Spoke Dol. PRIME MINISTER that is wrong will it Alan Newman Limited have written to you in a tone of surprise and disappointment over their problems in finding a British shipbuilder to carry out a contract to convert a 40,000 ton liner into a floating hotel. Mr. Newman finds it impossible to reconcile the negative response from British shipbuilders and other British yards with the parlous state of the shipbuilding industry. The Department of Industry have been in touch with British Shipbuilders, who justify their lack of interest on four grounds: inadequate planning by the potential client; some major items with long delivery times in relation to the overall contract period; at peak loading the contract would require about 2300 men, largely in the outfit trades where labour is still scarce; additional contract labour for the purpose creates problems of meeting delivery dates if the workforce realise that there is no follow-on work available. If you are content with this explanation, may I write on your behalf as in the attached draft from Sir Keith Joseph's office? 18 July 1980



PS /Secretary of State for Industry

## DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY ASHDOWN HOUSE 123 VICTORIA STREET LONDON SWIE 6RB

TELEPHONE DIRECT LINE 01-212 5501
SWITCHBOARD 01-212 7676

July 1980

Mike Pattison Esq Private Secretary to the Prime Minister 10 Downing Street London SW1

## Dear Mike,

Thank you for your letter of 3 July attaching a copy of a letter the Prime Minister had received from Mr Alan Newman about the company's difficulty in finding capacity in the shipbuilding industry to work with them on a liner conversion contract.

2 I attach a draft Private Secretary reply which you may care to send to Mr Newman on the Prime Minister's behalf.

Yours ever, Pete

PETER STREDDER
Private Secretary

JU



DRAFT REPLY FOR THE PS/PRIME MINISTER TO SEND TO

Alan Newman Esq

The Prime Minister has seen your letter of 2 July about the difficulties you have encountered in trying to place a contract for conversion of a liner into a floating hotel with British Shipbuilders and Harland & Wolfe. She has asked me to reply to you.

Officials at the Department of Industry and the Department of Commerce in Northern Ireland have taken up the points in your letter with the companies. British Shipbuilders have explained that although it is a major contract they felt that in some areas detailed planning by your client was not well advanced and that

- O specific major items would have had awkwardly long delivery times in relation to the required contract period. But, more particularly,
- the contract at peak loading would have called for about 2,300 men, mainly in the outfit trades. You are of course correct in thinking that British Shipbuilders and Harland and Wolff are both in urgent need of work for their men but neither of them has
- enough spare labour in the relevant trades to take on your business in the time allowed. Nor do they consider that it is a viable
- proposition to take on extra labour specifically for this contract since they would be unable to provide follow-on work and would have to get rid of the extra labour when the contract was complete. This could itself lead to difficulties in meeting contract dates when completion means the end of a job. Extensive use of sub-contract labour, even if this were possible to arrange, could create difficulties with the companies' own work forces.

Having looked into this the Prime Minister is satisfied that the companies' reasons for refusing the contract are commercially sensible. She feels, however, that the reasons for doing so may not have been fully explained to you and I am therefore sending copies of this letter and of yours to the Chairmen of British Shipbuilders and Harland and Wolff.