UNATTRIBUTABLE PRESS BRIEFING TO DEFENCE CORRESPONDENTS 20 MAY 1982

PUS QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q. In a way are the Commander's options narrower as he cannot keep those people on those ships for too long?
- A. It depends on the ships. It is likely there will be an increase in pressure. The screw will be tightened at a variety of points as and when the Commander thinks it right.
- Q. When you say he has a whole range of options open to him are you saying that a political decision has been taken and that it is up to him to decide how to exercise that political decision?
- A. I think throughout we have been in a situation where the military side It is also related to the build up of military pressure and availability of people, weaponry and ships to the Task Force Commander. In some senses his options narrow and in others it opens up. I think he will step up action in a whole variety of ways. This is the most likely thinkg to happen.
- \mathbb{Q}_{\star} . Is Mrs Thatcher finding that what she said today has built up the pressure in some way?
- A. The Government is extremely dubious. No-one believes that in the next few days the whole situation will change.
- Q. Up to now we have been using the military to push the diplomacy along. Now is there not a new military phase under way since we have given up with diplomacy?
- A. Yes. I think there is to the extent that military pressure will move rather more quickly.
- Q. ?
- A. Yes, a whole series of ?? and I think it would differ in relation to where the Argentine forces are and where their resources are. Fairly well spread out and I think a whole series of opportunities. The Commander will decide what is going to really damage the Argentine forces on the FI and what is going to get the best return at the least loss.
- Q. Does not necessarily mean that he is going to want to establish how big bases on the Island?
 - A. He may establish some bases somewhere quite possible. Sometimes may do further landings and come back. If you make people feel unhappy destroying their things may be a more effective way. I think he has got a fair degree of freedom and manoeuvre and can exercise that in whatever way he wants.
 - Q. Force them to surrender are going to a pitch set piece confrontation?
 - A. I think it is largely the name of the game and how done is very much left to local decision.
 - Q. Rather than repossession?
 - A. No, the aim is to be in possession. Obviously, a certain amount has been found out over the past few weeks and I have no doubt it will vary from unit to unit

- \mathbb{Q}_{\star} Instead of having one large bank (invasion) it will be lots of little growls over some little time?
- A. A mixture of both. I am not trying to confuse you. If you find something easier people will find how to exploit a situation as you see it.

PRIME MINISTER

Engagements

Q1. Mr. Ray Powell asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 20 May.

The Prime Minister (Mrs. Margaret Thatcher): This morning I presided at a meeting of the Cabinet and had meetings with ministerial colleagues and others. In addition to my duties in the House, I shall be having further meetings later today.

Mr. Powell: Is the Prime Minister aware that the call for a ceasefire in the Falkland Islands is gathering strength nationally and internationally? Will she therefore tell us how many more lives—[Hon. MEMBERS: "Reading"]—will be sacrificed to satisfy the lust for blood by the hawks on the Government Benches behind her? Will she tell us when the nation can expect the faith, hope and harmony that she promised three years ago from the steps of 10 Downing Street?

The Prime Minister: A ceasefire without withdrawal would leave the invader in possession of the Falkland Islands and our people under his subjection. That is far from our objective.

Sir Anthony Kershaw: Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind that the object of this exercise is to restore freedom and the rule of law to the Falkland Islands? Will she ensure that her view of that is not obscured by any Argentine fancy footwork?

The Prime Minister: I entirely agree with my hon. Friend. Our objective is to restore freedom and the rule of law to the Falkland Islands and we will not be put off by Argentine procrastination.

Mr. David Steel: Will the Prime Minister tell the House, in advance of her speech this afternoon, whether she will be able, in the course of that speech, to inform the House of the terms proposed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations? If that is not possible, can the right hon. Lady give us an idea of when she thinks those terms might be made known to the House?

The Prime Minister: Not in detail, but I shall be able to give some indication of aspects that have yet to be resolved.

Mr. Hordern: As President Mitterrand has invited my right hon. Friend to state what is Britain's role within the European Community, would my right hon. Friend tell President Mitterrand that we will not be told by others what lies within our national interest, and that a heavy responsibility now rests with the Community to put right the wrong that it has done?

