



CONFIDENTIAL

2 MARSHAM STREET
LONDON SW1P 3EB
01-212 3434

My ref:

Your ref:

COL
17 July 1984

Dear Keith

THE NEW ILEA

Thank you for your letters of 13 and 14 June in which you set out in detail your proposals for reconstituting ILEA and for direct elections. I have also seen Leon Brittan's letter to you of 3 July. We are pursuing separately your proposals about the timing of the initial and subsequent elections. This letter sets out my comments on your other detailed proposals.

I am content that the new authority should retain its predecessor's name. I am also content with your proposals for review of its functions.

I agree with Leon Brittan that there should be a requirement for the Local Government Boundary Commission to review the new ILEA's area as soon as possible after the first elections and to submit proposals to move to single member electoral divisions. Our officials have discussed possible detailed arrangements with his. They recommend, and I agree, that the Commission should be required to complete its first review, including proposals for single member divisions, within two years of the Bill's receiving Royal Assent (ie by July 1987 for completion by 1992). The Commission should be required in undertaking that review, as well as to have regard to the geography of the area and its local communities, to ensure that each division should lie wholly within a London borough. They should also be required to ensure that the total number of divisions should be no less than 48 nor more than 58 - which is, I understand, the range considered acceptable given the nature of the functions of the authority.

I am broadly content with your proposals for consultation between the new ILEA and the inner boroughs. Your proposal that the new ILEA should be required to produce an annual report and by a specified date, however, as you recognise, goes further than Part II of the Local Government, Planning and Land Act 1980 for local authorities generally. To impose such a requirement might cast doubt on the adequacy for all other local authorities of the existing provisions of the 1980 Act on annual reports, including on the Code of Practice published under that Act. Nor am I convinced that such a requirement would necessarily ensure that there was made available to the boroughs the sort of exposition of the new ILEA's policy objectives which is your aim. There is no hint of such an exposition in ILEA's latest, 1981/82, annual report. Our officials have discussed an alternative arrangement requiring the new ILEA each year to produce, and to consult the boroughs on, a statement of its policy objectives as an adjunct to its draft budget. I hope this is acceptable to you.

CONFIDENTIAL

ILEA would still be required, as you propose, to consult the boroughs on its draft budget, school reorganisation proposals, and any other issues affecting the provision of education across the whole of inner London, as it considered necessary. It would also be subject separately to the existing requirements of Part II of the 1980 Act on annual reports, in the same way as all other local authorities.

If you are content, I hope we can include announcements on all these points in the paper on the destination of functions post-abolition, which I am publishing next week.

I am sending copies of this letter to the Prime Minister, members of MISC 95 and to Sir Robert Armstrong, and to John Selwyn Gummer in his capacity as Party Chairman.

*Yours
Patrick*

PATRICK JENKIN

EDUCATION
LEA
PAY

18 JUL 1984

1984

070

NBPM
AT
1817
C. Jk

CONFIDENTIAL



2 MARSHAM STREET
LONDON SW1P 3EB
01-212 3434
My ref:
Your ref:

17 July 1984

Dear Elizabeth

THE NEW ILEA

I am writing to correct an omission of one line from my Secretary of State's letter of today's date.

In the middle of paragraph 3, the words in parentheses should read: (ie by July 1987 and therefore ahead of its review of the London boroughs which is due to begin in 1987 for completion by 1992).

I apologise for this and for any inconvenience to your Secretary of State and other copyees.

I am copying this letter to the Private Secretaries of those who received copies of Mr Jenkin's letter.

Yours

Andrew

A C ALLBERRY
Private Secretary

Ms Elizabeth Hodkinson

*attached
with AT? NO*



NBPM
AT 4/17
SCOL

QUEEN ANNE'S GATE LONDON SW1H 9AT

3 July 1984

Yes, please. - coming.
will request if required.

You asked for comments on your letters of 13 and 14 June to Patrick Jenkin and the note enclosed with the former about the replacement of the ILEA by a body of directly elected members in 1985.

I agree with your view that the Parliamentary constituencies should form two-member electoral divisions for the new authority as a temporary expedient and that the normal term of office should be four years.

I would, however, urge you to include in any Bill a requirement for the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to conduct an immediate review of the area and submit proposals for new one-member divisions at the earliest possible opportunity. I press this for two reasons. First, single member divisions have many advantages over multi-member divisions as paragraph 6 of the note by your officials points out. Second, the boundaries of the Parliamentary constituencies were based on the electorates of the boroughs in 1976. The electorate of the area as a whole has declined since then, so that the 1984 electorates of the constituencies now range from 47,250 in Hammersmith to 73,041 in Hackney South and Shoreditch. I believe these anomalies should be rectified as quickly as possible if the elections to ILEA are not to be criticised for producing distorted results.

I share your rejection of elections by halves. I see little merit in creating a further complex refinement to our already complicated system where some authorities have whole council elections while others have elections by thirds. I suspect the proposal would arouse hostility, and it would certainly add to the authority's expenditure.

On the timing of elections, I, too, favour holding them in a different year from the borough elections. I believe this would help accountability.

If direct elections are included in the paving Bill, I can see no objection to the removal of the borough and City appointees in May 1985.

I agree with your proposals for the date of the first ILEA elections.

The only comment I would like to make on your letter of 14 June is that I endorse your reasons for preserving the name of the authority.

I am copying this letter to the recipients of yours.

The Rt Hon Sir Keith Joseph, Bt., MP.

Education: ILEA pt 4.



SP

CONFIDENTIAL



904
NBPA
AT
24(7)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE
ELIZABETH HOUSE, YORK ROAD, LONDON SE1 7PH
TELEPHONE 01-928 9222
FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Rt Hon Patrick Jenkin MP
Secretary of State for Environment
2 Marsham Street,
LONDON SW1P 3EB

24 July 1984

Dear Patrick,

THE NEW ILEA

Thank you for your letter of 17 July.

I am glad to have your and Leon Brittan's agreement to my proposals for the new ILEA, with the helpful modifications you have both proposed, which I accept. I should be content for the decisions on these points to be announced in the proposed paper on the destination of functions.

I am sending copies of this to the Prime Minister, members of MISC 95, Sir Robert Armstrong and John Selwyn Gunner.

*Leon
Jenkin.*

Edmonton
LEA
Party

24 JUL 1984

