

CONFIDENTIAL



NBM

Treasury Chambers, Parliament Street, SW1P 3AG

The Rt Hon Sir Patrick Mayhew QC MP
Attorney General
Law Officers' Department
Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London
WC2A 2LL

26 October 1987

*Dear Patrick,**will request
to reg'd***1987 PUBLIC EXPENDITURE SURVEY: CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE**

Nick Lyell wrote to me on 21 October in your absence.

I am grateful for your agreement to the compromise proposal on the treatment of running cost and manpower requirements which I put forward. So far as future adjustments of your running costs limit is concerned, although future years' negotiation will be subject to the general circumstances at the time, I accept that on present workloads the current manpower baseline reflects the number of staff which you would need to carry out the tasks of the department if you could recruit fully up to complement, and I accept that the objective is that running costs should match these manpower figures, subject to any efficiency squeeze which is being applied on a general basis. As agreed between our officials, your running costs limit for years 2 and 3 of the Survey remains at baseline, pending further work on management plans to deliver efficiency targets. But our officials have agreed on manpower figures for all 3 years of the Survey to reflect the underlying position, although these figures will of course be subject to review in the light of efficiency savings and other changes for future years.

On tape recording, I am prepared to agree that introduction should be phased over 3 years. This is on the basis of the present costings, which allow for the

CONFIDENTIAL

use of tape recording by prosecution and defence lawyers in respect only of indictable and either way offences. I should make clear that I should be opposed to any general use of tape recording in the prosecution of summary offences. I do not propose to reopen my PES agreement with the Lord Chancellor in the light of this, since I would expect that the 1988-89 costs to legal aid of tape recording could be contained within the margin of error of the legal aid budget, although I accept that we will need to look again at substantive figures in next year's Survey in the light of costings which are now in hand. I understand that phased introduction over 3 years would be acceptable to the Home Office.

I agree also the basis of settlement of the other parts of your bid, although I should confirm that advance disclosure also is the subject of a policy review in the course of the Autumn.

Finally, I note the points which you make about the pay of lawyers in the Civil Service. But this matter can of course best be handled separately from this year's Survey.

... I attach a table of figures including the new manpower plan, agreed between our officials, which reflects the above basis of settlement.

I am copying this letter to the Prime Minister, Sir Michael Havers and Douglas Hurd, and to Nick Lyell.

Yours Ever,
John

JOHN MAJOR

Crown Prosecution Service

£m

1988-89

1989-90

1990-91

Running costs:

workload	-	-	-
tape recording	1.0	-	-
advance disclosure	6.9	-	-
time limits	-	-	-
lenient sentences	-	-	-
recruitment realism	-3.26	-	-
reduced requirements	-6.87	-	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
sub total	-2.23	baseline	baseline

Crown prosecution costs:

workload	-	0.27	3.66
tape recording	1.4	3.1	4.3
time limits	0.18	0.19	0.21
lenient sentences	0.68	0.75	0.83
recruitment realism	7.66	-	-
reduced requirements	-3.3	-0.56	-0.58
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
sub total	6.62	3.75	8.42
capital	-1.02	-0.72	-0.85
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	3.37	3.03	7.57
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

Manpower:

1.4.88	4540
1.4.89	5180
1.4.90	5430
1.4.91	5720