

Tuesday 8th July 1980

Mr Marlow & Nine Members
to discuss immigration

15-30

No 10

WILLIE

I THINK THAT THIS SHOULD
BE REGARDED AS ENTIRELY A
PRIVATE MATTER.

DO YOU AGREE, PLEASE?

Wm.



MARLOW
BEARNE
BROWN
STANBROOK
CARLISE
BUDWIG
MARELAND
ALEXANDER
WARRING
HAWKLEY
BONDOL
WIMBORNE

MARLOW

1. Current population 55,000 both
30,000 immigrants.

Request 1 claim for over size intake.

1 - 6, 1 - 5

nothing is written, plan to change the
2 million to 5 million.

2. 45% of births - breast.

Illegal immigrants

3. Nationality Act will not affect the position

Concerned because of own Constituents - Working
News Units

4. 1% total of electorate - Immigrant population.

HAWKLEY

AL. G. SIM.



P. 43

Q. These permanently settled here, are entitled to remain here.

BONSDA

or, Uncertainty about numbers for sub cultures - different to become like us. Not prepared to conform. no disobedience to law.

WIMBORNE

Daint Lane. Positive discrimination towards minorities.

Common for Racial Equality.

Working class vote being alienated!

MARLBOROUGH

Support Burson.

BUSTON

Prepared to keep Race Relations Tribunal

IF we have a Register.

REG-ISSER.



Budwin registers could show who was here lawfully.

"Immigration as we have known it is coming to an end" — P. 43.

We are not fulfilling our promise — we are going to lose white working class votes — not going to

CHALWISSE Working class vote to show figures.

The figures are going up — more the highest ever.

People: the clubs are bewildered

Brown Small but significant movement of people.

Immigrants here will be responsible for defendants coming in.

At end of period of the Parliament many more IMMIGRANTS.

Pressure from our members.



P. 4. PASSAGE FIELDS only 4% don't
includes but people who are refugees
not immigrants. If we reported them,
the figures would look better.

- H.S.
1. Rates about 1/12 apart from U.K. Citizens
 2. About extent dependants.
 3. France rules have dried up.
 4. Refuse refugees from immigrants.
 5. Only 4% don't so far. There is - but
Cabinet - we are slowing the process.

Business If it has melted a bit faster, good
Illegal immigrants at our stages - those
REVISION.

H.S. Most of illegal immigrants in western have been
here for years.

Business Well, I'd like to believe there was a finite
commitment.

P. 4. We have no abundant Regula.



P.C. Sorry about delay in getting immigration
rules through + difficult 30 +
We now have to consider a Register

- H.S.
1. NATIONALISATION BILL 4800 7.11.67
will not really deal with immigration.
 2. Can do more, we do about the
rules.

WINTERTON

People will ask why we should take
them at all.

We have been a soft touch for too long.

SILVERBROOK

Need some to get it through - Register

H.S. If we were going to stop Dependents -
Nampster will not help.

OLDFATHERS

Restart important Register

Big Public Relations Exercise.



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

W.W.

Overstaying of visas

Call to 10,000 if you do it at

places of work; it has to be

give false names.

We will press hard.

M.M.L. 2

Part against was become and were
discriminate against ~~workers~~ women.

BROWNIE

Quota shall be declining early on.
Part trusts on illegals
No blind confession of U.K. Citizenship
Parti like discrimination with gov
Identity Cards - limit of
Threats



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Budget.

not paying tax

P.M.

1. Really first Lloyd George
2. Try to get some accounts prepared
3. Revision
4. Habits Bill
5. Accept your common.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO WILL BE ATTENDING THE MEETING
WITH THE PRIME MINISTER AT 3.30 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 8TH JULY.

Michael Brown●.

John Browne.

Nicholas Winterton.

Richard Alexander.

John Carlysle.

Ivan Stanbrook.

Paul Marland.

Tony Marlow.

The following have not confirmed but may be attending:-

Timothy Brinton

Anthony Speller

Gerry Neale

Bill Hawksley.



HOME OFFICE
QUEEN ANNE'S GATE LONDON SW1H 9AT

7 July 1980

Dear Sir,

The Prime Minister is to meet Mr Tony Marlow MP and a number of his colleagues to discuss immigration tomorrow afternoon, 8 July. She will be having a word with the Home Secretary about the meeting at 10.45 in the morning. You have asked for some briefing.

... As you know, the Home Secretary himself saw Mr Marlow some two weeks ago. I attach some notes on points which, in the Home Secretary's judgment, Mr Marlow may be expected to pursue.

