



CF

10 DOWNING STREET

JS  
Parliament  
c. Bida  
Strauss.

THE PRIME MINISTER

3 July 1981

Dear Jonathan,

You asked me in the House on 16 June if, now that the Monopolies and Mergers Commission had reported on the proposed merger between British Rail Hovercraft and Hoverlloyd, I would use my influence to ensure that the merger was delayed no further by Government intervention. I understand that you have explained to Sally Oppenheim your particular concern that the Government's decision should be announced before new timetable arrangements came into effect on 4 July.

At the time you raised the matter, the Government had, of course, only just received the Commission's report. We have, however, taken steps to publish it as early as possible and, as you may be aware, Sally Oppenheim announced publication on Friday 26 June. She has, I understand, made arrangements for you to receive a copy of the Press Notice. As you will note, the Commission have concluded that the merger may not be expected to operate against the public interest provided Hoverspeed reviews certain undertakings currently given to the Government by British Rail Hovercraft Limited. Provided the necessary undertaking is forthcoming, the companies are therefore free to proceed with their negotiations.

Because British Rail Hovercraft Limited is a subsidiary of the British Railways Board, the merger will need the consent of the Secretary of State for Transport under the Transport Acts. For that, Norman Fowler will need to see detailed

/ proposals

Jur

proposals from the Railways Board, setting out the structure of the company and the way it is intended that it will interact commercially with the Board itself, and with others. I know that he recognises the urgency of finding a satisfactory solution for the problems that both these companies have recently been facing. I am sure, too, that he will be seeking, if at all possible, to obtain a structure that would place the new company firmly in the private sector so that it would benefit from the freedoms and stimulus that that would provide.

Yours sincerely,

MT

Jonathan Aitken, Esq., MP.



# DEPARTMENT OF TRADE

1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET  
Press Office: 01-215 5061  
Out of hours: 01-215 7877

Ref 310

## Press notice

June 26 1981

### BRITISH RAIL-HOVERCRAFT LIMITED/HOVERLLOYD LIMITED

#### MONOPOLIES AND MERGERS COMMISSION REPORT

Mrs Sally Oppenheim, Minister for Consumer Affairs, today announced publication of the Monopolies and Mergers Commission report\* on the proposed merger between British Rail Hovercraft Limited and Hoverlloyd Limited.

The Commission have concluded that the merger may be expected not to operate against the public interest provided that an undertaking on certain matters is given by the new company, Hoverspeed.

Mrs Oppenheim said that in the light of the Commission's conclusions British Rail Hovercraft Limited and Hoverlloyd Limited would be free to resume negotiations on a possible merger of their cross-channel hovercraft services.

In due course the British Rail Board would need to bring forward specific proposals for appropriate consents from the Secretary of State for Transport under the Transport Acts. However, before the Government could consider such an application it would be necessary for Hoverspeed to give an undertaking to take such action as the Secretary of State for Trade considered requisite to remedy the adverse effect of the merger specified by the Commission in their report. This adverse effect was that the existing undertaking by British Rail Hovercraft Limited, not to agree or discuss with other operators fares for car accompanied passengers or related matters, would cease to have effect when that company ceased to exist as a

\* British Rail Hovercraft Limited and Hoverlloyd Limited. A report on the Proposed Merger. HoC No 374, ISBN 0 10 237481 3. Available from HM Stationery Office, price £3.60.

separate operator, and that this would reduce the measures at present available to the Director General of Fair Trading to deal with any matters to which the undertaking by British Rail Hovercraft Limited was relevant.

The Commission had been concerned to guard against the adverse consequences of this undertaking ceasing to exist and had accordingly recommended that Hoverspeed should be required to give a similar undertaking. The Secretary of State for Trade was therefore asking the Director General to seek to negotiate suitable undertakings for this purpose.

Mrs Oppenheim said that the Commission's main conclusions were that the merger afforded the best prospect of maintaining effective competition from Hovercraft on the short-sea routes, and that the maintenance of such competition was the more important in a market which had until recently not been noticeably competitive. The Commission had been concerned that, should the situation arise that the parent companies might need to provide further finance for Hoverspeed, the means by which British Railways Board, as a public corporation, provided finance to the new company should be published and readily identifiable.

The Commission had obtained from British Railways Board a written assurance that the amounts, terms and conditions of any loans, advances, guarantees or financial support which it might make available in future to Hoverspeed would be published in a readily identifiable manner in British Railways Board's own accounts. Brostroms Rederi AB, the parent company of Hoverlloyd Limited, had acquiesced in British Railways Board's assurance.

