

Qa 06075

To: MR BUTLER
From: JOHN SPARROW

CONFIDENTIAL

I am not happy with the British Union terms of reference. I should prefer to have a letter with Norman, let's say Patrice, Jeanne, fruit & veg & something.

Prime Minister (1)
Content with this approach?

*Ms 7/10
6 October 1982
No, do I like the present approach. Will discuss further.*

CPRS Work Programme

1. In the light of my talk with the Prime Minister on 31 August (recorded in your note of that day), we have worked out three detailed specifications for studies on topics agreed then - education, the unions and occupational pensions - and I attach notes on these.
2. We have found it particularly difficult to define a remit on unions. The Secretary of State for Employment is about to circulate a paper on further legislative steps, and we are not in a good position to foresee where CPRS work in this area will be most useful until Ministers have discussed the Department of Employment proposals and reached decisions on them. There are other important aspects, aside from legislation on immunities - the question of unions' structure and responsiveness to members' interests, and the effect of unions on individuals' behaviour (paragraph 7). I would of course welcome any guidance the Prime Minister is able to give us on particular subjects on which she would like CPRS work to concentrate. I believe the right approach is for us to carry out an analytical study, on the lines suggested in the remit, as a first stage, and then to decide what further work to do on prescription as a second stage in the light of Ministers' decisions between now and the end of the year.
3. If the Prime Minister is content the remits might be sent to the Ministers mainly concerned:

Education - Department of Education & Science (copies to Industry, Employment, Treasury)

Unions - Department of Employment (copies to Industry, Treasury)

Pensions - Department of Health & Social Security (copies to Trade, Employment, Industry, Treasury).

We have already had informal exploratory discussions with officials, and will of course need to keep in close touch with work going on in

CONFIDENTIAL

Departments. To get full value from the studies I think it important that we should also be able to consult suitable outsiders, such as academics, on a personal and informal basis; there is inevitably some risk of leaks and misunderstandings in sensitive areas (e.g. union legislation, longer-term finance for higher education), but we will do our best to avoid these, and will treat our enquiries as exploratory CPRS work rather than a formal remit to report to Ministers.

4. We aim to complete our work on the first part of the union study, and on higher education, around the turn of the year. On pensions, which is a wide-ranging subject needing exploration before we know where to concentrate our effort, I should prefer not to commit myself more precisely than the first half of next year.

5. As mentioned on 31 August, this is not of course the full CPRS work programme. We shall be making proposals soon for work on patents. We are taking on a number of remits for the Family Policy Group. And in the discussion of youth unemployment on 13 September the Prime Minister asked for a report on possible changes in the structure and level of benefits.

6. I am sending a copy of this minute to Sir Robert Armstrong.

JB.

Att

Caroline

215

Please and you

①

Thurs

PRIME MINISTER

arrange, for this week if poss?

CPRS Work Programme

M

at Max

You were not happy with the proposals on trade unions and pensions in John Sparrow's note. I understand that you had a word with Mr. Tebbit this morning about the former.

Would you like to have a brief word with John Sparrow about all this - say, for half an hour or so later this week?

MCS

Yes or

Michael

arranged for 1415 on Thursday.

11 October, 1982

*Extract from
the record of
PM's meeting
with S/S Emp
on 11/10/82.*

iv) The Prime Minister referred to the proposals she had received from Mr Sparrow for a CPRS study of the unions, and said that she would want Mr Sparrow to have a talk with Mr Tebbit and the Secretary of State for Industry to define the project. She was also concerned whether the CPRS had sufficiently qualified people to undertake it. One possibility was to second someone from the Department of Employment. Alternatively someone might be brought in from outside.



10 DOWNING STREET

Mr Butler

To see the genesis of
Prof Minford's involvement in
the unemployment study.

~~Mr. Scholar~~

MLS 11/10

Discussed with FERB
MLS 12/10

Thanks. Do we know anything
of the circumstances in which the CPRC
and Minford took separate directions
instead of working together?

FERB

12.10.