Ireland, unless we remain within the Customs Union? Most people think there are only 2 options to achieve this, either we sign a trade deal with the EU allowing for free movement of goods across borders or Northern Ireland has to stay within the Customs Union with an internal tariff border with the rest of the UK. However, actually we have a 3<sup>rd</sup> option, which is a streamlined trade border akin to Canada/USA without a control of people movement. Ireland is not part of Schengen, as such maintaining the common travel area should indeed be possible as it is today.

The reality is that the Ireland border issue cannot be resolved until we have some idea about the ending trade deal. Anything else suggested by the EU is absolute rubbish. The sole reason the EU chose to frontload this at the beginning of the negotiation is to try and force the UK to stay in the single market and customs union in all but name. The negotiators rather cunningly have tried to trap the Brexit negotiating team into a position where any deal which doesn't threaten the peace in Northern Ireland, requires the UK to stay in the single market. Credit to the government on this one, the UK wisely refused to come to a "hard" deal on Northern Ireland before we have got on to trade talks and the EU accepted a "soft" indication of intent. If the EU insists again on an agreement about the border prior to conclusion of trade talks, we need to be ready to walk away from the negotiations and start piling the pressure on the EU. Unfortunately, sometimes a show of strength is the only way to make the other side understand we are being serious.

The case of Gibraltar is possibly a little simpler. Gibraltar overwhelmingly voted to stay in the EU with 96% of voters voting to Remain and in addition we need Spain's approval for the eventual deal for the UK to apply to Gibraltar. In light of these two dominant factors and how integrated Gibraltar is within the European Economic Area, we should look for a solution with Spain where Gibraltar remains part of the Single Market and Customs Union. Gibraltar, unlike the rest of the UK, is too dependent on trade with Spain to thrive outside of Europe. However, Gibraltar is a unique case in this regard. Pragmatism is the British way.

### **The Final Deal?**

Now these negotiating steps laid out above should help the UK government take steps towards achieving a better deal for Britain. Yet nothing is ever guaranteed. The eventual deal will probably end up being settled only a month or so before the UK "crashes out" of Europe, as brinkmanship dominates these political negotiations. This will unfortunately lead to some slowing of the UK economy, as businesses put off investment decisions. Even with the economic stabilisers suggested above, growth will be tepid for the next year and a half as uncertainty over the deal hangs over the UK economy. However, once this uncertainty lifts, the UK will witness a rapid surge in growth as postponed investments are pushed forward, creating jobs, wage growth and boosting tax revenues. Over the next few years, we are in for an economic ride, but we could easily end up with a fantastic final deal.

## THE ENVIRONMENT

### CARBON ADDED TAX

Taxing carbon consumption will decarbonise the economy, while protecting British manufacturing.

### REFOREST BRITAIN

Farmer's should be our guardians of nature. Paying farmers to reforest lands will begin to undo some of the damage of the past centuries.

### PARK EXPANSION

Derelict land can be reclaimed within cities to transform all our cities into garden cities.

The European Union has been widely credited for its environmental forward thinking and its commitment to the environment and combating global warming. Under a tough European regulatory advance, manufacturing across Europe has become greener, as highly polluting industries and competitors were shut down by strict emission standards and other green legislation. They have succeeded in bringing down emissions across the UK to below 76% of Kyoto levels, while economic growth has continued to expand. Cars have grown more efficient and energy wasting appliances & lightbulbs have been scrapped. Overall the EU's track record on reducing emissions production across the Eurozone has been largely successful. Nonetheless, evidence-based research demonstrates that the EU's environmental policy has not just disrupted economic growth, but more importantly has done nothing to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions and may have led to the world emitting more carbon dioxide.

Now how on earth could we make such a wild claim? How could environmental emissions standards for EU industry actually harm the environment and the world we live in? Well those polluting factories that we shut down have just moved overseas to countries with little to no environmental regulation and exported even more environmentally damaging goods back to the EU. The UK alone imports goods with a carbon footprint of 391 million tonnes of carbon dioxide, 47% of our whole carbon footprint. The big lie in all the propaganda pushed by the EU is that what matters is pushing down the level of emissions produced in the EU. Whereas in reality what matters is the amount of emissions generated by the stuff we can consume and use. It doesn't matter, for the environment from a planetary perspective, if the steel we use is produced in a factory in Port Talbot or Hebei China, it only matters how many emissions are generated in the steel we use. If you look at our carbon consumption, i.e. carbon emissions generated making the stuff we consume in the UK, we find that carbon emissions are unchanged since Kyoto. A complete and utter betrayal of the spirit of the Kyoto protocol.

So how do we propose to combat climate change, protect the environment, while supporting British industry?

1. The introduction of a Carbon Added Tax (CAT), which taxes each tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> consumed within the UK. By levying on consumption of carbon rather than production emissions, we tax UK and foreign manufacturers equally, removing any environmental incentive for UK manufacturers to offshore jobs. This tax in fact would make UK manufacturing more competitive overnight, as UK manufacturing is less polluting than our developing world competitors. At the same time by increasing the price of carbon intensive goods, this would give an

incentive for consumers to decarbonise their consumption, while raising £44bn a year in tax revenues.

