



PRIME MINISTER

CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE

- Can GR check again? Prime Minister ①
- You had a word with the Solicitor General about this earlier in the week. The Chief Secretary is correct (his minute is attached). Agree that the Solicitor General should proceed on the basis (per se)?
- Yes not MFA 8/11
1. My minute dated 4 October 1985 accompanied a draft reply for you to send to the President of the Prosecuting Solicitors' Society of England and Wales (PSSEW). He had expressed concern about the terms likely to be offered to staff in the Crown Prosecution Service. My minute explained the position at that date, and I refer you to it. This minute sets out the present position.
 2. I have since met the Crown Prosecution Service Trade Union Group on two occasions. They represent unqualified as well as qualified staff at present employed in prosecuting solicitors' departments. I have met the Chairman of the PSSEW on a further occasion. The DPP has had further discussions with them. I have additionally been advised by Mr David Gandy, at present Chief Prosecuting Solicitor of Manchester and Field Manager designate of the new Service.
 3. In consequence I believe I have a sufficiently reliable assessment of the terms we need to offer to attract and retain staff of the required quality (our declared object).
 4. The matters on which anxieties centred divide into two categories, which I call respectively principal and ancillary. Comments by staff representatives are in quotes.
 - i. Principal matters:
 - (a) The salary band for Crown prosecutors (the lowest grade qualified staff).

"£9,700 - £14,000 is too low. Should be £12,000 - £16,000".



- page two -

- (b) Promotion prospects: Establishment of one Senior Crown Prosecutor for every three Crown Prosecutors. "Through grading", i.e. virtually automatic promotion on length of service (like 2/Lieutenant to Lieutenant) "desired, as in Government Legal Service. More senior grades desired for higher ranks. Proposals create insufficiently attractive career structure".
- (c) Pay protection: (Transferees retain any differential between existing pay from local authority and the pay for the grade they assume in the Service). "10 years not enough, should be for life, as has been offered in reorganisation of Government Legal Service, from which transferees to new service from Metropolitan Police Solicitors Department will benefit."

ii. Ancillary matters:

These embrace such items as ~~prescribed~~ hours and overtime payments, leave entitlement, seniority, mobility requirements and provision for travel on official business (e.g. car loans).

5. I concluded that our notified proposals in each of the principal matters needed to be improved. I have negotiated with the Treasury the following improvements:

- (a) Salary band for Crown Prosecutors £10,500 - £15,000.
- (b) Establishment to be one Senior Crown Prosecutor to two Crown Prosecutors. This will also produce a few improvements in gradings for more senior posts.
- (c) Pay protection to be for 10 years, but thereafter a "mark time" arrangement will apply in place of the four year taper presently proposed. The effect will be that the differential progressively diminishes after 10 years with each increase in the pay of the relevant Civil Service grade.



- page three -

6. As regards ancillary matters, we had not previously published proposals. Almost all the Unions' requirements at present specified to me under this heading are acceptable to the Treasury. The most important matter remaining to be resolved is the provision of transport for Prosecutors. Here, it is proposed that there should be a feasibility study to identify the most appropriate arrangement.

7. It is essential to avoid creating a pay bonanza at the taxpayers' expense occasioned by the new Service's inception. Equally we must ensure that we get and keep the people we need. A package comprising the negotiated improvements in the principal matters, and our proposals as to ancillary matters, represents in my judgment the point at which each of these objectives is achieved. This view is supported by the DPP and Mr Gandy. The Unions will, however, certainly continue to complain and campaign, notably about inadequate career prospects. Pay protection for life has a presentational force disproportionate either to its likely take-up after 10 years or its cost. There is no doubt it would help considerably. Nevertheless, I recognise that it is important to the Treasury not to concede it here, and have accepted their position. There will also continue to be complaints about haste, and the non-observance of formal negotiating procedures. These, however, have been dictated by the need to start the Service on 1 April 1986 in the areas at present subject to Metropolitan Councils, and the Unions know this.

8. I therefore propose to announce these terms soon, notifying the Unions a short time ahead of publication. I shall arrange for a further briefing note to go to our colleagues in the House of Commons at the same time.

Patrick A. G. Shaw

4 November 1985