On repatriation - the subject of one of the notes - the Prime Minister may wish to bear a further point in mind. The OPCS produce figures which, although not entirely reliable, show that a considerable number of people return at their own expense, so the average figure of 150 people a year repatriated under the Immigration Act 1971 is very far from the whole picture. In these circumstances it is the Home Secretary's view that it would be a mistake to spend Government funds on a more extensive official scheme.

Yours,
S W

(S W BOYS SMITH)

M A Pattison Esq



10 DOWNING STREET

PRIME MINISTER

This letter from Tony Marlow asks for a meeting to discuss the problems of immigration. The Home Secretary had a meeting with him and colleagues last week.

What do you want to do about Mr. Marlow's request? *Would*

you like to have a word with the Home Secretary before replying?

19 June 1980

*MS
Will of course meet
him - after I have
seen W.H.
out*



From Tony Marlow, MP, Northampton North.

R18
✓ CE13

Rt Hon. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher PC MP,
Prime Minister,
10 Downing Street.

16th June, 1980.

Dear Prime Minister

Last week as a result of our concern, nine colleagues and I were kindly granted a meeting with the Home Secretary to discuss the party's approach to immigration.

We believe that the party's manifesto commitments are the very least that are necessary and that they should be implemented without delay. The urgency is underlined by recent statistics for births and immigration, which show that for every six new ethnic Britons there is one new coloured citizen - a factor which on unchanged policies will be reflected in the eventual population make-up of the country, and which will be far exceeded in some of our towns and cities.

As this is a subject of great sensitivity and great legitimate concern to the whole country we would be very grateful if we could meet with you to discuss the matter further.

Yours Sincerely
Tony Marlow



10 DOWNING STREET

PRIME MINISTER

YOUR MEETING WITH MR MARLOW
AND NINE MEMBERS, TUESDAY,
8 JULY, AT 1530 HRS - TO
DISCUSS IMMIGRATION.

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten initials]

Ulysses Immigrants

Ten of thousands

Nachschlag' Art. $\frac{1}{2}$ m.

Register

Nicholas - Post culture

Michael W - for discovery

● Tony

Replacement Popl -

Plants - Net Disposal.

55,000 30,000.

550,000 - 50,000.

1:6.

1:10.

Liquidation. 2 → 8

No more net-impairment.

$\frac{1}{2}$ Budget

$\frac{1}{3}$ Leverage

45% in Bank.

Changes to the Nationality Law

1. The **Conservative** Manifesto promised the introduction of a new British Nationality Act to define entitlement to British Citizenship and to the right of abode in this country. The Manifesto promised that the Act would not adversely affect the right of anyone now permanently (and legally) settled here to continue to live here.
2. Since taking office the Government have been undertaking a thorough examination of the present law and this has now been completed. The Home Secretary will publish an outline of the Government's proposals for legislation in a White Paper before the Recess. (A Bill will follow, next Session it is hoped.) The country has been led to expect new nationality legislation for a number of years, and the purpose of the White Paper will be to let people know in general terms what the Government intend to do and thus put an end to speculation, some of which has been wild and damaging to the Government.
3. It would be preferable for the details of the White Paper not to be revealed to Mr Marlow at this stage. But it would seem to do no harm to tell him that the Government's intention is that the right of abode in this country should be enjoyed by British Citizens only (subject to some transitional provisions to fulfil the Manifesto's commitment to others lawfully settled here), and that this will entail the splitting up of the present all-embracing citizenship of the United Kingdom and Colonies.
4. If Mr Marlow should mention the right to vote enjoyed by Commonwealth citizens living here he might be reminded of the answer the Home Secretary gave to Mr Bruce-Gardyne on 26 October, which said that it would not be appropriate to deal with voting entitlements in a Nationality Bill (Mr Raison referred to this in reply to a similar Question by Mr Marlow himself on 31 October).

5. (If Mr Marlow should seek an explanation of this he might be told that civic rights and entitlements are spread over a considerable number of statutes, and are expressed in terms of a person being or not being a 'British subject', which in law means the same thing as 'Commonwealth citizen'. To attempt to deal with each and every one of these statutes in the course of a Nationality Bill would clutter up the Bill intolerably. The right course is to get our nationality law sorted out; the question whether the various statutes containing these rights should be amended can be left until each statute is due for review.)

Repatriation

The Conservative manifesto said that the Government would "help those immigrants who genuinely wish to leave this country" but that there could "be no question of compulsory repatriation".

