

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

E(81) 4th Meeting

COPY NO 56

CABINET

MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC STRATEGY

MINUTES of a Meeting held at  
10 Downing Street on  
MONDAY 26 JANUARY 1981 at 4.45 pm

PRESENT

The Rt Hon Margaret Thatcher MP  
Prime Minister

The Rt Hon William Whitelaw MP  
Secretary of State for the  
Home Department

The Rt Hon Lord Carrington  
Secretary of State for Foreign  
and Commonwealth Office

The Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Howe QC MP  
Chancellor of the Exchequer

The Rt Hon Lord Soames  
Lord President of the Council

The Rt Hon James Prior MP  
Secretary of State for Employment

The Rt Hon Peter Walker MP  
Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries  
and Food

The Rt Hon Michael Heseltine MP  
Secretary of State for the  
Environment

The Rt Hon John Biffen MP  
Secretary of State for Trade

The Rt Hon David Howell MP  
Secretary of State for Energy

The Rt Hon Leon Brittan QC MP  
Chief Secretary, Treasury

THE FOLLOWING WERE ALSO PRESENT

The Rt Hon Nicholas Edwards MP  
Secretary of State for Wales  
(Item 1)

The Rt Hon Humphrey Atkins MP  
Secretary of State for Northern Ireland  
(Item 1)

The Rt Hon Sir Michael Havers QC MP  
Attorney General  
(Item 2)

Sir Ian Percival QC MP  
Solicitor General  
(Item 2)

The Rt Hon Michael Jopling MP  
Parliamentary Secretary, Treasury  
(Item 2)

Mr Norman Tebbit MP  
Minister of State, Department of

Mr Malcolm Rifkind MP  
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of  
State, Scottish Office  
(Item 1)

Mr J R Ibbs  
Central Policy Review Staff

## SECRETARIAT

Sir Robert Armstrong  
Mr P Le Cheminant  
Mr D J L Moore

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1	ENTERPRISE ZONES	1
2	THE TIMES NEWSPAPERS	3

## 1. ENTERPRISE ZONES

Previous Reference: E(81) 2nd Meeting

The Committee considered memoranda by the Secretary of State for the Environment (E(81) 9) and by the Secretary of State for Industry (E(81) 10) on Enterprise Zones (EZs) in England.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT said that many of the EZs so far selected were in the range of 500 to 600 acres and that the Tyneside Zone was over 1,000 acres. He had now come to the view that the experiment would benefit if it included some smaller sites. Of the four contenders for the further site in the North of England, he accordingly recommended approval of the two smaller sites in Hartlepool and Wakefield rather than either of the two larger ones in Sheffield and Scunthorpe. Neither Hartlepool nor Wakefield were affected by current closures in the steel industry, and so their selection would not form a precedent in that respect. The two local authorities were both containing their expenditure within their budgets, and he was satisfied that they would work well with the Government in the promotion of their EZs. Although the Committee had previously decided against an EZ in Wandsworth, he now recommended that he should explore with Wandsworth Council the possibility of designating a Zone of not more than 50 acres. Although small, this was likely to be welcomed by the Council as a recognition of their efforts to deal with the severe financial and other problems facing the Borough. Finally he invited the Committee to decide on the boundaries of the Tyneside EZ which had already been selected. The Secretary of State for Industry wished to include in it the whole of the Team Valley Industrial Estate, which was owned by the English Industrial Estates Corporation, whereas he considered that only the southern and undeveloped part of the estate should be included.

THE PRIME MINISTER, summing up a short discussion, said that the Committee agreed that there should be small Enterprise Zones in Hartlepool and in Wakefield, as proposed by the Secretary of State for the Environment. They recognised the case for helping Wandsworth by the designation of a small site there, but they confirmed their earlier decision against a second EZ in London, since this would lead to irresistible pressure for second EZs in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Committee could not be expected to consider detailed questions on the precise boundaries of particular Zones,

and the Secretaries of State for the Environment and Industry, together with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, should reach agreement among themselves as to how much of the Team Valley Industrial Estate should be included in the Tyneside EZ. They should do so urgently, and in time for the Secretary of State for the Environment to announce the outcome, and the Government's decisions on Hartlepool and Wakefield, as soon as possible and before any Debate which might take place on unemployment. The Secretary of State for the Environment should make clear in his announcement that no further EZs would be designated until the Government had been able to assess the effectiveness of the present experiment.

The Committee -

1. Agreed that there should be Enterprise Zones in Hartlepool and in Wakefield.
2. Agreed that there should not be an Enterprise Zone in Wandsworth.
3. Invited the Secretary of State for the Environment -
  - i. In consultation with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Industry, to decide urgently on how much of the Team Valley Industrial Estate should be included in the Tyneside Enterprise Zone.
  - ii. To announce these decisions on Enterprise Zones as soon as possible and, in doing so, to make clear that no more Enterprise Zones would be designated for the time being.

## 2. THE TIMES NEWSPAPERS

The Committee had before them a minute of 26 January from the Secretary of State for Trade to the Prime Minister on the application by Thomson British Holdings Limited (TBH), controlled by the Canadian-owned International Thomson Organisation Limited, for the consent of the Secretary of State for Trade, under the 1973 Fair Trading Act, to the transfer of The Times and The Sunday Times to News International Limited, controlled by Mr Rupert Murdoch.

