

# Home Affairs Committee

Committee Office House of Commons London SW1A 0AA  
Tel +44 (0)20 7219 2049 Email [homeaffcom@parliament.uk](mailto:homeaffcom@parliament.uk)  
Website [www.parliament.uk/homeaffcomk](http://www.parliament.uk/homeaffcomk)

From the Committee Chair

27 April 2018

Rt Hon Amber Rudd MP  
Home Secretary  
Home Office  
2 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DF

Dear Amber

Thank you for giving evidence to the Home Affairs Committee on Wednesday.

I am obviously extremely concerned about the inaccuracies in the information we were given both by you and by Glyn Williams, and about the changing information given to Parliament from the Home Office.

I am writing to ask for urgent clarity on the facts, and also to follow up some of the other points raised at the meeting. The Committee would be grateful for the following information:

## **Removals targets**

On Friday it was reported that you, the then Immigration Minister and your office had been sent information in July 2017 which both referred to targets and reported performance against those targets, stating: "Immigration Enforcement has set a target of achieving 12,800 enforced returns in 2017-18 [...] This will move us along the path toward the 10% increased performance on enforced returns which we promised the Home Secretary earlier this year."

It is important for the Committee to have the full facts when examining this important issue.

Please can you tell us as a matter of urgency:

- At what point did you become aware of targets for removals?
- Did you agree to a target or objective of a 10% increase in enforced returns, as suggested by the 21 June 2017 memo?
- Did you agree to or sign off the IE target of achieving 12,800 enforced returns in 2017-2018?
- Did you see the 21 June 2017 memo?
- Do you or your private office receive regular summaries of immigration performance?
- How do you explain your statement to the Committee that there were no targets?
- How do you explain your statement to the House of Commons that you were neither aware nor had agreed to those targets?
- How do you explain the fact that Mr Williams also said he was not aware of those targets when he gave evidence on Wednesday?

Please can you also provide the following information:

### **Enforcement action**

- A guarantee that no-one from the pre-1973 Windrush generation is currently in detention or subject to reporting requirements.
- How many people from this cohort have been detained in the last four years and their length of detention?
- Whether your checks for deportation include administrative removal?
- What information is the Home Office searching for in their examination of removal documents? i.e. if a person could not prove they were in the pre-1973 cohort at the time of detention, how is the Home Office able to check whether anyone from this cohort has been removed?
- How many people have been denied re-entry?
- How many people from this cohort have had their passports seized or not renewed, as in the cases described by Sarah Jones and Satbir Singh?
- What targets for removals existed in the Home Office, for example, were caseworkers given targets to meet in terms of the number of cases forwarded to enforcement teams and what targets were those enforcement teams working to?

### **New task force**

- An update on the progress and workload of the task force in dealing with pre-1973 Windrush cases.
- How much and what type of evidence is required by the new task force to satisfy the balance of probabilities?
- Whether negative decisions will be subject to appeal?
- Details of the advice being provided to people coming forward from the 1973-1988 cohort, examples of common cases and how they are being treated, particularly with regard to fees.
- Whether similar support to the Pre-1973 cohort will be made available to individuals in a similar position from the Chagos Islands and Somaliland?

### **Compensation**

- What underlying principles will support the proposed compensation scheme? For example, will the scheme cover not just objective costs such as loss of earnings, benefits and legal costs incurred, but also compensate people for the distress and personal tragedy that has been caused to them, including - where appropriate – the cost of returning to their lawful life in the UK?

### **Biometric residency permits**

- Some people who have attempted to resolve their cases have been granted BRMs but have been told that they will have to apply again in several years' time and are understandably anxious about the process. What advice do you give to people such as Paulette Wilson who are in this situation?

### **Correspondence and guidance**

- Copies of any correspondence from other government departments, such as the Foreign Office, which raised concerns about the treatment of this cohort of people, and the Home Office reply.
- Information received by Home Office Ministers about the concerns of the Caribbean Commonwealth High Commissioners raised with the FCO in May 2016, and what action was taken.
- Copies of the guidance that you have sent out to other departments in the last few weeks about the Windrush cohort.

I would be grateful for your immediate response to the questions concerning removals targets, and your response to the remaining questions by Wednesday 2 May.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yvette Cooper', written in a cursive style.

**Yvette Cooper MP**