Although the precise numbers are not available many immigrants do already leave this country of their own volition and at their own expense. There can be no question of providing an unnecessary subsidy for such departures.

The provisions which exist for assisting voluntary repatriation are designed to meet special needs and to help those who cannot help themselves. The main provision is made by Section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971. Provision also exists under Section 3 of the Supplementary Benefit Act 1976 and Section 90 of the Mental Health Act 1959. (The latter is confined to patients receiving treatment for mental illness as an in-patient). The Supplementary Benefit provision, which is the responsibility of DHSS, permits a single payment to be made to meet exceptional need. Under this, an annual average of just under 100 repatriations were assisted over the last five years.

The average number of repatriations annually over the last five years Under S 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 was about 150. This provision is statutorily limited to persons who wish to leave the United Kingdom and in whose best interests it can be shown to be that they should do so. The criteria, which are subject to Treasury approval, are designed to limit this assistance to persons who have failed to settle satisfactorily in this country but do not have the means to leave it.

Expenditure under the Immigration Act averages about £800 a person and, under the Supplementary Benefit Act, about £220. The difference reflects the differing criteria applied under the relevant provisions.

These provisions are designed to cater for the special, and exceptional, needs of individuals. They meet the needs of those who "genuinely wish to leave this country" but they also have regard to criteria which ensure that there cannot be abuse.

Any extension of the existing provisions would need to take account of a number of difficulties.

The existing arrangements are designed to meet special needs; there is no evidence that they are failing in this. Any extension would, therefore, have to be considered in the light of how far some other basis might justify an extension and what that basis should be.

Any extension which would result in a substantial increase in the numbers would be likely to be expensive. It is arguable that there would be compensating savings but the relationship between these and the expenditure could not be directly demonstrated.

Increased expenditure of this kind would almost certainly require legislation to provide statutory authority both on account of the likely sums involved and because of the changes in the criteria of eligibility.

Any basis of eligibility other than the special needs covered by the existing provisions would be likely to be capable of serious abuse.

Any provision which facilitated voluntary repatriation (or departures) beyond what is already available seems likely to expose immigrants to pressures of various kinds - some of which might be very objectionable in character - which could tend to derogate from the genuinely voluntary character of such decisions.

Immigrants are accepted here on the basis of permanent settlement. It would be a significant change of policy to do anything which might suggest that this does not mean what it said.

Any proposals for "voluntary" repatriation which might lead to improper pressure being brought on immigrants would have a very adverse effect on race relations.

SCHEMES FOR REPATRIATION

BACKGROUND NOTE

Mr Tony Marlow MP asked Questions last autumn about the number of persons receiving assistance under Government schemes for voluntary repatriation and about action taken to publicise and make more attractive these schemes. More recently he asked the Prime Minister a supplementary Question about the increasing numbers of coloured persons in the country. Another Member, Mr Michael Brown, has asked several Questions in recent weeks about voluntary repatriation, which suggest that he would also support a scheme, on a larger scale than at present, for assistance towards voluntary repatriation. (Copies of these Questions and Answers are attached at Annex A).

Statutory provisions

2. Provision for financial assistance for repatriation is made in the Immigration Act 1971 /the Supplementary Benefits Act 1976. (There is also provision in the Mental Health Act 1959 but this is confined to in-patients receiving treatment for mental illness).

Immigration Act 1971

3. The Home Secretary has responsibility for making payments for voluntary repatriation under section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 (Annex B). Individual applications for assistance under section 29 have to be made to International Social Service of Great Britain (ISS) who have administered the arrangements on behalf of the Government since October 1971. The agreement with this organisation was renewed in September 1976 for a further period of 5 years. The qualifying criteria, approved by the Treasury, are as follows:

- (a) The applicant has failed to settle.
- (b) The applicant cannot be expected to finance his departure himself.
- (c) There will be a saving to UK public funds.
- (d) The head of family is subject to immigration controls and is free of conditions.
- (e) Emigration is likely to be in the best interests of the person and family concerned.
- (f) Current weekly earnings do not exceed by more than £5 the appropriate supplementary benefit level.
- (g) The head of family has a poor employment record or prospects and has had or is likely to have significant periods of unemployment or frequent changes of low paid work.
- (h) Account has been taken of contributions to travel by the persons concerned.

- (i) Unemployed persons have first registered in order to explore the chances of employment.

Travel to the continent of Europe is excluded from the scheme. The intention is to assist only those who have failed to settle satisfactorily in this country and not, for example, returning visitors or those who wish to retire to their country of origin.