THE PRIME MINISTER said that in conducting their discussion of the proposed sale of The Times and The Sunday Times to News International Ltd the Committee would need to take full account of the advice of the Attorney General. This was to the effect that the general rule under the Fair Trading Act 1973 was that there must be a reference to the Monopolies Commission before the Secretary of State for Trade decided whether or not to give his consent to a transfer of newspapers; that there was an exception to this rule under S.58(3)(a) of the Act which gave the Secretary of State discretion to decide whether a reference should be made if he were satisfied that certain criteria were met; and that it was for the Secretary of State personally to decide whether these criteria were satisfied.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL, confirming the Attorney General's advice, said that the Attorney General also advised that, if the Secretary of State concluded that the criteria were met for the exercise of his discretion, it was for him personally to decide how to exercise it, though he would be entitled to hear the views of his colleagues before making his decision.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR TRADE said that the Fair Trading Act 1973 provided for him to give his consent to newspaper mergers without prior reference to the Monopolies and Mergers Commission (MMC) only if he was satisfied that the newspaper in question was not economic as a going concern and that the case was one of urgency. The three supplements of The Times were not "newspapers" under the Act and their sale did not, therefore, require his consent. On the basis

CONFIDENTIAL

of advice from his Department's accountants, he was satisfied that neither The Times nor The Sunday Times was economic as a going concern, though only in the case of The Times was the issue clear-cut. He was also satisfied that the case was one of urgency: the Thomson Organisation had announced that the papers would close in March unless a buyer were found, and the Chairman of the MMC had advised him that, to give sufficient time for representations, he would need eight weeks for an inquiry. Since he was satisfied that the conditions under the Act were met, the question which he had to decide was whether to refer the bid to the MMC or to exercise the discretion given him under the 1973 Fair Trading Act to give his consent to the merger without prior reference to the MMC.

He had discussed the position that morning with the Chief Executive of TBH and the Editor-in-Chief of The Times Newspapers; and, separately, with Mr Murdoch. The representatives of The Times had advised him that Mr Murdoch was the only suitable bidder and that they could not extend their March deadline for closure of the newspapers to give time for an eight week inquiry by the MMC. They had already issued redundancy notices on the assumption of closures in March; to extend the deadline would mean either that they would have to bear the cost of redundancy payments to all employees, irrespective of whether they were likely to be re-employed subsequently by Mr Murdoch, or that they would have to re-negotiate the redundancy arrangements at a cost to themselves. Mr Murdoch would be unable to start his discussions with the MMC on which the transfer still depended, until the MMC had concluded their enquiries. The disruption to production which could result from such a delay, and the further loss of advertising revenue, would further diminish the commercial value of the newspapers. The representatives of The Times had subsequently confirmed that the Thomson Organisation would not agree to extension of their deadline. In the meantime, Mr Murdoch had told him that, if Thomson had been able to agree to an extension, he would not, contrary to what had been reported in the Press, object to a reference to the MMC, but, because of the effect on the commercial prospects of the papers, he would have to re-negotiate his contract with Thomsons. He would have no objection if the Secretary of State's consent to the merger was conditional on observance of the undertakings which he had already given on editorial independence,

4

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

and he was prepared to envisage strengthening those undertakings, if asked to do so. He (the Secretary of State), therefore had two alternatives open to him. He could make a reference to the MMC in the hope that the Thomson Organisation would then extend their deadlines, but with the risks of causing TBH to lose a substantial sum of money, of declaring around 4,000 redundancies, and of bringing about what might prove to be the permanent closure of The Times. Alternatively he could give his consent without a reference, subject to a condition which would in effect entrench the undertakings which Mr Murdoch had given, bearing on the independence of the papers and on editorial freedom, and ensure that they could not be changed thereafter without his consent.

In discussion it was suggested that, if the Secretary of State for Trade were to refer the bid to the MMC, it was unlikely that the Thomson Organisation would in practice refuse to extend their deadline. In the circumstances there seemed, however, little advantage to be gained from a reference, and considerable risks and costs in making it. The Thomson Organisation had taken the view that no suitable alternative purchaser had made a bid. Those who were now pressing for a reference were mainly concerned that this would enable greater authority to be put behind the undertakings on independence of the papers and editorial freedom which Mr Murdoch had already given. Their concern on this count should be met if the Secretary of State for Trade were able to assure them that, if he were to give his consent without a reference, he could entrench those undertakings in his consent. It might be that the Opposition would be less inclined to press for a reference when they understood that it would take as long as eight weeks and the consequences which might flow from such a delay.

The Committee -

1. Took note that the Secretary of State for Trade had satisfied himself that under the 1973 Fair Trading Act he had discretion to decide whether to refer to the Monopolies and Mergers Commission the bid by News International Limited for The Times and The Sunday Times.
2. Took note that the Secretary of State for Trade, once he had decided whether or not to refer the bid to the Monopolies and Mergers Commission, would discuss with the Chief Whip when he should announce his decision in relation to the Emergency Debate on 27 January.

Cabinet Office

28 January 1981

CONFIDENTIAL

5

24