



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 the Environment
2 Marsham Street
LONDON SW1P 3EB

26 October 1984

Mr Patrick

Mrs Morrell, the Leader of the ILEA, has asked to meet me to discuss a number of issues concerning abolition and rate-limitation. I enclose a copy of her letter and of my reply.

Among other points, she refers to remarks you were reported as making about the future use of County Hall. I confess to being unclear as to our policy on County Hall. The general policy on accommodation, as sketched out in the Yellow Book, is that it will be for the Residuary Body to decide how to dispose of all surplus property. This might result in their arranging for ILEA to remain, and take over rooms vacated by the GLC.

But I think that we have always had it in mind that there was a symbolic significance in the future handling of County Hall, which might merit some exceptional treatment beyond what is envisaged in the Yellow Book.

There is also some attractiveness in the argument that the new ILEA ought to have the opportunity to make a fresh start in new premises - though as Mrs Morrell says, that would have a cost.

When she comes, she is likely to say that moving to a new building would undoubtedly be expensive since the new ILEA might need to undertake adaptations to create a council chamber with public gallery, meeting rooms and other facilities for elected members, and accommodation for a computer. We would be under pressure to make good the cost, which it would be argued would otherwise have gone to the provision of education. The move would also entail considerable administrative disruption at the time of the constitutional change. Vacating County Hall might in any case have to be a phased operation, and it would depend

on when the Authority was able to find satisfactory premises and have them fitted out. It could be argued that since the Authority is, we intend, to be subject to review in 1991 it was not cost-effective to oblige it to seek new premises for what might be a short stay. These are all arguments for leaving the new ILEA and the residuary body to negotiate between themselves over the ILEA's position in County Hall, with no ministerial involvement; and there is also the argument of principle that we should refrain from intervening in the future of County Hall as in any other specific expenditure decision of a local authority.

I would like to be clearer on these points before I see Mrs Morrell and to have your advice on what I might say to her.

I am sending a copy of this letter and enclosures to the Prime Minister, members of MISC 95, and Sir Robert Armstrong.

Enc.

Keith

From FRANCES MORRELL
LEADER OF THE INNER LONDON EDUCATION AUTHORITY
THE COUNTY HALL, LONDON SE1 7PB
01-633 7321

RECEIVED - 1 OCT 1984

52/003739/I

1 October 1984

The Rt. Hon. Sir Keith Joseph, BE MP
Secretary of State for Education and Science
Elizabeth House
York Road
London SE1 7PH

Dear Sir Keith

cc Mr Colley
Mr Turpin
Mr Viriel
Mr Noobury
Mr Stuart
Mr Whitaker
Mr Gaffin
Mr Street (HC for Sps) *0.15.1*
Mr Sexton

I am writing to seek your assistance on two matters. The first is the case for a general exemption for the Inner London Education Authority from the provisions of Sections 7, 8 and 9 of the Local Government (Interim Provisions) Act 1984. The Education Officer wrote to your Permanent Secretary expressing concern about this legislation. I have seen the reply but do not consider the outcome satisfactory. The second question is the need to clarify the future use of County Hall. I should be grateful if I could meet you to discuss these matters.

Local Government (Interim Provisions) Act 1984 - Sections 7, 8 and 9

In seeking a general exemption from this legislation I wish to make three points.

First, it is the Authority's understanding that the Government included clauses 7, 8 and 9 in the Act because of its concern that 'there could be scope for obstructive or irresponsible actions' on the part of the GLC and the metropolitan county councils in the period before 1 April 1986. There are, no doubt, many aspects of the abolition issue on which the Government and this Authority would disagree. What is clearly not in dispute, however, is the fact that there will continue to be an education authority for Inner London after April 1986. The existing administration has sought to avoid any disruption to the work of schools and colleges and would not wish in any way to act irresponsibly or to damage the very service it has been at such pains to defend.