Notes for Editors

1. The Secretary of State for Trade referred the proposed merger between British Rail Hovercraft and Hoverlloyd Limited to the Commission on March 5 1981. The Commission were required to report within three months. The reference was made under the assets criterion of the Fair Trading Act 1973. The Secretary of State received the report on June 4 1981. Sir Godfray Le Quesne QC, Chairman of the Commission, led the group of six members carrying out the investigation.
2. Under Section 88 of the Fair Trading Act, where a report from the Commission concludes that a merger operates or may be expected to operate against the public interest, the Secretary of State may request the Director General of Fair Trading to consult the relevant parties in order to obtain undertakings with a view to remedying or preventing the adverse effects specified in the report.
3. The Secretary of State may exercise the order-making powers provided by Section 73 of the Fair Trading Act 1973 only where the Commission have concluded that the merger operates, or may be expected to operate, against the public interest.
4. The consent of the Secretary of State for Transport is needed because British Rail Hovercraft Limited is a subsidiary of the British Rail Board.
5. Copies of the report are available, price £3.60, from HM Stationery Office, 49 High Holborn, London WC1V 6HB, and branches, or by post from HM Stationery Office, PO Box 569, London SE1.

REPORT OF THE PROPOSED MERGER BETWEEN BRITISH RAIL HOVERCRAFT LIMITED (BRHL) AND HOVERLLOYD LIMITED (HOVERLLOYD)

Summary

BACKGROUND

The Secretary of State for Trade referred the proposed merger between BRHL and Hoverlloyd to the MMC on 5 March 1981 and asked the Commission to report within three months. (A second reference was sent to the Commission on 6 April 1981 enabling them to encompass certain other enterprises under the control of Brostroms Rederi AB (Brostroms), the parent company of Hoverlloyd.) In deciding whether a qualifying merger would be created, the Commission were asked to consider only the assets criterion of the Fair Trading Act 1973 (the Act), as amended (that is whether the total value of the assets to be taken over exceeded £15 million), and not whether the merger would create or intensify a monopoly situation. The reference followed the announcement in November 1980 that discussions were taking place between BRHL and Hoverlloyd on the possibility of merging their cross-channel hovercraft services: these arrangements came within the scope of section 75 of the Act, wherein provision is made for reference in anticipation of a merger. The Commission sent their report to the Secretary of State on 4 June and, as the Act requires, a copy was sent to the Director General of Fair Trading.

THE PARTIES TO THE PROPOSED MERGER

2. The report is about the proposed merger between BRHL and Hoverlloyd. BRHL, which was formed in April 1966 to develop and operate hovercraft services, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the British Railways Board (BRB) and carries passengers and cars on two routes (Dover/Calais and Dover/Boulogne). It operates these services under the trade name "Seaspeed", in association with French Railways - Societe Nationale des Chemins de Fer Francais (SNCF). In the year ended 31 December 1980, BRHL had a turnover of £13.1 million and a pre-tax loss of £2.9 million. At that time, it had fixed assets of £15.1 million, current assets of £1.6 million and current liabilities of £3.9 million. The amount due to its parent, BRB, was £20.1 million, and accumulated revenue losses totalled £8.9 million. BRHL has about 475 permanent employees, and some 225 additional staff in the Summer. Hoverlloyd was registered as a UK company in 1965 under the name Cross-Channel Hover Services Ltd; its name was changed to Hoverlloyd in 1966, and it became a wholly-owned subsidiary of Brostroms in 1976. It carries passengers and cars between Ramsgate and Calais, and its operations are carried on in association with two other UK companies (International Hoverports Ltd, which operates the Pegwell Bay hoverport, and Hoverlloyd Hirings Ltd which owns one of the hovercraft used by Hoverlloyd), both of which are subsidiaries of Brostroms. In the year to 31 December 1980, Hoverlloyd had a turnover of £17.2 million and a pre-tax loss of £686,000. It had fixed assets of £14.4 million, current assets of £3.4 million and current liabilities of £5.8 million. Its capital structure includes a loan of £2 million from Brostroms, £1 million outstanding in

respect of the lease/purchase of one of its hovercraft and a bank overdraft of £2.1 million. Hoverlloyd employed an average of 623 people, with 279 others in the Summer.

#### THE COMMISSION'S INVESTIGATION

3. The investigation was carried out by a group of six members of the Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr J D Eccles, a Deputy Chairman of the Commission. Written evidence was received from the parties involved (and their parent companies), the Departments of Industry, Trade and Transport, and many other interested parties, including the Trades Union Congress and three unions. Four hearings were held. The Commission have pointed out that some of the evidence obtained in the course of their inquiry was of a confidential nature, and that their report contained only such information as they considered necessary for an understanding of their conclusions.