The Prime Minister: I entirely agree with my hon. Friend. What has happened over the Luxembourg compromise is very serious and could be even more serious if majority voting is applied to other aspects of Community work. Our role in the Community is to be a full and equal partner and to be fully entitled to equitable and fair treatment.

Q2. Mr. Parry asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 20 May.

The Prime Minister: I refer the hon. Gentleman to the reply that I gave some moments ago.

Mr. Parry: Does the Prime Minister agree that the decision taken in Europe is a kick in the teeth and a sell-out of British interests? Does she further agree that the simplest answer to the present crisis in the EEC would be to take Britain out of the common agricultural policy? Is she aware that that decision would be widely welcomed on Merseyside, in the regions and, indeed, throughout the land?

The Prime Minister: The decision is without precedent and has serious implications. we are full members of the EEC. We intend to remain full members of the EEC and we intend to make our views known and see whether we can reverse that decision about the Luxembourg compromise.

Mr. Maxwell-Hyslop: Will my right hon. Friend convey to the New Zealand Government this country's widespread appreciation and gratitude for their generous action in support, not only of Britain but of the rule of international law, not least by offering to support us with Her Majesty's New Zealand ship "Canterbury"?

The Prime Minister: Gladly. The New Zealand Government and people have been absolutely magnificent in their support of this country, of the Falkland Islanders and of the rule of liberty and the rule of law. I shall gladly convey that to Mr. Muldoon who, only yesterday, reminded me "Don't forget. In New Zealand, we are still a member of the same family."

Mr. Foot: I return to the question of the Luxembourg compromise. We shall be discussing the other matters later today. Will the right hon. Lady say whether her answer a few moments ago means that she advocates that we should remain members of the Common Market and of the common agricultural policy, whatever may happen to the Luxembourg compromise? Would she like to have a vote of this House of Commons following the debate that we are glad will be taking place on this extremely important subject next Wednesday to sustain her? Does she agree that this might be helpful? Will she give a guarantee to carry out what the House of Commons voted for?

The Prime Minister: We are a member of the European Community. What has happened over the Luxembourg compromise is very serious. I believe that it is in our interests to continue to be a member of the European Community. The right hon. Gentleman will understand that one needs a little time to see precisely how we should tackle this latest serious situation.

Mr. Ian Lloyd: Since this remarkable document, in the Vote Office, has revealed that Her Majesty's Government, in the interests of peace, has been prepared to carry compromise almost to the point of folly, has not the time now come for the House to turn its back on timidity and compromise and to make clear to the gauleiters of Buenos Aires that when British forces are committed in a just cause, that have always triumphed and the consequences for their opponents have been devastating?

The Prime Minister: As I shall say in my speech later, I do not believe that we have, in that document, compromised any of the fundamental principles that I set out at the beginning—none of them. We were prepared to make certain practical changes that were reasonable if we were to obtain the prize of no further loss of life. But there has been no compromise on fundamental principles.

Mr. Donald Stewart: Does the Prime Minister accept that her reiteration that the Government intend to stay in the Common Market is an indicaton to her so-called partners that they will get away with anything that they like to try? Will she take a much firmer stand than was evident in the replies of the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food yesterday—for instance, by going immediately to a 200-mile limit for fisheries?

The Prime Minister: I was merely suggesting that we should have time to think through all the aspects before we propose action. That seems to me a very good principle.

Mr. Beaumont-Dark: Bearing in mind what happened yesterday in the European Common Market, will my right hon. Friend adopt the same robust attitude over this issue as she has so properly adopted over Argentina? If we are to remain members of the Common Market, will my right hon. Friend be just as forthright on that issue?

The Prime Minister: We are entitled to reasonable and fair treatment. I believe that what has happened over the Luxembourg compromise, and the idea that we can go ahead with changes in the CAP without changes in the structure of the budget, is a breach of faith. We must now get changes in the structure of the budget to Britain's advantage.

Mr. McNamara: Will the right hon. Lady explain how the failure of our Community partners to observe the Luxembourg compromise will affect the future of the common fisheries policy? Is it not a fact that, at the end of the year, whatever any of her right hon. and hon. Friends may say, if the right hon. Lady persists in remaining in the community, the Common Market countries can fish up to our beaches, have all our fish, ruin our industry and give us no compensation?