2. Investing in farming subsidies for reforesting land, will transform farmers roles into part farmer and part guardian of nature.
3. There will be a large share of derelict land in cities and towns freed up by the planning reforms that we propose in our section on anti-bureaucratic planning reforms. As such, we propose that the government should invest £1.8bn a year reclaiming these derelict areas as parks and nature reserves.

## TAX REFORM

### BORDER ADJUSTMENT TAX

Today our tax base encourages companies to move overseas to avoid taxes. The BAT will ensure that offshore firms pay their fair rate of tax.

### SCRAP STAMP DUTY

Farmer's should be our guardians of nature. Paying farmers to reforest lands will begin to undo some of the damage of the past centuries.

### SCRAP INTEREST TAX DEDUCTION

Corporate interest tax deduction allows companies to avoid the tax owed by offshoring profits.

Today some companies do not pay their fair share of tax, depriving our public services of much needed money and forcing up taxes on the rest of us. Multinational companies manage to exploit the system using: the manipulation of transfer prices, offshore intellectual property sale and leaseback and finally offshore interest loan manipulation. These actions, do not just reduce their taxes, they also make companies take on excessive debt, offshore jobs and asset strip their British operations. However, it is possible to remove the incentive for this economic vandalism through a few elegant changes.

A brilliant Oxford based economist, Michael Devereux, came up with an elegantly simple replacement to the current corporation tax system to achieve just this. The Destination-Based Cash Flow Tax (DBCFT), otherwise known as the Border Adjustment Tax. Instead of taxing companies on the basis of where their production resources were, companies would be taxed based on where the revenues were earned. The tax collected on profits earned by German Audi sales in the UK, would be collected in the UK not in Germany. Under such a system any imports into the UK could not be expensed for corporation tax purposes, while exports by UK companies would not count towards revenue. Effectively we would start taxing importers and stop taxing exporters. In addition, interest on debt would no longer be tax deductible for corporation tax purposes. In one fell swoop, transfer pricing manipulation, debt fiddles and dodgy lease arrangements would be pointless and have no effect on corporate tax revenues! That is the magic of leaving our source based taxation to a destination based system.

Actually, the advantages don't just end there. The DBCFT may be the best option for making UK manufacturing competitive again. By switching the burden of corporation tax from UK exporters to imports from foreign firms, we make it cheaper to manufacture and export from the UK. Companies looking where to locate their new manufacturing plants in Europe will trade off between the UK and other European bases and see that the UK offers them 0% taxation on their exports. As the UK is a country with a net trade deficit, such a change would have the added benefit of boosting tax revenues, by collecting more in taxation on foreign imports than would be lost on stopping taxes on UK exporters. In fact, this simple change while holding the tax rate at 19% would raise around £7.2bn of additional revenues, ignoring the increased economic growth from the increased competitiveness of UK exporters. These revenue gains could be even more dramatic if we removed the tax deductibility of interest for corporate profits. Removing debt interest deductions, could overnight eliminate the ability for companies to evade tax by loading UK firms with debt, owned by an offshore subsidiary, such as Google Cayman. Companies have genuine reasons for taking on debt, to finance new investments in plants &

machinery and to finance their everyday business, but too often companies take on debt just to lower their tax bill. And tax avoidance is never the right reason for a business decision. Removing this would not only remove the incentive for firms to overleverage and put their workers at risk, but also bring in much needed tax revenue to the government in these times of austerity. In fact, scrapping the corporate interest deduction would raise £15.2bn of additional revenue and lose £5.1bn other tax receipts from the growth deduction.

There is little doubt that such a radical change would struggle to gain adherents in the vested interests of existing national or EU tax authorities, but the noise for change is growing and political pressure may demand action is taken to ensure that corporations pay their fair share of tax!

These tax raising reforms, alongside the extra revenues from planning reforms, immigration reforms and the Carbon Added Tax would enable us to fund much needed tax cuts, such as:

1. Scrapping Stamp Duty Land Tax, which is estimated by the Adam Smith Institute to be 8 times as damaging to economic activity as VAT, causing £10bn of economic damage, on top of the £12bn that it takes away from taxpayers every year.
2. Scrap Stamp Duty Reserve Tax, the next most economically damaging tax. Lowering the cost of capital for British firms and entrepreneurs.
3. Reduce the limit for VAT registration to £26,000, raising £2bn for additional tax cuts/public spending increases.
4. Introduce a flat rate of income tax at 20%, transforming the UK into the most attractive place to work in Europe, at a cost of £32.7bn.
5. Raise the National Insurance tax free threshold to £12,500, to put money back into the pockets of low and middle earners. A tax cut for working Britain, at a cost of £18.7bn

These policies are designed with 2 simple goals: to restore Britain's economic competitiveness and to put money back in the pockets of ordinary working Brits.

## THE AGE OF INNOVATION

### UNIVERSITY INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

In order to be the leading innovators of tomorrow, we must build a University Industrial Complex around our world leading research universities.