#### THE COMMISSION'S CONCLUSION ON THE MERGER SITUATION

4. The Commission concluded that a merger situation qualifying for investigation would be created if BRHL merged with Hoverlloyd, in that BRHL's assets exceeded £15 million.

#### THE COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUES OF PUBLIC INTEREST

5. The Commission considered the merger and possible alternatives to it. They noted that, if BRHL and Hoverlloyd were to be merged, competition between their hovercraft services would cease, but that competition between hovercraft and other suppliers of cross-Channel services would remain. The Commission thought that, if the merger did not take place, Hoverlloyd was likely to end its operations at an early stage, and that subsequently, there was the possibility of the BRHL also ceasing to exist, which would mean the disappearance of hovercraft competition by British operators as it existed in the cross-Channel market. The Commission considered the possibility that another person or persons might then purchase one or both of the present hovercraft businesses but concluded that these possibilities were slight, bearing in mind the recent financial performance of both BRHL and Hoverlloyd, the parties' poor view of their future prospects as separate organisations, and the failure of Brostroms' efforts to sell Hoverlloyd.

6. The Commission then considered the possible effects on competition of the various likely alternatives. The first of these was that the current operations of BRHL and Hoverlloyd were merged which would remove competition within the hovercraft sector itself. The Commission noted that, while the companies operated the same basic type of hovercraft and service, there were differences in some aspects of the services offered, and that it could be argued that a merger might reduce enterprise and initiative in the future conduct and development of the business. However, they saw no reason why the lessons learnt by both companies in the past should not be fully heeded; they also commented that competition from ships and aircraft would keep the new management under heavy pressure to achieve cost savings and increases in efficiency. The Commission said that the merger would have the detrimental effect of removing price competition between the two hovercraft companies, but competition between the ship ferries would continue to be the

decisive factor in determining the structure and levels of prices. The Commission noted that it was likely that there would be fewer services from Ramsgate, but more from Dover, and concluded that the changes under contemplation would not effectively reduce the range of hovercraft services available to the public.

7. On the question of the effects of the merger on competition within the cross-Channel market as a whole, the Commission considered that the merger should improve the financial performance of hovercraft operations, that the potential improvements offered the prospect of short-term viability to the merger company, and might go further than that. The Commission concluded that the merger might bring some improvement in the financial position of the hovercraft companies but, bearing in mind the very limited period of hovercraft operations on the present scale, they accepted that such improvement did not provide a basis for deciding on the long-term future in the cross-Channel market. In view of the increasing strength of the competition, the Commission did not expect the merger to alter the generally reactive position of the hovercraft operator in setting fares.

8. The Commission also considered two other aspects of competition. Firstly, the argument that competition had been distorted through BRB's financing for many years of the increasing losses suffered by BRHL, that neither hovercraft operator could expect to be profitable in future and that a continuing BRB subsidy would bring about an even more serious distortion of competition. In this connection, BRB had told the Commission of its firm intention to find a solution to the problem of BRHL's losses and had said that the financial arrangements for current business between the new company and itself would be on a strictly commercial basis. The Commission considered the possibility that the parent companies might need to provide further finance for the new company (to be named Hoverspeed) beyond the initial funding. They thought it important that any such finance provided by BRB to Hoverspeed should be publicly and readily identifiable, and obtained from BRB a written assurance that the amounts, terms and conditions of any loans, advances, guarantees or financial support which it might make available in future to Hoverspeed would be published in a readily identifiable manner in BRB's own accounts.

9. The other aspect of competition which the Commission considered was whether the merger, by reducing the number of independent operators on the short sea routes, might make it easier for them to agree or to co-ordinate fares with each other. The Commission recalled the undertakings which, as a result of their Report on Cross-Channel Car Ferry Services in 1974, several operators (including BRHL) gave that, inter alia, they would not participate in any agreements relating to rates on fares for accompanied car business. They noted that, if the merger took place, BRHL's undertaking would cease to have effect and they concluded that such a development would be against the public interest. They therefore recommended that an undertaking should be sought from Hoverspeed similar to BRHL's undertaking and incorporating any changes to that undertaking acceptable to the Director General of Fair Trading. The Commission decided not to recommend a similar undertaking for foot passengers, because the undertakings which followed the Commission's 1974 Report dealt only with car ferry services.