The Prime Minister: I accept that if major decisions are in future to be taken by majority rule, this would have a very serious effect on almost every major decision and would seriously affect the future of the Common Market. I ask the hon. Gentleman and the House for time to consider this latest position and to prepare a proper response.

Mr. Rippon: I thank my right hon. Friend for what she has said about our relationship with the European Community.

Has my right hon. Friend in mind the terms of the draft Labour manifesto of 1980 published under the authority of the national executive of the Labour Party, of which the right hon. Member for Bristol, South-East (Mr. Benn) is the most prominent member, which said—

Hon. Members: Reading.

Mr. Canavan: It is what the right hon, and learned Gentleman said in 1972 when he took us into the EEC.

Mr. Rippon: The draft said in paragraph 88-

Hon. Members: Reading.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I expect that the right hon, and learned Gentleman's memory is good enough to sustain him. He has had a look now.

Mr. Rippon: The draft said that we will in no circumstances hand over the Falkland Islands to a regime like the Argentine regime that has no respect for human and civil rights. Does that not reflect in a fair way what is the view of the British people as a whole?

The Prime Minister: I believe that it does reflect the view of the British people as a whole that we should not hand over the Falkland Islands to the dictatorship of Argentina. I believe that we have the people united behind us in that resolve.

Q3. Mr. Kilroy-Silk asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for Thursday 20 May.

The Prime Minister: I refer the hon. Gentleman to the reply that I gave some moments ago.

Mr. Kilroy-Silk: will the Prime Minister agree that one feature of the Falkland Island crisis is the clear demonstration of how quickly and effectively the Government can act when they have the political will to do so? Will the Prime Minister now put the same effort, the same commitment and the same resources into ending unemployment?

The Prime Minister: We are putting every commitment and every effort into ending unemployment, which afflicts the whole of the Western world. This requires not only talking, but the efforts of people themselves to create jobs and work harder.

Sir Patrick Wall: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the veto may prove essential for the future of the British fishing industry? Will she look personally into the question of the common fisheries policy?

The Prime Minister: I am very much aware of that issue. It is one of the very serious aspects of what happened in the taking of a vote by majority rule on the CAP yesterday. Another issue is the future of New Zealand lamb. We are very much aware of this, but we need time to prepare a proper response.

Mr. Harry Ewing: Is the Prime Minister aware that if majority voting in the Common Market is to be the new rule, it means almost invariably, especially in relation to the common agricultural policy and the possibility of agreement on a common fisheries policy, that the majority vote will act against British interests? Is the Prime Minister seriously suggesting that, in these circumstances, she would continue to want Britain to be a member of the EEC?

The Prime Minister: I am suggesting that we do not dash into any hurried conclusions before we have had time to think these things out. I accept entirely that what happened over the voting on the common agricultural policy was extremely serious and without precedent. It is noteworthy that those of us who entered the Community after the 1966 agreement on the Lyuxembourg compromise refrained from voting because we felt that there had been a breach of faith of the terms on which we entered the Community.

Mr. Viggers: During her testing day, will my right hon. Friend draw strength from the fact that those most directly concerned in the Falkland Islands crisis—the men of the Armed Forces and their families—fully understand the issues and the risks involved and are resolute in their will to perform the roles expected of them?

The Prime Minister: We are very fortunate in the men and women who make up the Armed Forces. They are resolute and courageous. We are very proud of them.

Q4. Mr.Dubs asked the Prime Minister if she will list her official engagements for 20 May. The Prime Minister: I refer the hon. Gentleman to the reply that I gave some moments ago.

Mr. Dubs: Is the Prime Minister aware of recent assurances by Treasury Ministers that the large sums of money that are being spent on the task force are in no way having an adverse effect on Government economic policy? When the military action in the South Atlantic is over, therefore, will those same sums of money continue to be spent but on the needs of the homeless, the poor and the unemployed?

The Prime Minister: The hon. Gentleman has failed to observe one factor. If money from the Contingency Reserve is spent once, it cannot be spent twice.

Mr. John Carlisle: Will my right hon. Friend confirm the assurance that was given to the House by the Minister with responsibility for sport that the Government will put no pressure on the British football authorities to withdraw from the World Cup? Does she agree that it would be more worthwhile if, in the event of our being drawn against Argentina, we were to withdraw on the morning of the game, thus putting pressure on FIFA to expel Argentina?

