



Treasury Chambers, Parliament Street, SW1P 3AG

T Flesher Esq
Private Secretary
10 Downing Street
LONDON
SW1

10 October 1985

Dear Tim

CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE

I have seen David Norgrove's letter of 7 October to Tony Kuczys.

The Chief Secretary has asked me to let you have one comment on the proposed draft reply from the Prime Minister to the Prosecuting Solicitor's Society. He considers the reference in paragraph 2 to the provision of adequate resources for the maintenance of law and order unexceptionable in general terms. But he is clear that its translation into pay rates must depend on the job to be done as well as the aspirations of those concerned. The Society may seize on the law and order reference as support for any claim they choose to pursue. For this reason he suggests as a minimum that the words "to the job to be done" be substituted for "both to market rates" in the second paragraph.

The Chief Secretary has no other objection to the references to pay and grading, which are of course a Treasury responsibility although the Treasury was not consulted at official level or otherwise on the draft reply put to you. It may be worth pointing out that Treasury officials have been closely involved in preparations for the setting up of the Crown Prosecution Service since the decision was taken in October 1983. Pay and grading proposals are based on detailed studies. The Chief Secretary takes the view that we have to pay the rate for the job against the criteria of the need to recruit, motivate and retain. To do otherwise would be expensive and damaging to the civil service pay and management regime. There is some evidence that some local authority pay rates in this area may be over the odds, and the pay protection arrangements which have been offered are in fact a concession to meet this. While the Society are undoubtedly concerned that some of their members will be on pay protection, we nevertheless expect the great majority of them to transfer with their jobs; and the Government will need to take the initiative to lower the exaggerated expectations of the solicitors which are reflected in their approach to the Prime Minister.



The Chief Secretary is taking up these points separately with the Solicitor General.

Yours sincerely
Richard Broadbent

R J BROADBENT



COMPAGNIE
DE
LONDON

From the Solicitor General

9/10

W/W T/E
9/10
Seen

Dear Colleague,

CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE

1. This letter is about anxieties currently being voiced by prosecuting solicitors about terms and conditions of service in the new Crown Prosecution Service.
2. The Prosecution of Offences Act 1985 provides for an independent prosecution service. This fulfils an undertaking given by the Government during the passage of the Police and Criminal Evidence Bill. We are committed to 1st April 1986 as the introduction date for the Crown Prosecution Service in the six Metropolitan counties and to 1st October 1986 for London and the remainder of England and Wales. Its Head will be the Director of Public Prosecutions, under the superintendence of the Attorney General.
3. Staff presently employed in prosecuting solicitors' departments are intended to transfer to the Service and become civil servants. Their representatives complain of the arrangements proposed as to grading and salaries, inadequate consultations by the DPP, and inadequate information, particularly as regards matters which are ancillary to their terms and conditions of service but which are important to them when comparing posts in the new Service with their existing jobs.
4. I have arranged to meet the Crown Prosecution Service Trade Union Group and shall explain to them the need for such a tight timetable - it is designed to dovetail with the abolition of the Metropolitan counties - and to discuss with them their

anxieties. As regards the salary and gradings proposals, I have already received a delegation from the Prosecuting Solicitors' Society of England and Wales (PSSEW), and officials thereafter attended their annual conference. As regards ancillary matters, the DPP hopes to make proposals quite shortly.

5. It remains the Government's intention that the staff who will serve in the Crown Prosecution Service should receive fair and reasonable remuneration, having regard both to market rates and the need to attract and retain staff of the requisite calibre. This accords with what we have always said, in the House and outside. There is general support on the staff side for the principle of an independent prosecuting service. I shall be giving careful consideration to the things their representatives say to me about the employment package which it should provide.
6. I thought I would, in Michael Havers' absence in hospital, let you know the present position, since you will have a personal interest in the subject and may additionally need to respond to letters.

Yours,

Patrick

8 October 1985