



Prime Minister ②

CCAO

To note facts on police pay and costs.

AT

18/4

Treasury Chambers, Parliament Street, SW1P 3AG
01-233 3000

18 April 1984

Comment passed to Ho and that orally by TR AT 2514

The Rt. Hon. Leon Brittan QC MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

POLICE PAY

You wrote to me on 10 April about the proposed review of police pay.

I agree the review should consider increases in police earnings and those in the economy as a whole between 1979 and 1984; the position of the police in the "pay league"; information on recruitment and retention, and job security and starting salaries for a range of jobs including the armed services.

The growth in police costs since 1978/79 has been dramatic. Indeed it was concern about this which prompted the proposal to hold a review in the first place. Whichever way you look at the figures, they are disturbing. Thus:-

- (a) Between 1978/79 and 1983/84, total local authority relevant current spending increased by about 85 per cent in England and Wales; during the same period local authority relevant current spending on the police went up by 126 per cent;
- (b) In cost terms, total local authority relevant current expenditure increased by about 9 per cent between 1978/79 and 1983/84. During the same period expenditure on the police increased by about 30 per cent in cost terms.
- (c) Growth in police spending accounts for about one-third of growth in total local authority relevant current spending in cost terms since 1978/79.

I appreciate your tactical objections to tabling this information in the context of the review itself and I would not want to insist on that. But I am glad you think that the figures should be used in the negotiations which will follow the review. I believe we should also stiffen the resolve of the local authority employers by making it clear from the start that we shall not look favourably on representations for a "disregard" (or any other special arrangements) for the police pay award in 1984/85 and I hope that you can ensure that this message is clearly conveyed.

Copies of this letter go to the Prime Minister, the Secretaries of State for Employment, Environment, Scotland and Northern Ireland and to Sir Robert Armstrong.

NIGEL LAWSON

This is for to be diff with this when the position have been in the front we

Blue-Blue Day May 7th.



CONFIDENTIAL

NBPM 4/11/84

~~CCNO~~



QUEEN ANNE'S GATE LONDON SW1H 9AT

10 April 1984

R. Nigel,

POLICE PAY

Following our discussion about police pay in E(PSP) on 29 February, our officials have been considering the information which we should aim to have considered by the joint review of the pay of the federated ranks.

Much of the material which we would wish to have considered is covered by the terms of reference: the increases in police earnings and those in the economy as a whole between 1979 and 1984, their positions in the pay league, a technical appraisal of the average earnings index. Other information which Departments have agreed should be covered include figures on recruitment and retention, on the lines of my minute of 21 March to the Prime Minister, information about starting salaries for a range of jobs including the armed services, and information about job security.

Treasury officials have suggested that we should also include information about increases in police costs since 1979, and as a proportion of total increases in local authority expenditure. I have considered this carefully but, on reflection, I would prefer not to include this information as part of the joint review. That does not mean it is not extremely relevant. I think it is, but I think it is likely to be more helpful at the negotiating stage. Moreover, the Police Federation have made it clear that they will insist on agreeing the topics to be included in the joint review. They have always been reluctant to take part and would be happy to find an excuse to pull out. This could provide it.

/The

The Rt Hon Nigel Lawson, MP

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

The Home Departments will be providing some information (eg on recruitment and retention) for the review, but we envisage most of it will be obtained by OME, following agreement of the two Sides. This will not prevent the Official Side from pursuing separately any issues not covered by the joint review as a background for framing proposals for the negotiations.

I am copying this letter to the Prime Minister, the Secretaries of State for Employment, Scotland and Northern Ireland and to Sir Robert Armstrong.

Car
Car

CONFIDENTIAL

Price : pay

May 79



4 APR 1984

CONFIDENTIAL



NBPM AT 1415 ~~CC NO~~

2 MARSHAM STREET
LONDON SW1P 3EB

01-212 3434

My ref:

Your ref:

14 May 1984

Dear Leon,

POLICE PAY

Nigel Lawson copied to me your letter of 10 April about the proposed review of police pay, and his reply of 18 April.

The information tabled for the review group is, of course, a matter for you. But I do have an interest in the outcome of the review, since the increasing proportion of the scarce resources available for local authority current expenditure which is being pre-empted by police pay as a result of the Edmund-Davies formula is a matter of considerable concern here. Anything, therefore, which can be said which might stiffen the resolve of the local authority employers is to be welcomed, and I endorse Nigel Lawson's suggestion that requests for special arrangements for the 1984/85 police pay award are unlikely to find favour.

I am copying this to the Prime Minister, the Chancellor, the Secretaries of State for Employment, Scotland and Northern Ireland and to Sir Robert Armstrong.

Yours
Patrick

PATRICK JENKIN

POLICE: Pay May 79



RECEIVED