Some of the greatest advancements in technology we have made as a human species have been down to the military industrial complex. Without high levels of western military spending, we would never have created GPS, the jet engine or the internet. However, since the decline in military equipment spending over the last few decades, it has fallen to the private sector to pick up the slack and propel research and development forwards. Sadly though, despite the vibrancy and creativity of the private sector in the UK, we have not been able to propel ourselves forward as a research and development superpower. While the military industrial complex in Israel, has continued to produce ground breaking technologies and built an incredible entrepreneurial scene. Nonetheless we believe the age of military industrial complex driven growth is coming to an end and we are heading slowly into an increasingly demilitarised world, for which we should be very grateful. In this new era, it is vital that we develop a new growth pole to propel our technological advances forward and we propose that this growth pole shall be the university-industrial complex.

The UK has some of the best universities in the world, yet outside of Imperial College London and a couple of other world leading institutions, we lack the focused technical universities to contend with MIT, Caltech and the Indian Institutes of Technology. We need research universities which cater for the needs of the industries of tomorrow, building vast research centres where we begin to develop the technologies which will transform the world we live in. However, most importantly this cannot be the government picking winners and distorting the economic landscape with their own populist preferences.

As such we suggest the new age should be built on university industrial partnerships, where large firms and universities co launch specialised research cells within universities. Already many firms sponsor PhD students to embark on research which will be useful for the private firms, however, the government does little to nothing to support the financing of this research. Instead we should build a model of co-financing research PhDs across the country, where the government pays 50% of the cost of every PhD support program. Overnight this could double the number of PhD students producing research of genuine economic need and attract the brightest and best academics from all over the world. This simple reform could do wonders at propelling investment into ground breaking research and give British firms a leg up in their race for technological supremacy.

However, expanding the PhD research network is only the first step in crafting a new high-tech Britain. The second and much trickier stage is ensuring that these highly educated and specialised researchers deploy their skills in UK R&D rather than disappearing off overseas. The first step is to guarantee every PhD educated individual who has passed through the co-financing program the right to work in the UK for 2 years and secondly to require all PhDs who emigrate straight after graduation to pay back the cost of the PhD to the UK government over 2 years. These 2 simple measures should ensure that the UK trained talent does not leave straight after completing their doctorates.

Next, we need to deepen the research presence of the science parks dotted across the country. These already established research centres built around university cities have incubated some of the most valuable companies created in the UK in the last couple of decades, from Autonomy to ARM. With a new surge of research talent, there initially may be insufficient research projects that corporates will be able and willing to finance to employ all this new research talent. The government could step in at this point by financing "moonshot" research projects for advances which will have massive social benefits, but limited private benefit. This could include pumping money into financing Educational Artificial Intelligence to revolutionise our primary education system, where the brightest and best look into how to implement AI techniques in educational applications to deliver low cost learning for children across the world. The government could also seek to finance research projects into government service delivery, to test alternative methods of public transit or police monitoring. These research projects need not be expensive, and gradually the UK government can pull back its financing role, as Corporates and venture capitalists fill the breach and inject capital into the research industry.

This final wave of private sector driven innovation will only flourish if our financial services industry starts delivering capital to UK high growth companies. We already have the largest venture capital industry in Europe to build on, yet our venture capital sector is a mere minnow in comparison to the structure built up in Silicon Valley. Although it is true that as a country we are far more dependent on growth in London for our prosperity than we should be, the venture capital boom will need to start in London with investors pouring capital into the Golden Triangle between Oxford, Cambridge and London. This area has the highest density of skilled workers of anywhere in the world, as well as access to the world's leading financial centre. In fact, the Golden Triangle lacks only one key thing. An entrepreneurial mindset. However fantastic Oxbridge may be at producing the brightest and most capable workers, it fails to produce entrepreneurs & risk takers. The same issue exists in a lesser form across almost all British universities, in comparison to the entrepreneurial focus of the US university system. Fortunately, there are a couple of lessons we can steal from the Americans to foster this entrepreneurial ecosystem, and it needn't be expensive.

Universities in the US are the incubation engines of entrepreneurship, both financing and nourishing "want to be entrepreneurs" straight out of graduation. Encouraging students to take risks in the first few years of graduating, because if they fail they can always start into regular graduate life a couple of years late. Over in the US, entrepreneurship is not seen as the privilege of the rich, unlike in the UK where 50% of business ideas are financed from personal wealth, family and friends. Incubators could break this link between family wealth and entrepreneurship. These incubators also allow US universities to share in the success of their alumni, as the profits of successful investments are poured back into the universities. This would enable UK universities to gradually build up endowments and invest more into education without the government or students paying a penny more. Investing £680mn a year could enable each university to establish an incubator for themselves, financing start-ups for 13,500 graduating students every year. This cash injection over a 10-year period should be enough to permanently seed these incubator schemes and enable these universities to develop their own entrepreneurial ecosystems. Some will fail after government financing is withdrawn, however those successful incubator schemes, together with the PhD co-financing initiative and the "moonshot" plan, will become the foundations of a new entrepreneurial Britain.

## BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE FUTURE

### DRIVERLESS CAR READY ROADS

This mobility revolution will transform the lives of every person living across the UK, and it is essential that we upgrade our road network, so that driverless cars can reach every part of the country.

### RAIL REVOLUTION

Rail investment has been London centric for too long. It is vital that we invest in upgrading rail infrastructure across the country, for the post petrol era.

For too long in this country we have been playing catch up when it comes to infrastructure investment. We have accepted that the UK can't afford to invest in infrastructure projects for the future growing needs of our country and instead only spends enough to maintain the existing infrastructure. We are fixing potholes but failing to build the new roads to unclog our traffic plagued regions. More than this, new infrastructure spending is allocated to high growth areas, such as London and the south east on the basis of economic models which assume regional prosperity as given, not a function or result of the infrastructure and spending decisions of previous generations. This means that the limited infrastructure spending that exists is almost solely allocated to the economically successful regions of the country. This infrastructure allocation accelerates the clustering of wealth and further deepens the regional divides, which are one of the greatest challenges the United Kingdom faces. To put this into perspective, the UK government currently spends £1943 on transport infrastructure per person in London, while the North East and North West of the country only receive £220 and £680 per head respectively. This stinks of economic neglect of vast swathes of the United Kingdom and if we are to have a Brexit which works for everybody, not just London, it is vital that this regional gap is closed.

With clear holes in our infrastructure plan, it is blatantly clear that our infrastructure does need targeted significant investment to take it into the 21st century. Slow internet speeds are a drag on productivity and it is the responsibility of the UK government to correct this lack of investment by British Telecom, who have exploited their position as a natural monopoly to rip off British consumers. Water leakage rates are wasteful and leave the UK with a weakened ability to respond to crises, drought and floods. Road traffic and underinvestment in rail by Network Rail, the UK state rail monopoly, hold back the expansion of growth outside of London. Closing the infrastructure gap could be one of the key solutions to closing the prosperity gap between different parts of the UK.

We propose 4 core pillars to close this prosperity gap.

1. Preparing our road network for self-driving vehicles: By upgrading 50% of the 196,306 of C, D & U network roads into 2-4 lane roads.
2. Cycling path explosion: 50% of the roads across the country to have dedicated cycle paths and pedestrian paths protected from traffic.
3. Electrifying our roads: by installing 500,000 electric charger stations across the country.
4. Rail Upgrade: Allocate £8bn/year of additional investment outside of London to finance electrification and the construction of new lines such as the Cambridge-Oxford corridor and the Manchester-Liverpool interchange.

## THE SOCIAL MOBILITY REVOLUTION

### THE GREAT EXCHANGE

We propose every child will be granted the opportunity to spend 12 months immersed abroad in foreign languages or computer science. To ensure they can compete and thrive in the modern economy.

### DECENTRALISE EDUCATION

Parents should have power to drive their children's education. We propose distributing educational vouchers to give power to parents to drive change in education.

Brexit presents the greatest opportunity for an economic and social revolution in Britain. For all the merits of the neoliberal revolution in the 1980s and the prosperity that it brought to the UK, an increase in social mobility was not one of them. As of today, children from foster care represent 27% of the prison population, workers educated in UK private schools earn 17% more than state school educated workers within 3 years of graduating and are 4 times more likely to be a millionaire. If we are to build a truly Great Britain we must exploit the skills of our entire population, not just the social elite.

People across the country despair at the prospect that their children will grow up with fewer life chances than themselves. Children from troubled backgrounds are told that their results "are good considering your situation", while families with means pay for hundreds of extra hours every year with external tutors. Meanwhile, we grant increased benefits to the baby boomer generation at the expense of investment in education and financial support for parents. Inheritance or parental support is seen as the only option for many to get on the housing ladder, further widening the gulf of opportunity between those from wealthy backgrounds and regular households.

It does not have to be this way. The solution is not more money but a new prioritisation of resources. Education is the great leveller, it equips children with the skills which will enable them to compete in this newly globalised world. Education is a weapon of social reform, it allows us to correct for the existence of ill equipped parents, schools can be a substitute for aspects of parenting.

Over the 20th century we managed to attain 99.9% academic literacy and numeracy. Almost every adult and child can read and write and, although many are numerically weak for the needs of many of their jobs, they are capable of functioning in everyday life. This is in retrospect a fantastic and vital achievement of developed countries across the globe. However, these skills are not sufficient for the basic jobs of the future. Computer and programming literacy will soon become a prerequisite of the job market which our children will enter into. Equally we live in a far more globalised world than that of our parents and if we wish to make the most of Brexit, it is vital that our children are able to speak the languages of the world (Mandarin, Spanish, Arabic & Russian).

Schools in their traditional form are particularly poorly designed to teach both programming and languages. Immersion in both computer and natural languages has been shown to considerably outperform "spread out" classroom teaching. Put simply immersion works. Immersion, particularly in natural languages has a secondary benefit of boosting cultural understanding alongside equipping children with the linguistic skills they require. Further this is a tried and tested method both for programming and language education.