My second point arises from the impact of the general consents which were issued by the Department of the Environment on 2 August 1984. Many of those consents related specifically to the ILEA and appear to recognise not only that there will continue to be an education authority for Inner London but also the responsible way in which the Authority conducts its affairs. Despite those general consents Sections 7, 8 and 9 have generated additional work for the Authority. It does not help the ILEA to have imposed upon it additional responsibilities which appear to be intended for other authorities and which hinder the smooth-running of the education service. The scope of the powers returned to the Authority by the general consents of 2 August inevitably lead one to conclude that it was not really the intention to make ILEA the subject of Sections 7, 8 and 9. It seems only logical to take the further step which would exempt ILEA entirely.

ACKNOWLED 2 OCT 1984

My third point relates to the degree of detail with which central government must inevitably be concerned in dealing with applications for consent. Already details of hundreds of routine lettings of ILEA premises to non-ILEA organisations have been supplied to officials at the Department of the Environment and it would appear that it may yet be necessary to supply them with information about the many minor disposals of land in which the Authority engages which do not involve disposal of the freehold interest. I really cannot believe that it is in the interests of either central or local government that information of such a trivial nature needs to be passed from one to the other.

The future of County Hall

The ILEA at present occupies a substantial part of County Hall, our total accommodation requirement being about two-thirds of the space currently available. If the new education authority were required to move elsewhere it would incur substantial costs. Apart from rent, it has been estimated that the cost of adapting and removing to new premises could be as great as £8.5m. Paragraphs in the White Paper, 'Streamlining the Cities', and in the Yellow Paper published on 31 July 1984 appear to indicate, however, that a property such as County Hall would be transferred to the successor bodies. There have been suggestions from the Secretary of State for the Environment that this might not be the case (and that the building should be allocated to the Inland Revenue). The Authority would welcome clarification of the Government's intentions.

The ILEA's Budget

I should also like to bring to your attention the fact that the Secretary of State for the Environment has been notified that the Authority will not be seeking derogation. However this does not imply that the Authority accepts the scale of reductions sought. Reduction on such a scale will seriously damage education in Inner London.

Yours sincerely

Francis Thornell.

MRM4D1



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

ELIZABETH HOUSE YORK ROAD LONDON SE1 7PH
TELEPHONE 01-928 9222

FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mrs F Morrell
Leader ILEA
The County Hall
LONDON SE1 7PB

26 October 1984

Dear Mrs Morrell.

Thank you for your letter of 1 October.
I should be glad to meet you to discuss
the points you raise.

Perhaps your office could contact mine
to arrange a date.

*Yours,
Alan Joseph*

STATEMENT ON FIRST ELECTIONS TO THE NEW ILEA

CC Press
QUEST
AD
Duty
W 2 the

With permission, Mr Speaker, I wish to make a statement about the timing of the first direct elections to the new Inner London Education Authority.

The Government announced earlier this year that in the light of the consultations which it had carried out it had decided that the new Inner London Education Authority to be formed on the abolition of the Greater London Council should be directly elected. During the passage through Parliament of the Local Government (Interim Provisions) Act 1984, it was also decided that the term of office of the existing GLC members (from whom the bulk of the ILEA membership is drawn) should be extended from May 1985, when elections would have been due, to April 1986, the proposed date of abolition. We have been considering how best to secure continuity for the administration of education in inner London through the transition.

The Government has concluded that the first direct elections to the Authority which will succeed the ILEA should be held in May 1986 to coincide with the London Borough elections. We propose that the new corporate body which is to take over the functions of the ILEA from 1 April 1986 should be established, like the new joint boards, in September 1985, in order to prepare the budget and fix the precept for 1986-87 and make other necessary preparations.

From its establishment until the elections in May 1986, the new body would be composed of the present members of the ILEA (who will, of course, also continue to constitute the existing Authority as a special committee of the GLC until 1 April 1986). Later elections would also coincide with those for the Borough Councils.

Unlike other services for which the GLC has a responsibility,

the functions exercised by the ILEA will be exercised by a single directly elected body. The new Authority will differ from the existing ILEA only in the method by which it is constituted. In these circumstances it is appropriate to place the responsibility for the preparatory work which the new Authority will need to undertake on the existing members of the ILEA.

