



PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE
WHITEHALL, LONDON SW1A 2AT

11 April 1986

Ponnie Winter 2
This describes
the deal reached over
Mr Clarke's bill.

Dear Tony,

DKS
11/4

and

DISABLED PERSONS (SERVICES, CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION) BILL

The Lord President had a meeting last night with your Secretary of State, the Lord Privy Seal, the Chief Whips of both Houses, the Financial Secretary, Treasury, your Ministers of State and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Scottish Office, to discuss the handling of this Bill. Mr Langdon and Mr Eland (Cabinet Office) were also present.

Mr Fowler

Your Secretary of State explained that he and his Ministers had been negotiating with Mr Clarke about the amendments to the Bill put down by the Government. The expectation had been that Mr Clarke would be unwilling to accept the package on offer and that arrangements would need to be made to talk the Bill out. But he had in fact now accepted these amendments. Your Secretary of State was aware that the Bill, even so amended, was still not acceptable to his colleagues on expenditure grounds and he therefore had proposed to the Chief Secretary and colleagues most concerned that these doubts be tackled in two ways. First, he would use the commencement provisions to defer implementation of those portions of the Bill's provisions which would entail significant costs. Second, he had offered to meet the eventual costs of implementation in England from within his own programme. In practice this would mean that he was unlikely to be able to implement any parts of the Bill which would entail significant cost before 1989/90 and implementation thereafter would depend on the speed at which resources could be made available.

The Financial Secretary, Treasury, said that he had discussed the matter with the Chief Secretary, Treasury, and, if the judgement was that the Bill should not be talked out, they were prepared to agree to the arrangements suggested by your Secretary of State, subject to the following additional points.

- i. That if it became impossible to delay implementation of the Bill until at least 1989/90, then your Secretary of State would bear the additional costs from the earlier implementation date.

A Laurence Esq

CONFIDENTIAL

- ii. That the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland Secretaries accepted that the costs of implementation in their territories would be met from within their existing block provision.
- iii. That all these undertakings applied to the Bill not merely as it left the Commons, but to whatever provisions the Government had to accept at the end of the day after the Bill had been through the Lords.

Your Secretary of State and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Scotland, agreed to these conditions.

The meeting also took note of the point in the Environment Secretary's letter of 10 April to your Secretary of State about the need for increased Exchequer grant.

The handling of the Bill in the House of Lords was then discussed. It would be very advantageous if Mr Clarke would select as sponsor a peer or peers who commanded the respect of the House and was prepared to work to deliver the agreement reached in the Commons and to persuade the Bill's supporters in that House to abide by that agreement. If the agreement was subsequently broken, then it must be recognised that all bets were off and, if necessary, the Government would take action to talk out or defeat the Bill on its return to the Commons.

The Lord President, summing up the discussion, said that the meeting were prepared to agree to your Secretary of State's proposal on the understanding that he and the other Ministers concerned agreed to the Financial Secretary's conditions. It would be useful if Mr Clarke could be guided in his choice of a sponsor in the Lords and this should be discussed further with the Chief Whip, Lords. If the deal were broken, then all bets were off and this must be made absolutely clear to the backers of the Bill, as should the Government's intentions in relation to speed of implementation.

I am sending a copy of this letter to David Norgrove in No 10 and to the Private Secretaries to the Lord Privy Seal; the Secretaries of State for Wales, Northern Ireland, the Environment, and Scotland; the Chief and Financial Secretaries, Treasury; both Chief Whips; the two Ministers of State, and the PUSS, DHSS (Mr Hayhoe, Mr Newton and Baroness Trumpington); the PUSS, Scotland (Mr Mackay); First Parliamentary Counsel; and Sir Robert Armstrong.

Yours sincerely
Joan MacNaughton

JOAN MACNAUGHTON
Private Secretary



CONFIDENTIAL

From: THE PRIVATE SECRETARY

CONFIDENTIAL



also
NORTHERN IRELAND OFFICE
STORMONT CASTLE
BELFAST BT4 3ST

Tel. Belfast (0232) 63011

Miss Joan MacNaughton
Private Secretary
Privy Council Office
Whitehall
LONDON
SW1A 2AT

NBM
29 April 1986

Dear Joan

DISABLED PERSONS (SERVICES, CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION) BILL

Thank you for the copy of your letter of 11 April to Tony Laurence. *at Map*

It appears from the progress of the Bill that day that our consent was assumed to the Financial Secretary's second condition, that any costs of implementation in Northern Ireland would be met from within the existing block provision.

The Bill does not extend to Northern Ireland. No decision has yet been taken on making parallel provision by Order in Council but if a decision were taken to proceed with similar legislation my Secretary of State would accept that any additional costs would fall to be financed from within the Northern Ireland Block provision.

I am copying this letter to David Norgrove in No 10 and to the Private Secretaries to the Lord Privy Seal; the Secretaries of State for Social Services, Wales, the Environment, and Scotland; the Chief and Financial Secretaries, Treasury; both Chief Whips; the two Ministers of State, and

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

-2-

the PUSS, DHSS (Mr Hayhoe, Mr Newton and Baroness Trumpington); the
PUSS, Scotland (Mr Mackay); First Parliamentary Counsel; and Sir Robert
Armstrong.

Yes surely

Geoffrey Sawley

G H H SONNENBERG

CONFIDENTIAL