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend the Minister with responsibility for sport replied to a question on that matter yesterday. It is not our present intention to intervene in the matters of the World Cup or the taking part in the World Cup of teams from Britain.

Aeronautical Co-operation

Mr. Kenneth Carlisle asked the Secretary of State for Industry whether he will make a statement on the Anglo-French ministerial discussions on aeronautical cooperation which took place on 6 May.

Mr. Norman Lamont: As agreed at our previous meeting on 29 October 1981, I met M. Charles Fiterman, French Minister of State and Minister of Transport, on 6 May to discuss Concorde and Airbus matters. The results of the meeting were set out in a joint communique, copies of which have been placed in the Libraries of both Houses.

Departmental Reports

Mr. Proctor asked the Secretary of State for Industry if he will give the total number of reports commissioned by his Department in each of the last five years.

Mr. Butcher [pursuant to his reply, 18 May 1982, c. 98]: I regret that collection of data would involve disproportionate cost. I will, however, do my best to assist if my hon. Friend will let me know more precisely the kind of reports he has in mind.

FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Falkland Islands

Mr. Eldon Griffiths asked the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if he has indicated to the Secretary General of the United Nations that at the commencement of an agreed and supervised withdrawal of Argentine forces from the Falkland Islands, Her Majesty's Government would be willing to start withdrawing certain elements of the British task force.

Mr. Onslow: I shall write to my hon. Friend.

Mr. Deakins: asked the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if, in his international discussions on the Falkland Islands, he is making a clear distinction between the islands and the dependencies.

Mr. Onslow: I shall write to the hon. Member.

Passports

Mr. Ernie Ross asked the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs in what circumstances Her Majesty's Government issue passports to young men for a single year rather than full 10-year passports which have been applied for.

Mr. Rifkind: Passports are occasionally issued for periods of validity of less than 10 years, but this does not apply in particular to young men, who are dealt with on the same basis as all other applicants.

Argentina

Mr. Teddy Taylor asked the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if he has obtained from the European Commission or from member States of the European Economic Community an assessment of the broad percentage of their imports from the Argentine which is covered by continuing contracts and thereby excluded from the ban on imports under the European Economic Community agreement on sanctions.

Mr. Hurd: We have not obtained any such assessment. It would be difficult in free market economies to obtain this information.

Mr. Teddy Taylor asked the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs if he will obtain from the European Economic Community an estimate of the effect on the volume of Argentine exports to the European Economic Community since the policy of sanctions on imports, excepting goods in transit and continuing contracts, was agreed by the European Economic Community.

Mr. Hurd: We have no plans to seek such an estimate. The information on which a meaningful estimate would be based would in any case not be available for some time.

ENVIRONMENT

Planning Charges

Mr. McKelvey asked the Secretary of State for the Environment how much local authorities spent to implement the introduction of planning charges.

Mr. Giles Shaw: Implementation in England and Wales of the scheme for charging for planning applications is estimated to have cost of the order of £2 million in the first year. We do not have detailed evidence of costs either form CIPFA or other sources.

Inner City Areas (Capital Programmes)

Mr. McKelvey asked the Secretary of State for the Environment whether additional public expenditure would be necessary to restore to 1979 levels the capital programmes of the areas defined as inner city areas; and, if so, how much.

Mr. Giles Shaw: The capital expenditure allocations for all designated inner city partnership and programme authorities for 1982-83 for all services under the new capital control system are £810 million. These authorities will also receive the major proportion of the resources, some £228 million, available for urban programme and derelic land reclamation schemes. They can augment these allocations in a number of ways, particularly by using capital receipts, including 5 per cent. of receipts from council house sales.

In 1979-80 the total capital expenditure for the same authorities was £1,086 million; however, this also includes expenditure on law and order services which is not covered by the capital control system and which could not be taken out of the 1979-80 figures except at undue expense.

Land Purchases

Mr. Andrew F. Bennett asked the Secretary of State for the Environment if he will list all land bought by him, or land bought by someone else, with assistance from the National Land Fund, between 1946 and 1980 and all land bought by him, or land bought by someone else, with assistance from the National Heritage Memorial Fund since 1980; who now owns and manages the lands; and which of them are open to public access.