Our proposals to re-skill Britain are as follows:

1. To offer every student before sixth form at 16 or after school at 18 the opportunity to spend 6 months abroad immersed in a foreign language and an additional 6 months on an intensive computer programming course or another 6 month language immersion. Foreign languages and computational skills cannot be the preserve of the rich and such a program would help to close this skill gap, enabling all our children to compete in a globalised world. This would cost around
2. Decentralising education further is vital to allowing our schools to innovate and for educational technology to transform education. As such, we propose taking the Academisation program one step further by granting every parent school vouchers worth the same amount as Academies receive today. These schools would be allowed to charge up to the school vouchers value and parents could use any additional school vouchers on additional tutoring, music lessons or educational technology. This would inject hundreds of millions a year into the educational technology sector, enabling children to reap the benefits of the cutting edge in educational technology. This would not cost a penny more than the current system.

## THE NHS

### PUBLIC FUNDING

The Private Finance Initiative has failed our NHS and has only enabled governments to hide their borrowing.

### UNLIMITED DEMAND

Demand is unlimited for healthcare, the sooner we accept that the sooner we realise we must make compromises.

Our National Health Service faces some of the greatest challenges of all our public services and sadly this will always be the case. This is because of the fundamental law of unlimited health demands. People will die of something one day, whether it is a heart attack, cancer or a car crash. Every time we improve the quality of healthcare and save a patient's life, the saved patient will end up dying of another disease. This means we will never have enough doctors or hospitals or money to cure every disease and treat every patient. The reality is to raise more money for the NHS, we either need to cut spending on education, pensions or raise taxes. No other part of the government budget is large enough to produce the savings needed. Nonetheless, spending levels remain insufficient to maintain the health service as it is today. Buffeted by high price inflation in pharmaceuticals and an aging population, health demands will continue to grow over the next decade faster than. As such, we have made available £8bn of additional funds for the NHS and social care to relieve some of the pressure felt by social care and our National Health Service.

However, money alone cannot be the answer, integrating with social services is vital to enable a continuity of care that the elderly in this country deserve. As such, we propose shifting the responsibility of social care from the local councils, as it is today, under the clinical commissioning group budgets.

As a short note, our migration reforms detailed on the other page, will ensure that never again we will face a shortage of nurses or doctors, because of government bureaucracy.

Beyond that, it is vital we look to the future and embrace technologies which may save patients lives and revolutionise the way we deliver care. We should deepen our strategic co-operation with advanced technology firms, such as the partnership with Google Deep Mind, to deliver more effective medical diagnostics. Opening access to the NHS to these private technology experts, will enable the UK to be the world leader in medical technology, and ensure that our ill and infirm have access to the latest advances earlier than almost anywhere in the world!

Overall our health and social care plan is built into 3 core measures:

1. Integrate NHS and social care into one NHSCS (National Health and Social Care Service).
2. Spending £8bn a year more, to relieve the NHSCS of the growing pressures of an aging population and medical inflation.
3. Embrace artificial intelligence and medical technology experts within our healthcare service.

## IMMIGRATION & INTEGRATION

### £5,000 WORKER VISAS

Allow any employer to sponsor the workers they need for £5,000 a year in visa fees to ensure that every migrant pays their way.

### ENTREPRENEURSHIP VISAS

Release £10,000 a year entrepreneurship visas granting migrants the freedom to work, live and start up their own companies in the UK.

### FREE ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

All migrants will receive 80 hours of English language classes for free to ensure they can integrate properly into British society.

After the referendum on the 23rd of June, Brexit voting Brits were labelled and castigated as uneducated and misguided. We were blanket stereotyped with many of the above criticisms and were clearly too stupid in the eyes of the "highly educated" elite to make a decision. Should we think that our Remain voting friends were stupid? Unpatriotic? Un-caring? No, of course not. They had genuine fears that this country was about to head down a terrible path.

These fears of xenophobia and anti-immigrant ethno-nationalism should not be dismissed out of hand. There was a small, but significant, contingent of Brexit supporters who wanted a whiter Britain. It would be a travesty if these ethno-nationalists hijacked Brexit, to be some perverse Neo-Nazi dream. Our grandparents did not fight to let our country be conquered by this ugly ideology, in fact our country was built on waves of migrants moving for better economic opportunity or fleeing persecution. Whether the Huguenots in the 1680s fleeing religious persecution or the Lascars (Indian scholars) migrating to the UK in the 17th and 18th century, every migrant group has shaped this country to make it what it is today. Including my own ancestors, the Huguenots, fleeing persecution in France. Yet for decades, the immigration system of this countries has been warped and distorted, shutting the door on skilled migrants while having no control on selection for 500mn potential migrants. This has to change. On June 23rd we voted to take back control of our borders from EU bureaucrats and to make decisions here in Westminster about how we select the people who get to reside in our great nation.