10. The Commission then considered the alternatives to the merger. The first of these was that British hovercraft operations would cease on the cross-Channel routes, sooner or later. The Commission noted that there would thus be a reduction of competition, which would reduce the pressure on the ship ferry companies to maintain and improve the standard and variety of service they offer. They said that the disappearance of hovercraft from the market could be the more serious because of the uncertainty as to whether a substantial new ferry operator could enter the market. They also noted that it would deprive people of an alternative choice to ships. The second alternative was that one or both of the existing hovercraft operations might be acquired and run by another person or persons. The Commission, regarding such a possibility as slight, considered that there would be much more uncertainty as to whether such alternatives would provide effective and continuing competition to the other cross-Channel operators, as compared with the competition that might be provided by the merged company. They also addressed the question whether large hovercraft might emerge at some stage as more formidable competitors on the short-sea routes, and considered that the proposed merger held out the best hope of continued use of hovercraft which might lead to improvements in the present craft and provide a basis for the introduction of a new generation of hovercraft.

11. The Commission's general conclusion on competition was that the merger afforded the prospect of maintaining competition from hovercraft on the short-sea routes. It was only within the past two years that a noticeable increase in effective competition had emerged, and it was therefore even more important to maintain the movement towards increased competition.

#### EMPLOYMENT

12. The Commission regretted the projected loss of about 250 jobs, but noted that the merger would protect the rest - about 850 permanent and some temporary in the Summer.

#### BRITISH DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION OF LARGE HOVERCRAFT

13. The Commission accepted the view of the British Hovercraft Corporation that the merger would provide a potential benefit to manufacturing industry in the UK, both for the introduction of a new type of large hovercraft and for improving the prospects of re-engining the existing craft.

#### THE INTERESTS OF CONSUMERS

14. The Commission believed that the merger, when compared with the alternative, would on balance be beneficial to consumers.

#### OTHER ISSUES OF PUBLIC INTEREST

15. The Commission did not consider that any other issues of public interest arose from the merger.

## CHANNEL TUNNEL


16. The Commission understood that the earliest time by which a fixed rail link to France could be operational was about the end of the decade, and concluded that the Channel Tunnel was not a factor to be taken into account in reaching a decision on the proposed merger.

## SUMMARY

17. The Commission's main conclusions were that the merger afforded the best prospect of maintaining effective competition from hovercraft on the short-sea routes, and that the maintenance of such competition was the more important in a market which had until recently not been noticeably competitive. They were concerned that the means by which BRB provided finance to the new company should be published and readily identifiable, and, in this respect, had obtained an assurance from BRB. They were also concerned to guard against the adverse consequences of the present undertaking (on fares for accompanied cars) by BRHL ceasing to have effect, and had therefore recommended that Hoverspeed should be required to renew BRHL's undertaking.

## CONCLUSION

18. The Commission concluded that, if the enterprises carried on by or under the control of BRHL ceased to be distinct from enterprises carried on by or under the control of Hoverlloyd, that fact might not be expected to operate against the public interest, provided that an undertaking was given by Hoverspeed in respect of fares for accompanied cars under section 88 of the Fair Trading Act 1973.



126 JUL 12 1944



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT  
2 MARSHAM STREET LONDON SW1P 3EB

G.R.

Turn these two offerings into  
one letter pl, as indicated on  
DOT draft.

26 June 1981

MJP 29/vi.

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

Dear Mike,

Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter of 17 June to Peter McCarthy at Trade following up the exchange between the Prime Minister and Mr Jonathan Aitken, MP, at Question Time on 16 June. I have seen Peter McCarthy's letter to you of 26 June.

Mr Aitken's interest in the proposed merger between British Rail Hovercraft Ltd and Hoverlloyd Ltd no doubt stems from the fact he is Hoverlloyd's local MP. Since British Rail Hovercraft Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of the British Railways Board the consent of my Secretary of State will be needed under the Transport Acts before the merger can take place.

The Railways Board have not yet submitted detailed proposals but when they do Mr Fowler will consider them urgently. One of his aims will be to ensure the merged company is part of the private sector and so has the best possible chance of reversing the losses which - despite Mr Aitken's implication - both companies are suffering at present.

I attach a draft paragraph which picks up these points and which might be included in the reply to Mr Aitken.

A copy of this letter and enclosure goes to Peter McCarthy.

Yours,

Anthony Mayer

R A J MAYER  
Private Secretary

DRAFT PARAGRAPH FOR LETTER TO MR AITKEN

cc/gv

"Because British Rail Hovercraft Ltd is a subsidiary of the British Railways Board the merger will need the consent of the Secretary of State for Transport under the Transport Acts. For that Norman Fowler will need to see detailed proposals from the Railways Board, setting out the structure of the company and the way it is intended that it will interact commercially with the Board itself, and with others. I know that he recognises the urgency of finding a satisfactory solution for the problems that both these companies have recently been facing. I am sure too that he will be seeking, if at all possible, to obtain a structure that would place the new company firmly in the private sector so that it would benefit from the freedoms and stimulus that that would provide."