Mr. Giles Shaw: The activities of the National Land Fund, until its demise in 1980, were the responsibility of

Falkland Islands

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—[Mr. Thompson.]

3.43 pm

The Prime Minister (Mrs. Margaret Thatcher): Seven weeks ago today the Argentine Foreign Minister summoned the British ambassador in Buenos Aires and informed him that the diplomatic channel was now closed. Later on that same day President Reagan appealed to President Galtieri not to invade the Falkland Islands. That appeal was rejected.

Ever since 2 April Argentina has continued to defy the mandatory resolution of the Security Council. During the past 24 hours the crisis over the Falkland Islands has moved into a new and even more serious phase.

On Monday of this week our ambassador to the United Nations handed to the Secretary-General our proposals for a peaceful settlement of the dispute. These proposals represented the limit to which the Government believe it was right to go. We made it clear to Senor Perez de Cuellar that we expected the Argentine Government to give us a very rapid response to them.

By yesterday morning we had had a first indication of the Argentine reaction. It was not encouraging. By the evening we received their full response in writing. It was in effect a total rejection of the British proposals. Indeed, in many respects the Argentine reply went back to their position when they rejected Mr. Haig's second set of proposals on 29 April. It retracted virtually all the movement that their representative had shown during the Secretary-General's efforts to find a negotiated settlement. I shall have some more to say about his efforts later.

The implications of the Argentine response are of the utmost gravity. This is why the Government decided to publish immediately the proposals that we had put to the Secretary-General and to give the House the earliest opportunity to consider them. These proposals were placed in the Vote Office earlier today. The Government believe that they represented a truly responsible effort to find a peaceful solution which both preserved the fundamental principles of our position and offered the opportunity to stop further loss of life in the South Atlantic.

We have reached this very serious situation because the Argentines clearly decided at the outset of the negotiations that they would cling to the spoils of invasion and occupation by thwarting at every turn all the attempts that have been made to solve the conflict by peaceful means. Ever since 2 April they have responded to the efforts to find a negotiated solution with obduracy and delay, deception and bad faith.

We have now been negotiating for six weeks. The House will recall the strenuous efforts made over an extended period by Secretary of State Haig. During that period my ministerial colleagues and I considered no fewer than four sets of proposals. Although these presented substantial difficulties, we did our best to help Mr. Haig continue his mission, until Argentine rejection of his last proposals left him no alternative but to abandon his efforts.

The next stage of negotiations was based on proposals originally advanced by president Belaunde of Peru and modified in consultations between him and Mr. Haig. As my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs informed the House on 7 May, Britain was willing to accept these, the fifth set of

proposals, for an interim settlement. They could have led to an almost immediate ceasefire. But again it was Argentina that rejected them.

I shall not take up the time of the House with a detailed description of those earlier proposals, partly because they belong to those who devised them, but, more importantly, because they are no longer on the negotiating table. Britain is not now committed to them.

Since 6 May, when it became clear that the United States-Peruvian proposals were not acceptable to Argentina, the United Nations Secretary-General, Senor Perez de Cuellar, has been conducting negotiations with Britain and Argentina.

Following several rounds of discussions, the United Kingdom representative at the United Nations was summoned to London for consultation last Sunday. On Monday Sir Anthony Parsons returned to New York and presented to the Secretary-General a draft interim agreement between Britain and Argentina which set out the British position in full. He made it clear that the text represented the furthest that Britain could go in the negotiations. He requested that the draft should be transmitted to the Argentine representative and that he should be asked to convey his Government's response within two days.

Yesterday we received the Argentine Government's reply. It amounted to a rejection of our own proposals, and we have so informed the Secretary-General. This morning we have received proposals from the Secretary-General himself.

It will help the House to understand the present position if I now describe briefly these three sets of proposals.

I deal first with our own proposals. These preserve the fundamental principles which are the basis of the Government's position. Aggression must not be allowed to succeed. International law must be upheld. Sovereignty cannot be changed by invasion.

The liberty of the Falkland Islanders must be restored. For years they have been free to express their own wishes about how they want to be governed. They have had institutions of their own choosing. They have enjoyed self-determination. Why should they lose that freedom and exchange it for dictatorship?