Yet, we did not vote to take back powers from EU bureaucrats just to let Whitehall bureaucrats enforce the same rules in the same bureaucratic manner. If we truly want to satisfy the will of the people we must build a migration system which is transparent, non-bureaucratic and works for the interests of the British people. Currently to hire a high skilled expert in artificial intelligence on say £100,000, companies need to prove to the government that this type of skilled worker doesn't exist in the UK or the EU. How on earth does a bureaucrat in the home office know whether that skill exists in the UK or not? They don't! Instead of strangling these companies in red tape, why don't we make an immigration system that works with companies and market signals.

Imagine for a moment that we replaced the current system of bureaucratic visas with a market based immigration system. The biggest challenge with immigration is the burden which some migrants put on public services and the wages of the low skilled. What if we designed a system which ensured that every immigrant paid their way, not just the most skilled? What if we designed a system where migrant labour was no longer able to

suppress the wages of low skilled workers who are struggling to make ends meet? What if we could do all this while ensuring that every company who needed a worker would be able to hire that worker without having to go to a bureaucrat in Whitehall that they needed that worker?

We propose a simple combination of policies to create a system which opens our doors to skilled migrants and ensures that all our migrant communities are integrated into British society:

1. We propose replacing the migration visa system with a simple annual visa fee system, where employers can pay £5,000 a year for each worker & dependent they wish to sponsor, ensuring that every migrant is a net contributor to society. Raising £10.2bn for schools and hospitals, while removing the incentive from employers to import low-skilled workers.
2. In addition, the migration system must enable entrepreneurs to bring their ideas and investment to this country. As such, we propose launching entrepreneurial visas for £10,000 a year which enable entrepreneurs and investors to live, work and start up companies in the UK, as if they were a British citizen. Freeing entrepreneurs from regulatory constraints and using this fee will both raise £3.0bn and bring the world's best entrepreneurs to our doorstep.
3. Launch an integration fund financing free English classes for all new migrants to enable them to integrate more easily. Breaking down language barriers is the first step to enabling cultural integration.

## BREAKING THE CONSTRUCTION CARTEL

### TRADABLE PLANNING PERMITS

Instead of giving away permits for construction, giving away tens of billions of pounds a year in free building rights, we should sell these permits to fund tax cuts, support public services and pay down government debt

Since the 1980's there has been a surge in economic productivity across manufacturing and services alike, following the liberalisation of product and services markets. In stark contrast, productivity in both construction and agriculture has been far weaker over the last three decades, held back by excessive regulation and protectionism respectively. Excessive planning restrictions have led to a chronic shortage of housing in the UK, pushing up rents and house prices relentlessly. As discussed in the prior chapter, generous subsidies have distracted farmers from improving agricultural productivity, and have instead diverted their focus onto exploiting Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) subsidies, which makes up 38% of UK farm income. We must relax excessive planning regulations to allow the construction industry to finally blossom and to wean the farming industry off of its subsidy addiction.

Subsidy reform is conceptually simple, however without a well-planned policy program for the transitional pain, this will be impossible to achieve without causing excessive hardship to the farming community. Correspondingly, deregulation of planning permission needs to be carefully designed so that we do not ruin the “Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty” and vital wildlife reserves, which preserve the special natural diversity we have in this country. These two policy objectives may initially seem incompatible, yet farmers have one simple asset, which could help solve this dual problem: farmland.

69% of the UK is farmland — wide open spaces dedicated to the growing of crops and rearing of livestock for the UK and global market. It is dominated by monoculture and has severely limited biodiversity. So what if we allowed developers to build on this monoculture “greenbelt” land and allow farmers to cover the cost of the subsidy cuts with profits from small land sales to developers? If just 1% of UK land was converted from agricultural to residential land, we could build 12.1mn new homes (at the average UK density of 48 homes per hectare), the relentless increase in rents and house prices could be halted, and we could begin to build the houses people actually want to live in.

Let us empower farmers to build these houses. We can allocate permits to farmers to convert a small share of their agricultural land into residential land, compensating them for their subsidy losses. These permits should be transferrable so that the farmer in the unpopulated Scottish Highlands can sell his Tradeable Planning Permits to a developer occupying land in the under-housed south east. This will ensure that houses are built where there is the highest demand for them; it will also maximise the farmers' incomes. Providing 11,000 TPPs a year to farmers should raise around £3.6bn a year — due to the strong price growth in developable land — enough to cover the loss of all CAP subsidies (whose abolition would save the UK government £3bn).

There will be protests, objections and legal challenges, as NIMBYs and environmentalists decry the destruction of “greenbelt” land, even if in reality it is dull monoculture land. They will moan about “profiteering” developers earning millions from the destruction of our natural landscape. Therefore, it is vital we compensate the “losers” from this decision through council tax cuts, investments in local infrastructure and investments in nature reserves. So we need to design a system which raises the revenue to at least cover

the cost of compensating the NIMBYs and environmentalists, while further encouraging construction in the areas people want to live.

This revenue could easily be raised by the government selling additional TPPs to developers looking to convert agricultural to residential land. Selling 160,000 TPPs a year would raise approximately £53bn a year in direct revenue and far more in increased tax take from the increased economic activity. This would be enough to finance the abolition of air passenger duty, compensate NIMBYs, raise the national insurance threshold to £12,500 (aligning it with income tax cuts), 2 more Crossrail lines, build a new 4 runway Thames Estuary airport and a new underground system for Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester by 2025.