From the  
Minister of State  
for Consumer Affairs

The Rt Hon Sally Oppenheim MP

Mike Pattison Esq  
Private Secretary  
Prime Minister's Office  
10 Downing Street  
London SW1

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE  
1 VICTORIA STREET  
LONDON SW1H 0ET

TELEPHONE DIRECT LINE 01 215 5662  
SWITCHBOARD 01 215 7877

CF  
Chase D/Trans  
for their offering, etc

MAP  
26/VI  
CF

26 June 1981

Dear Mike,

Your letter of 17 June requested a draft letter for the Prime Minister to send to Mr Jonathan Aitken MP following an exchange during Question Time about the Monopolies & Mergers Commission's report on the proposed merger of the British Rail Hovercraft operation with Hoverlloyd Limited. Mr Aitken has been in touch with Mrs Oppenheim about the MMC's investigation pressing for an early decision on whether the merger should be allowed to proceed. The report is being published today and I enclose a self-explanatory letter for the Prime Minister to send to Mr Aitken. I understand that the Department of Transport will be submitting to you direct an additional paragraph dealing with Mr Fowler's likely response to the proposed merger when the parties are ready to go to him for consent under the Transport Act.

I am sending a copy of this letter and enclosure to Anthony Mayer at the Department of Transport.

Yours ever,  
Peter McCarthy

PETER McCARTHY  
Private Secretary

**DRAFT**

**File No.**

Addressed to :

Jonathan Aitken Esq MP  
House of Commons  
London  
SW1A 0AA

Copies to :

Originated by:  
(Initials and date)

H P N S  
24.6.81

Seen by:  
(Initials and date)

Enclosures :

Type for signature of

Prime Minister  
.....  
(Initials and date)

DEPARTMENT OF

You asked me in the House on 16 June if, now that the Monopolies and Mergers Commission had reported on the proposed merger between British Rail Hovercraft and Hoverlloyd, I would use my influence to ensure that the merger was delayed no further by Government intervention. I understand that you have explained to Sally Oppenheim your particular concern that the Government's decision should be announced before new timetable arrangements came into effect on 4 July.

At the time you raised the matter the Government had, of course, only just received the Commission's report. We have, however, taken steps to publish it as early as possible, and, as you may be aware, Sally Oppenheim announced publication on Friday 26 June. She has, I understand, made arrangements for you to receive a copy of the Press Notice. As you will note, the Commission have concluded that the merger may not be expected to operate against the public interest, provided Hoverspeed reviews certain undertakings currently given to the Government by British Rail Hovercraft Limited. Provided the necessary undertaking is forthcoming the companies

(CONTINUE TYPING HERE)

File No.

are therefore free to proceed with their negotiations, ~~with a~~  
~~view to submitting specific proposal for appropriate consents~~  
by the Secretary of State for ~~Transport~~ as required under the  
Transport Acts.

*Add O/Trans para.*





B/F 21/6

Parliament

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

17 June 1981

I enclose an extract from Hansard (Col. 856) reporting an exchange between Mr. Jonathan Aitken, M.P., and the Prime Minister at Question Time yesterday. You will see that the Prime Minister undertook to look into the state of play on the proposed merger of the British Rail hovercraft operation with Hoverlloyd.

I should be grateful if you could let me have a draft letter for the Prime Minister to send, following up the point raised in this exchange, together with any background information of which she should be aware. It would be helpful if this could reach me by 28 June.

I am sending a copy of this letter and enclosure to Anthony Mayer (Department of Transport).

M. A. PATTONSON

Peter McCarthy Esq  
Department of Trade

HANSARD - 16 June 1981

Column 856

**Mr. Aitken:** Is my right hon. Friend aware that, far from needing a Royal Commission, many of the channel ports have already suffered from an exhaustive inquiry by the Monopolies and Mergers Commission, which has delayed the merger of the loss-making British Rail hovercraft operation with the successful private enterprise operation, Hoverlloyd? Now that the Monopolies and Mergers Commission has reported, will she use her influence to ensure that the merger is delayed no further by Government intervention?

**The Prime Minister:** I shall see what I can do. I am anxious that all private enterprise ventures that would create new wealth and new jobs for Britain should be allowed to go ahead as soon as possible.