Our proposals are contained in two documents. First, and mainly, there is a draft interim agreement between ourselves and Argentina. Secondly, there is a letter to the Secretary-General which makes it clear that the British Government do not regard the draft interim agreement as covering the dependencies of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands.

I deal with the dependencies first. South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands are geographically distant from the Falkland Islands themselves. They have no settled population. British title to them does not derive from the Falkland Islands but is separate. These territories have been treated as dependencies of the Falkland Islands only for reasons of administrative convenience. That is why they are outside the draft agreement.

The House has before it the draft agreement, and I turn now to its main features. Article 2 provides for the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of Argentine and British forces from the islands and their surrounding waters within 14 days. At the end of the withdrawal British ships would be at least 150 nautical miles from the islands.

Rest not copied – no annotations

[Mr. Pym]

stage in the negotiations. That covers the important point raised by my hon. Friend the Member for Essex, South-East (Sir B. Braine), and others.

The House will recognise the position that I have described as the one which common sense requires. It does not in any way mean that we are no longer prepared to talk or that we will not follow up with imagination and energy any ideas which may lead to a fair settlement. We shall remain in the closest touch with the Secretary-General, who is doing all that he can to secure the implementation of resolution 502. He deserves the constructive support of all members of the United Nations. He will continue to get it from us. I hope that that answers the right hon. Gentleman. I hope that it answers also the point raised by the right hon. Member for Devonport.

Dame Judith Hart (Lanark): rose in her place and claimed to move, That the Question be now put; but MR. Speaker withheld his consent and declined then to put that Question.

Mr. Pym: We remain ready to negotiate, but we shall not do anything to give credit to the cynical Argentine pretence that they are negotiating in good faith when they are not. We have set out today what we have been prepared to do to achieve a peaceful settlement. Throughout the crisis we have been upholding the essential principles of freedom, democracy and international law and order. That is why we have been able to attract such widespread international support for our strategy since the invasion.

Mr. Dalyell rose in his place and claimed to move, That the Question be now put.

Question put, That the Question be now put:— The House divided: Ayes 33, Noes 296. Division No. 165] [9.59 pm

AYES

NOES

Abse, Leo Allaun, Frank Atkinson, N. (H'gey,) Benn, Rt Hon Tony Bennett, Andrew (St'kp'tN) Brown, Hugh D. (Provan) Canavan, Dennis Cryer, Bob Dalyell, Tam Dubs, Alfred Faulds, Andrew Hart, Rt Hon Dame Judith Holland, S. (L'b'th, Vauxh'II) Huckfield.Les Lambie David Lamond James McKelvey,William McTaggart, Robert Maxton, John

Tilley,John Wigley,Dafydd Tellers for the Ayes: Mr. Martin Flannery and Mr. Ernie Ross.

Maynard, Miss Joan

Powell, Raymond (Ogmore)

Roberts, Ernest (Hackney N)

Thomas, Dafydd (Merioneth)

Thorne, Stan (Preston South)

Meacher, Michael

Mikardo lan

Parry, Robert

Richardson, Jo

Skinner, Dennis

Roberts, Allan (Bootle)

Race, Reg

Adley,Robert
Altken,Jonathan
Alexander,Richard
Alison,RtHon Michael
Annoram,Michael
Arnold,Tom
Aspinwall,Jack
Atkins, RtHon H. (S'thorne)
Atkins, Robert (PrestonN)
Atkinson,David (B'm'th,E)
Baker,Kenneth (St. M'bone)
Baker, Kenlolas (N Dorset)
Banks,Robert

Bendall, Vivian
Bennett, Sir Frederic (*T'bay*)
Benyon, Thomas (*A'don*)
Benyon, W. (Buckingham)
Best, Keith
Biffen, Rt Hon John
Biggs-Davison, Sir John
Blackburn, John
Blackburn, John
Blackpert
Boscawen, Hon Robert
Boscawen, Hon Robert
Bostomley, Peter (W'wich W)