Numbers assisted and costs incurred

4. The numbers of persons assisted by ISS under the section 29 scheme in each of the last five years are as follows:-

1975/76	221
1976/77	112
1977/78	130
1978/79	173
1979/80	124

Expenditure incurred under this scheme was approximately £100,000 in 1979/80.

Supplementary Benefits Commission scheme

5. The Supplementary Benefits Commission (SBC) are prepared, in certain circumstances, to authorise a single payment under section 3 of the Supplementary Benefits Act 1976 (See Annex B) to pay the fare for an immigrant to return home. This provision is broader than that in the 1971 Act, in that patrials are eligible, but narrower in that only persons not in full time work are eligible for assistance. From November 1980 eligibility will be restricted to recipients of supplementary benefit. The person concerned must have virtually no prospects of settling down in this country, have been unable to find work, be unable to afford the fare and have a genuine wish to return home. In addition, the payment of the fare must lead to ultimate saving in public funds.

6. The numbers of persons assisted under the SBC scheme in each of the last five (calendar) years are as follows:-

1975	139
1976	90
1977	113
1978	84
1979	57

Expenditure incurred under this scheme was approximately £12,500 in 1979.

Publicity

7. When the section 29 was introduced in 1971 the Government emphasised the fact that it was intended to help immigrants who wished to leave the country voluntarily and who sought assistance of their own free will. It was to be, and to be seen to be, free of any element of pressure or persuasion. No publicity campaign was mounted, as a matter of deliberate policy. The arrangements were announced in Parliament and circulars were sent to local authorities, the local authority associations, the National Council of Social Service (now renamed the National Council for Voluntary Organisations), Citizens Advice Bureaux, Community Relations Council, Chief Constables and appropriate Government Departments, some of whom published their own circulars. The attention of these bodies was again drawn to the scheme in April 1973 when it was necessary to amend certain particulars in the original circulars.

ANNEX A

Mr Marlow asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many citizens from Pakistan and the New Commonwealth have re-emigrated in each of the last five years (a) with assistance from Government schemes and (b) without assistance.

Mr Raison: With regard to (a) my right hon Friend is responsible for arrangements for assistance under section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 and under section 90 of the Mental Health Act 1959. My right hon Friend the Secretary of State for Social Services is responsible for matters relating to a scheme operated by the Supplementary Benefits Commission.

Section 29 Immigration Act 1971

Information in the form requested can be obtained only at disproportionate cost. However the total numbers of people assisted under this scheme since 1974 - the majority of whom are thought to come from the New Commonwealth - are as follows:

1974-75	156
1975-76	221
1976-77	112
1977-78	130
1978-79	173

Section 90 Mental Health Act 1959

The information is as follows:

1974	5
1975	1
1976	1
1977	3
1978	2

With regard to (b) the information requested is not available

(O.R. 14 Nov. Vol. 973 col. 603-4)

E.R.

Mr Marlow asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will take action to publicise and make more attractive his schemes for assisted repatriation.

Mr Raison: I see no need for such action.

(O.R. 27 November 1979 vol 974 col 587.)

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will improve the administration and level of the assistance made available to members of the ethnic minorities seeking voluntary repatriation.

Mr Raison: I am not aware of any complaints about the administration of the scheme operated on the Government's behalf under section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 by International Social Service of Great Britain and we have no plans for altering the present arrangement. The scheme operated by the Supplementary Benefits Commission is the responsibility of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Social Services.

(O.R. 7 May 1980, vol. 984 col 121).

Mr Marlow: Is my right hon. Friend aware that for every 10 white babies born in the United Kingdom, there is one coloured child? Is she aware that that proportion is increasing, and that even after recent measures, a sufficient number of people of different cultures come into Britain to populate a parliamentary constituency once every other year? Is she further aware that within a generation, the population of coloured people in Britain will double, and that whatever noises Opposition Member may make, it is a matter of public concern? Will she tell the House what plans the Government have to take account of the general public's proper concern?

The Prime Minister: I hope that every hon. Member will agree that those born in this country with British citizenship will have equal rights, and that they will do everything possible to secure good race relations.

(O.R. 13 May 1980, vol 984 col 1047)

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is Government policy to improve arrangements for assisted passages under the Immigration Act 1971, in order to help those who genuinely wish to leave Great Britain.

Mr Raison: We are not aware of any need for changes in the present arrangements.

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how much money has been spent in publicising the voluntary repatriation scheme: and what form the publicity has taken.

