

Secret

Caroline's 25th

You may like to see that this is agreed.

Not incl

8

(1)

M.

PRIME MINISTER

Miners' Strike Ballot

You asked for a meeting ^{next week} to take stock ^{of the situation which might arise} after the miners' strike ballot next Thursday and Friday.

Peter Gregson's MISC 57 has produced a further report on the Government's preparedness, and also on a number of decisions which remain to be taken - the advice which might be given to electricity boards on the use to be made of the new Employment Act, their use of lighting-up oil and other ancillary materials, the role of the police and servicemen, and so on.

Mr. Lawson will be forwarding this to you early next week under cover of a minute giving his comments on the situation. I suggest that this forms the paper for your meeting, and that we invite the usual small group: Mr. Whitelaw, the Chancellor, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Nott, Mr. Tebbit, Mr. Jenkin, Sir Robert Armstrong, Mr. Gregson and John Vereker. We have arranged the meeting for 0930 on Thursday.

Agree to these arrangements?

Yes
no

MLS

22 October 1982

① Mr Rickett *misses*

② Mr Ingham

Isn't X a bit high
profile? *P. Scholar*

MR INGHAM

cc Mr Scholar ✓
Mr Rickett
Mr Mount

MINERS' EARNINGS

It may be helpful for you to have this aide memoire of the point we discussed earlier this afternoon, since it is bound to come up in the Lobby again.

Scargill is claiming that the miners need a 45% pay rise to bring them up to the purchasing power they had in 1975; and he alleged yesterday some academic respectability for this, in the shape of Ruskin College (!).

This kind of claim can be substantiated only by choosing the starting date very carefully, working on basic rates only, and taking an inflated estimate of the November RPI. The use of basic rates is particularly misleading, since the productivity scheme started in 1975 and has grown rapidly as a proportion of earnings since then.

I am sure it is right to say unattributably that Scargill's claims are the signs of a desperate man, and that in fact when adjusted for the RPI, miners' earnings are already higher than they were in 1975. This could also come up in Questions, so I am sending a copy to Messrs Scholar and Rickett.

*I think it is one thing
MCS 22/10 for me to say things
unattributably - but
critical and to make for
the PM to be on the record,
However, where is amount
of a matter of fact in
direct to*

*as on level of earnings -
I think it is OK
founded it
does not
suggests fact is
panicking*

*John
28/10*

22 October 1982