Beaumont-Dark, Anthony

Bowden, Andrew Boyson, DrRhodes Braine, SirBernard Bright Graham Brinton, Tim Brittan, Rt. Hon. Leon Brocklebank-Fowler, C. Brooke, Hon Peter Brotherton, Michael Brown, Michael (Brigg&Sc'n) Bruce-Gardyne, John Bryan, Sir Paul Buck, Antony Budgen Nick Burden, Sir Frederick Butcher.John Butler, Hon Adam Cadbury, Jocelyn Carlisle, John (Luton West)
Carlisle, Kenneth (Lincoln) Carlisle, Rt Hon M. (R'c'n) Chapman, Sydney Clark, Hon A. (Plym'th, S'n) Clark, Sir W. (Croydon S) Clarke, Kenneth (Rushcliffe) Clegg, Sir Walter Cockeram, Eric Colvin, Michael Cope, John Cormack, Patrick Costain, Sir Albert Cranborne, Viscount Crawshaw, Richard Crouch David Cunningham, G. (IslingtonS) Dean, Paul (North Somerset) Dorrell, Stephen Douglas-Hamilton, LordJ. Dover, Denshore du Cann, Rt Hon Edward Dunn, James A Dunn, Robert (Dartford) Durant, Tony Dykes, Hugh Eden, Rt Hon Sir John Edwards, Rt Hon N. (P'broke) Eggar, Tim Elliott, Sir William Ellis, Tom (Wrexham) Emery, Sir Peter Eyre, Reginald Farr, John Fell, Sir Anthony Finsberg, Geoffrey Fisher, Sir Nigel Fletcher, A. (Ed'nb'ah N) Fookes, Miss Janet Forman, Nigel Fowler, Rt Hon Norman Fox. Marcus Fraser, Rt Hon Sir Hugh Fraser, Peter (South Angus) Freud, Clement Gardiner, George (Reigate) Garel-Jones, Tristan Glyn, Dr Alan Goodhart, Sir Philip Goodhew, Sir Victor Goodlad, Alastair Gorst.John Gow, lan Greenway, Harry Grieve, Percy Griffiths, Peter Portsm'thN) Grylls, Michael Gummer, John Selwyn Hamilton, Hon A. Hamilton, Michael (Salisbury) Hampson, Dr Keith

Hannam, John Hastings, Stephen Havers, Rt Hon Sir Michael Hawksley, Warren Hayhoe, Barney Heath, Rt Hon Edward Heddle, John Heseltine, Rt Hon Michael Higgins, Rt Hon Terence L Hill, James Hogg, HonDouglas (Gr'th'm) Holland, Philip (Carlton) Hooson, Tom Hordern, Peter Howe, Rt Hon Sir Geoffrey Howell, Rt Hon D. (G'ldf'd) Hunt, David (Wirral) Hunt, John (Ravensbourne) Jenkins, Rt Hon Roy (Hillhead) Jessel, Toby JohnsonSmith, Geoffrey Johnston, Russell (Inverness) Jopling, RtHonMichael Joseph, Rt Hon Sir Keith Kaberry, Sir Donald Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Elaine Kershaw, Sir Anthony Kimball, SirMarcus King, Rt Hon Tom Kitson, SirTimothy Knight, MrsJill Knox, David Lamont, Norman Lang, lan Langford-Holt, SirJohn Latham, Michael Lawrence, Ivan Lawson, Rt Hon Nigel Lee John Lennox-Boyd, HonMark Lester, Jim (Beeston) Lewis, Kenneth (Rutland) Lloyd, lan (Havant & W'loo) Lloyd, Peter (Fareham) Loveridge, John Luce.Richard Lvell.Nicholas McCrindle, Robert Macfarlane, Neil MacGregor, John MacKay, John (Argyll) Macmillan, Rt Hon M. McNair-Wilson, M. (N'bury) McNally, Thoma McQuarrie, Albert Madel, David Major, John Marland Paul Marlow, Antony Marshall, Michael (Arundel) Marten, Rt Hon Neil Mates, Michael Mawby, Ray Mawhinney, DrBrian Maxwell-Hyslop, Robin Mellor, David Meyer, Sir Anthony Miller, Hal (B'grove) Mills, Iain (Meriden) Mills, Peter (West Devon) Miscampbell, Norman Mitchell, R. C. (Soton Itchen) Moate, Roger Molyneaux, James Monro, Sir Hector Moore, John Morris, M. (N'hamptonS) Morrison, Hon C. (Devizes) Morrison, Hon P. (Chester) Murphy, Christopher