Mr Raison: Information about financial assistance under section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 has been made available to local authorities, the National Council for Voluntary Organisations, Citizens Advice Bureaux, community relations councils and others. The cost of providing this information is not available.

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many persons seeking voluntary repatriation have been granted assistance by the International Social Service of Great Britain in each year since its inception.

Mr Raison: The numbers of such persons granted assistance by the International Social Service of Great Britain in each year since the inception of the schemes provided for under section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 were as follows:

1971-72	1
1972-73	122
1973-74	277
1974-75	156
1975-76	221
1976-77	112
1977-78	130
1978-79	173
1979-80	124

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many approaches have been made to the International Social Service of Great Britain by persons seeking assistance with voluntary repatriation under section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 in each year since the inception of the scheme.

Mr Raison: I understand from the Interantional Social Service of Great Britain that the information is as follows:

Year	Preliminary inquiries which do not progress to formal applications for assistance	Formal applications for assistance	Total
1971-72	-	1	1
1972-73	57	243	300
1973-74	271	238	509
1974-75	245	171	416
1975-76	274	181	455
1976-77	520	240	760
1977-78	493	207	700
1978-79	435	217	652
1979-80	273	132	405

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many offices have been established by the International Social Service of Great Britain for administering the voluntary repatriation scheme other than its office in Brixton Road, London S.W.1.

Mr Raison: None

(O.R. 23 May vol 985 col 413-415)

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will consider bringing forward an amendment to section 29 of the Immigration Act 1971 to enable payments to be made to meet a person's expenses in leaving the United Kingdom when that person wishes to do so, irrespective of whether such passage is judged by social workers to be in the person's interest.

Mr Raison: We have no plans to do so.

(O.R. 13 June 1980, vol 986 col 328)

E.R.

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will consider employing bodies, other than the International Social Service of Great Britain, to administer schemes for voluntary repatriation in areas other than Brixton.

Mr Raison: The scheme administered by the International Social Service of Great Britain already covers the whole of the country. We see no need for any changes in the present arrangements.

Mr Michael Brown: asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what assessment he has made of the reasons why, of the 4,198 people who have approached the International Social Service of Great Britain with a view to seeking assistance with voluntary repatriation, only 1,630 have eventually made formal applications for assistance.

Mr Raison: None, so far.

(O.R. 17 June vol 986 col 474-5)

Annex B

Extract from Immigration Act 1971 Chapter 77

Contributions for expenses of persons returning abroad

29. - (1) The Secretary of State may, in such cases as he may with the approval of the Treasury determine, make payments of such amount as may be so determined to meet or provide for expenses of persons who are not patrial in leaving the United Kingdom for a country or territory where they intend to reside permanently, including travelling expenses for members of their families or households.

(2) The Secretary of State shall, so far as practicable, administer this section so as to secure that a person's expenses in leaving the United Kingdom are not met by or out of a payment made by the Secretary of State unless it is shown that it is in that person's interest to leave the United Kingdom and that he wishes to do so.

Extract from Supplementary Benefits Act 1976 Chapter 71

Supplementary benefit to meet exceptional needs

3. (1) Where it appears to the Commission reasonable in all the circumstances they may determine that supplementary benefit shall be paid to a person by way of a single payment to meet an exceptional need.

(2) In determining whether supplementary benefit shall be paid under this section, and the amount of any such benefit, the Commission may have regard to any resources which would otherwise fall to be disregarded under Part III of Schedule 1 to this Act (calculation of resources).

Quotas, and a register of dependants

1. The Conservative Manifesto said that the Government would "introduce a Register of those Commonwealth wives and children entitled to entry for settlement under the 1971 Immigration Act" and would "then introduce a quota system, covering everyone outside the European community, to control all entry for settlement".
2. These are not simple matters, and legislation would be required if a register and quotas were to be effective. Legislation would be necessary in order (a) to apply any sanction whatever to the wives and children of Commonwealth citizens settled here before 1 January 1973 (whose freedom to come here is protected by section 1(5) of the Immigration Act 1971) or to Commonwealth wives of citizens of the UK and Colonies (who have the right of abode here); (b) to create a criminal offence (e.g. of intentionally providing false information, which seems desirable); and (c) to provide a right of appeal against a decision entailing withdrawal of entitlement to settlement.
3. It is unlikely that the Parliamentary programme will have any time for such legislation next Session. The intention is to introduce the Nationality Bill as soon as Parliamentary time permits. Legislation for a register would be quite outside the scope of a Nationality Bill, and the two things could not be combined.
4. A good deal of progress has been made in implementing the Manifesto commitments on immigration, a copy of which is attached. Apart from the Nationality Bill, items (ii), (iii) and (iv) were dealt with in the new Immigration Rules which came into effect on 1 March. Item (v) has been dealt with by the Department of Employment. And improved methods of dealing with illegal entrants and overstayers - item (viii) - are being developed.