The greatest benefit of these reforms and the construction boom that would follow may be to stabilise rents. According to the Shelter report “Building the Homes We Need”, raising housebuilding levels to around 250,000 homes a year should lead to price stabilization, putting an end to inflation busting house price and rental increases. Slower house price and rental increases near to economic hubs in Cambridge, London, Leeds or Manchester will encourage internal migration to these booming areas. Finally, there would be a boost to UK productivity, as workers shift from low wage periphery areas to these high wage centres of economic growth. This construction program could become a pillar of the new industrial strategy to boost productivity and allow the government to finally deliver housing that people want to live in.

### **Why Can't We Just Build on Brownfield?**

So, if we need more housing, why can't we just build on Brownfield land? That neglected industrial wasteland, blighting the inner parts of our cities and now just stands there derelict. The reality is we already do, yet Brownfield land suitable for housing only makes up 0.1% of UK land. Even if every inch of Brownfield land was used for additional housing, we could only build 1.5mn new homes in total. In fact, the previous Labour government's target of using 60% of brownfield land for construction “encouraged houses with large gardens” to be “replaced with denser housing or blocks of flats”, as private gardens were defined as brownfield sites. Why not be more imaginative with this brownfield land and focus on beautifying the centres of our towns? Instead of building at a high cost on brownfield sites, brownfield sites could be reclaimed for central parks and green spaces in the centre of our cities.

### **Paying Off Opponents?**

It can be concluded that farmers will be better off, housing will be more affordable, and the government could raise around £53bn from TPP sales. But these reforms could anger a vast number of homeowners on the border with the greenbelt, as well as anti-construction environmentalists. So how do we overcome this local resistance?

Earmarking £3.2bn of funds raised for council tax breaks in areas around development could grant 10 households around each new home a £2000 tax break and £1.8bn could be earmarked for reclaiming derelict land for public parks; wildlife reserves could appease the environmentalist objections. Even after these earmarks, the government would be left with around £46bn a year to spend on tax cuts, infrastructure improvements or paying government debt down.

### **Conclusion**

The UK's economic potential has been limited by ludicrously tight planning laws, which have punished the young and poor by driving up residential rents; high commercial rents have rendered manufacturing in large parts of the country uncompetitive. For too long developers have exploited the planning system, making large windfall gains every time a development is approved. It is time that those windfall gains are shared among all taxpayers, not just the few developers with lawyers expensive enough to obtain planning permission.

Imagine a policy, which boosted economic growth, improved agricultural productivity, raised tens of billions in tax revenues, pushed down rents and left the country more beautiful than when we started. Isn't that exactly what a cash starved new One Nationist government should be looking for?

## Policy Summaries

### *EU Withdrawal Policies*

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Withdraw From EU, EEA and ECU	+£14.6bn	+£10.3bn	Liberation from single market regulations and net payments
Governments pays EU manufacturing tariffs	-£5.5bn	-£5.5bn	Offsets negative GDP effect of customs union tariffs
Match EU research spending	-£1.1bn	Neutral	Maintains research plans by UK science
Match EU regional aid spending	-£1bn	Neutral	Matches all other EU cash injections into UK except CAP

So overall, the cost of guaranteeing little to no damage from a hard Brexit would be around £7.6bn a year, £7bn less than our annual EU contributions of £14.6bn a year. Importantly £5.5bn of this would never need to be spent if we were to gain a Brexit deal with tariff free access to the EU.

### *Costs of “Singapore West” No Deal*

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
5% Corporation Tax	-£35.0bn	+24.0bn	Mass corporate investment. HQ shifts from EU to UK. 1.2% GDP increase (from OECD/Irish Gov)
Abolishing Air Passenger Duty	-£3.2bn	+16.0bn	Steal air traffic from European hubs and airports.
Skilled worker visas	£0bn	Neutral	Skilled labour supply for all UK industries, offsetting negative of EU migration controls

Singapore West would be our backstop if Brexit talks failed, the remainder of the policies assume that this plan will not have to be needed, as the EU are driven back to the negotiating table by fear of damage. Maximum cost is assumed with an increase in business investment. The £38.2bn tax cut, may seem severe, yet in reality we would see a surge in income tax, VAT and other tax receipts. For all of the tax and spending changes proposed, I have ignored the GDP multiplier effect on tax revenues. This is simply because the overall proposals in this book will be fiscally neutral and as such, any tax cuts or spending increases will be offset by tax increases or spending cuts elsewhere. We should therefore be able to ignore the net demand effects for the sake of this analysis.