This provides the best guarantee for continuity of administration and a smooth transition to the new arrangements and is consistent with the Government's decision to enable GLC members, including those who are members of the ILEA, to continue to perform their functions until 1 April 1986.

Charlotte

pse full ✓ DES
four vs OK on

Done 22/10

4

CONFIDENTIAL



Department of Education and Science

Elizabeth House York Road London SE1 7PH

Telegrams Aristides London SE1 Telex 23171

Telephone 01-928 9222 ext

Prime Minister

Sr Keith is proposing
to announce the date
of ILEA elections
on Tuesday

T J Flesher Esq
Private Secretary
10 Downing Street
London SW1

Your reference

next week

Our reference

X

Date

28/10

18 October 1984

Dear Tim,

TIMING OF FIRST DIRECT ELECTIONS TO THE NEW ILEA - PROPOSED MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

The Prime Minister chaired a meeting of Ministers about this on 2 August, following which a draft statement was agreed in correspondence (my Secretary of State's letter of 20 September to the Lord President refers). I attach for ease of reference a copy of the Statement as agreed, but with an amendment to the end of the fourth paragraph to avoid repetition.

Because of the importance and political significance of the matter my Secretary of State would like to make the Statement orally in the House on Tuesday 23 October. That date has already been provisionally agreed with the Leader of the House's office. The Statement would be repeated in the House of Lords by the appropriate Government spokesman.

I should be grateful for your agreement to our preceding along these lines.

Copies of this letter and draft Statement go to the Private Secretaries of the Leader of the House, the Lord President, the Secretary of State for the Environment, the Home Secretary, the acting Chief Whip (Commons), the Chief Whip (Lords), the Paymaster General, the Secretary of the Cabinet and to the Chief Press Secretary No 10.

Yours
A B Thompson

A B THOMPSON
Parliamentary Clerk

DRAFT STATEMENT

The Government announced earlier this year that in the light of the consultations which it had carried out it had decided that the new Inner London Education Authority to be formed on the abolition of the Greater London Council should be directly elected. During the passage through Parliament of the Local Government (Interim Provisions) Act, ¹⁹⁸⁴ it was also decided that the term of office of the existing GLC members (from whom the bulk of the ILEA membership is drawn) should be extended from May 1985, when elections would have been due, to April 1986, the proposed date of abolition. We have been considering how best to secure continuity for the administration of education in inner London through the transition.

The Government has concluded that the first direct elections to the Authority which will succeed the ILEA should be held in May 1986 to coincide with the London Borough elections. We propose that the new corporate body which is to take over the functions of the ILEA from 1 April 1986 should be established, like the new joint boards, in September 1985, in order to prepare the budget and fix the precept for 1986-87 and make other necessary preparations.

From its establishment until the elections in May 1986, the new body would be composed of the present members of the ILEA (who will, of course, also continue to constitute the existing Authority as a special committee of the GLC until 1 April 1986). Later elections would also coincide with those for the Borough Councils.

Unlike other services for which the GLC has a responsibility, the functions exercised by the ILEA will be exercised by a single directly elected body. The new Authority will differ from the existing ILEA only in the method by which it is constituted. In these circumstances it is appropriate to

place the responsibility for the preparatory work which the new Authority will need to undertake on the existing members of the ILEA.

This provides the best guarantee for continuity of administration and a smooth transition to the new arrangements and is consistent with the Government's decision to enable GLC members, including those who are members of the ILEA, to continue to perform their functions until 1 April 1986.



10 DOWNING STREET

Prime Minister ⁽²⁾

Sir Keith Joseph has raised
the future of County Hall with
Patrick Jenkin and has
identified a dilemma

(i) Should ILEA be moved out
to County Hall as a
very visible example of
privatisation, or

(ii) Would giving ILEA new
headquarters tend to close
off option to break up ILEA
in 1991.

Kenneth Baker ^{*} has promised you
a paper on the options.

BF

AT
26/10

me

WOW
*SOS