5. Priority has thus been given to the measures which can readily be brought into effect and which bear on the numbers admitted to this country.

6. It is also relevant that a register would be expensive in staff costs. Some scores of civil servants would be required, and the Franks Group (the Parliamentary Group on the feasibility and usefulness of a Register of Dependants) found that a compulsory register would cost several million pounds.

young criminals. For certain types of offenders, we also support the greater use of community service orders, intermediate treatment and attendance centres. Unpaid fines and compensation orders are ineffective. Fines should be assessed to punish the offender within his means and then be backed by effective sanctions for non-payment.

Many people advocate capital punishment for murder. This must remain a matter of conscience for Members of Parliament. But we will give the new House of Commons an early opportunity for a free vote on this issue.

IMMIGRATION AND RACE RELATIONS

The rights of all British citizens legally settled here are equal before the law whatever their race, colour or creed. And their opportunities ought to be equal too. The ethnic minorities have already made a valuable contribution to the life of our nation. But firm immigration control for the future is essential if we are to achieve good community relations. It will end persistent fears about levels of immigration and will remove from those settled, and in many cases born here, the label of 'immigrant'.

- (i) We shall introduce a new British Nationality Act to define entitlement to British citizenship and to the right of abode in this country. It will not adversely affect the right of anyone now permanently settled here.
- (ii) We shall end the practice of allowing permanent settlement for those who come here for a temporary stay.
- (iii) We shall limit entry of parents, grandparents and children over 18 to a small number of urgent compassionate cases.
- (iv) We shall end the concession introduced by the Labour government in 1974 to husbands and male fiancés.
- (v) We shall severely restrict the issue of work permits.
- (vi) We shall introduce a Register of those Commonwealth wives and children entitled to entry for settlement under the 1971 Immigration Act.
- (vii) We shall then introduce a quota system, covering everyone outside the European Community, to control all entry for settlement.
- (viii) We shall take firm action against illegal immigrants and overstayers and help those immigrants who genuinely wish to leave this country—but there can be no question of compulsory repatriation.

We will encourage the improvement of language training in schools and factories and of training facilities for the young unemployed in the ethnic communities. But these measures will achieve little without the effective control of immigration. That is essential for racial harmony in Britain today.

1. NO MORE.
2. A FEW MORE PASSPORT MATTERS
3. NATIONALITY BILL
 - a) HOME HOME PASSPORTS
 - b, RULES - FINANCIAL PROVISIONS.
 - c) VIETNAMESE REFUGEES
4. BY NATIONALITY BILL NEXT SESSION
 - b, REGISTRAR - EXTRA CIVIL SERVANTS.
 - a) AMEND 1971 IMMIGRATION ACT -
NO ONE SHALL BE DISADVANTAGED
REFUGEE WOULD DISADVANTAGE PEOPLE.
 - d) KEEP REGISTRAR IN INDIA, PAKISTAN
AND BANGLA DESH - OPPOSITION
FROM OUR SIDE IF REGISTRAR
KEPT OVERSEAS.
5. Great difficulty to get so many
to vote for our rules.
Tangle on blood unemployment.
They have blood riots.
6. For the moment it is not clear in
blood.
7. Voluntary repatriation.
8. a) RIOTS.
b, UNEMPLOYMENT.
9. FINISH BILL



From Tony Marlow, MP, Northampton North.

C-16

Rt. Hon. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher PC MP,
Prime Minister,
10 Downing Street.

16th June, 1980.

Dear Prime Minister

Last week as a result of our concern, nine colleagues and I were kindly granted a meeting with the Home Secretary to discuss the party's approach to immigration.

We believe that the party's manifesto commitments are the very least that are necessary and that they should be implemented without delay. The urgency is underlined by recent statistics for births and immigration, which show that for every six new ethnic Britons there is one new coloured citizen - a factor which on unchanged policies will be reflected in the eventual population make-up of the country, and which will be far exceeded in some of our towns and cities.

As this is a subject of great sensitivity and great legitimate concern to the whole country we would be very grateful if we could meet with you to discuss the matter further.

Yours Sincerely
Tony Marlow