### ***Educational Programs***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Language/Programming immersion year	-£1.6bn	-£0.8bn	Programming and language skills for all new students
Education Vouchers	Neutral	Neutral	Edtech innovation
£250 retraining vouchers	-£1.2bn	Neutral	Reskilling of those left behind by globalisation

### ***Migration Visa System (after 6 years)***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
£5,000 working visas	+£10.2bn	+£10.2bn	Reduction in low skilled migration, increase in high skilled migration
£10,000 entrepreneur visas	+£3.0bn	+£3.0bn	Increase in number of start-ups
English language course	-£0.3bn	Neutral	Increased integration of disengaged migrant groups

### ***Green & Hi-Tech Programs***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Carbon Added Tax revenue	+£44bn	Neutral	Rejuvenation of the UK manufacturing sector Reduction in carbon emission
Elimination of hi-tech tariffs	-£0.7bn	Neutral	Access to the latest technology across the UK industrial sector
Investment expensing	Neutral	Neutral	Increase in short run investment, increased aggregate demand boost

### ***Financial Reforms***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Scrap CRD IV	Neutral	+£4.6bn	Reduce the cost of borrowing for UK firms
Scrap AIFMD	Neutral	+£1.5bn	Increase pension fund returns and savings returns

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Introduce RIFs	Neutral	+£6.0bn	Increased investment in illiquid assets and higher returns for retail investors
Replace Bank Levy with Capital Inadequacy Levy	Neutral	Neutral	Increase financial systematic security by punishing banks who have low capital levels

### ***Tax Changes***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Introduce Border Adjustment Tax	+£7.2bn	+£23.6bn	Shift of burden to foreign firms with taxes levied on foreign exporters of £70bn
Scrap Corporate Interest Deduction	+£15.2bn	Neutral	Reduced leverage in corporations, so more financial stability
Stamp Duty abolition	-£12bn	+£10bn	Reduced deposits to buy houses More mobile labour market
VAT limit change	+£2bn	Neutral	Increased SME formalisation and reduction in black market
Flat Income Tax at 20%	-£32.7bn	Neutral	Better work incentives for high skilled workers Attract higher skilled migrants
National Insurance threshold increase to £12,500	-£18.7bn	Neutral	Tax cut for all minimum wage earners across the country

### ***Innovation Programs***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Co-Sponsor PhDs	-£0.6bn	Neutral	Doubling PhD students
Moonshot programs	-£1.2bn	Neutral	Ground breaking research
University incubators	-£0.7bn	Neutral	Entrepreneurial centres

### ***Agricultural & Environmental Programs***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Reforestation subsidy	-£0.3bn	Neutral	Reforestation of marginal crop land
Derelict land conversion to parks	-£1.8bn	Neutral	Public parks for city dwellers Wildlife reserves for biodiversity

### ***Health & Social Care Programs***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
NHS budget boost	-£8bn	Neutral	Relief from pressure of medical inflation
Integration of Social Care and Health care	Neutral	Neutral	Long term efficiency gains as patients are redirected towards care in the home, instead of hospital-based care
Technology Partnerships	Neutral	Neutral	Exploiting machine learning expertise of tech firms to lower diagnostics costs and improve results

### ***Infrastructure Programs***

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Tradable Planning Permit Sales	+£53bn	Neutral	Raise lots of revenue Boost building rates
Council Tax Breaks	-£3.2bn	Neutral	Overcome resistance of NIMBYs Share prosperity of projects
New underground systems	- £11.1bn	+£5.5bn	Metro system for Leeds, Manchester and Birmingham
Thames Estuary Airport	-£4.8bn	+£2.4bn	Airport capacity for the future, not just today
2 more Crossrail lines	-£2.8bn	+£1.4bn	London underground system unblocked
Upgrade 50% C, D & U road network	- £13.0bn	+£6.5bn	Self-driving cars Congestion elimination
Cycle & pedestrian paths on roads (50%)	-£4.1bn	Neutral	Cyclists protected and have no congestion effects

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
500,000 electric charger stations	-£1.5bn	Neutral	Self-driving cars Emissions mitigation
Rail Expansion	-£8bn	+£4bn	Transit time reduction

## Overview

### *Program Totals*

Policy	Fiscal Change	GDP Effect	Benefit
Leaving the EU on good terms	+£12.5bn	+£10.3bn	EU membership fee savings Escaping single market regulation
Leaving the EU “Singapore West” Style	-£31.2bn	+£44.8bn	EU membership fee savings Aggressive deregulation
Education Programs	-£2.8bn	-£0.8bn	Social mobility gains Educational technology advance
Migration Visa System	+£12.9bn	+£13.2bn	Boosting skilled migration, while cutting unskilled migration Reducing cultural division
Green & Hi-Tech Programs	+£43.3bn	Neutral	Restoring UK manufacturing Reducing emission levels
Financial Reform	Neutral	+£12.1bn	Increased pension size Reduced financial inequality
Tax Changes	-£39.0bn	+£33.6bn	Tax cut for all minimum wage earners across the country
Innovation Programs	-£2.5bn	Neutral	R&D spending increase Company creation rate increase
Agricultural & Environmental Policy	-£2.1bn	Neutral	Restore our forests and parks
Health & Social Care Reform	-£8.0bn	Neutral	Integration of health and social care to improve outcomes and cut costs
Antibureaucratic Planning	+£4.5bn	+£19.8bn	Infrastructure to drive productivity growth for the decades to come