

From: Rt Hon Stephen Flynn MP <stephen.flynn.mp@parliament.uk>

Date: 28 November 2025

Type: MP response

Personal data removed: recipient details and email metadata.

Good afternoon,

Many thanks for taking the time to contact me on this incredibly important matter – I hope this finds you well.

Thank you also for your thoughts on the UK Government’s proposed immigration and settlement reforms. Many constituents have contacted me about these plans, and it is clear that the Home Office has created a great deal of uncertainty and anxiety for people who have followed every rule placed before them.

A common concern raised with me is the government’s willingness to alter key requirements retrospectively for people already on established routes to settlement or naturalisation. Changing the terms halfway through undermines basic fairness and damages trust in a system that should be predictable, transparent, and rooted in respect for those who uphold the law. These proposals also fail to recognise the realities of Scotland’s tax structure and labour market, creating outcomes that are both impractical and unjust for people who live and work here.

For your reassurance, I can confirm that I have since written directly to the UK Government’s Home Secretary, Shabana Mahmood MP, and have requested clear assurances that individuals who have complied fully with existing rules will not be penalised by these policy shifts – I would be happy to share this response when I receive it.

Whilst I understand that this will remain a deeply concerning matter, please do let me know if there’s anything else I can do assist going forward.

With kind regards,
Stephen

Stephen Flynn
MP for Aberdeen South



The Rt Hon Diane Abbott MP

Member of Parliament for Hackney North and Stoke Newington
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

diane.abbott.office@parliament.uk

Tel: (020) 7219 4426

Our Ref: [REDACTED]
2nd December 2025

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your email and for taking the time to set out your circumstances so clearly. I am sorry for the distress that these recent policy announcements have caused you and your wife. I also want to thank you for everything you both contribute to our community. Care workers and health workers keep this country running, and I am grateful that you have chosen to make Hackney your home.

You raise a very serious issue. The Government's suggestion that far-reaching changes to the route to Indefinite Leave to Remain could apply retrospectively to people already on established visas is deeply alarming. People should be able to rely on the terms under which they came to the UK. Any attempt to lengthen qualifying periods, impose new evidential requirements, or add behavioural and integration tests part-way through an individual's journey would amount to a betrayal. It would be unjust and destabilising for families who have acted in good faith and built their lives here. It would also undermine trust in the entire immigration system.

More broadly, I am very concerned about the direction of the Government's immigration and asylum policy. Proposals to raise income thresholds for family visas, restrict dependants for key workers, and tighten eligibility for work routes will have far-reaching consequences for families, employers and essential public services. These changes will separate families, intensify shortages in the care sector and other vital areas, and push many people who have lived, worked and paid taxes here for years into new and unnecessary insecurity.

As I set out recently, these reforms reflect a punitive approach that treats migrants, refugees and care workers not as human beings and contributors to society, but as targets for political point scoring. This is reaching for ever more extreme measures instead of investing in functioning asylum processing, safe routes and a fair and humane immigration system. We must instead oppose policies that foster division, drive families into hardship and undermine the rights of people who are already part of our communities.

Please be assured that I have raised these matters in Parliament and that I have also written directly to the Home Secretary to set out my concerns about the retrospective nature of the proposals and the impact on constituents like yourself. I will continue to press the Government to honour the original settlement terms for those already on the Skilled Worker (Health and

Care) route, and to ensure that any policy changes include fair transitional arrangements. I will also continue to challenge immigration reforms that are harmful, unworkable or unjust.

Thank you again for writing to me, and for all that you and your wife contribute through your work in our community.

Yours sincerely,

Rt Hon Diane Abbott MP
Member of Parliament for Hackney North and Stoke Newington



Rt Hon Jeremy Corbyn MP
Member of Parliament for Islington North

Rt. Hon. Shabana Mahmood MP
Home Secretary
Home Office
Unit 2 Marsham Street
SW1P 4DF

8 January 2025

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to share my grave concerns over the government's proposed changes to visa rules for care workers.

In November, you announced your plans to extend the number of years that an individual must have lawfully lived in the UK before they are eligible to apply for Indefinite Leave to Remain. Under the proposals, the standard qualifying period will increase from 5 years to 10 years. For care workers on Health and Care Worker visas, the qualifying period is set to triple to 15 years.

These changes are devastating for thousands of health and social care workers, who will now find it much harder to settle in Britain. In turn, this will have a catastrophic impact on the care sector by deepening the already severe workforce crisis.

I have met several constituents in recent weeks who have come to me in distress about the proposed changes. One of my constituents arrived in the UK in September 2023 through the Health and Care Worker Visa route. She described to me the exploitation and precarity she has endured as a care worker, which forced her to take on an additional part-time job to survive. "And yet we continue to care", she said.

She wrote to me saying: "The people we support never saw the pain behind the smile. They saw a carer who held their hand. Who listened. Who reassured. Who made them feel safe. We put smiles on the faces of the nation's loved ones while our own children live with fear and uncertainty. All we ask is that our families, too, be allowed to smile."

She is one of many constituents who are terrified by the proposed changes. Carers, teachers, cleaners, you name it: people who have come to this country and contributed so much are fearful for their future in this country. The government's plans treat care workers with contempt, and exhibit the opposite of gratitude for those who have dedicated their lives to supporting people in need.



Rt Hon Jeremy Corbyn MP
Member of Parliament for Islington North

I am writing to amplify my constituents' demands to:

1. **Protect the 5-year ILR qualifying period.**
2. **End employer-tied visas** that allow exploitation to flourish, and instead create a fair, sector-wide sponsorship model.
3. **Introduce a Fair Pay Agreement** to ensure proper pay, rights, and working conditions for care workers.

The government's proposed changes to ILR are part of a much wider assault on the rights and dignity of people who have made this country a better place. The crises we face in society are not caused by migrants and refugees. They're caused by a grotesquely unequal economic system that concentrates wealth and power in the hands of the few.

This government needs to wake up and realise that it will not defeat Reform by imitating them. It will only embolden them. A change in direction is long overdue – and it is time for this government to defend a system of immigration and asylum based on dignity, humanity and respect.

Yours sincerely,

Jeremy Corbyn
Independent MP for Islington North

From: Peter Swallow MP <peter.swallow.mp@parliament.uk>

Date: 12 January 2026

Subject: Fair settlement pathway for Skilled Workers

Type: MP response

Personal data removed: recipient details, case reference, email metadata and forwarding information.

Thank you very much for taking the time to share your experience and your concerns about the Government's proposed changes to our immigration and asylum system with me.

I believe the British people want to see an immigration system based on fairness - one where we are able to act compassionately towards those fleeing conflict or crisis, while ensuring we have overall control of our immigration system. No system in which people are forced to risk their lives crossing the channel on small boats in order to seek asylum in this country is functioning correctly, and it is clear that the system we inherited was neither controlled nor fair.

I understand that many people will have strong feelings about the proposals announced by the Home Secretary. I want to be clear that I believe that immigration has contributed a great deal to this country, and I am proud of the diversity it has brought with it. I also believe that the UK has a proud history of welcoming people fleeing persecution and conflict, and that this is a national duty we must always uphold.

I understand that the proposals concerning "earned settlement" are a source of anxiety for many. As you may be aware, the proposals are currently under consultation. Importantly, this consultation explicitly seeks views on transitional arrangements for those already in this country, and I would strongly encourage people affected by the proposals to share their views directly through the consultation.

I want to assure you that I believe that any changes to the immigration system must be introduced in a staggered way, respecting that many people have already come to this country on the basis of a clear settlement route, and that the rules should not change beneath their feet. I have raised this directly in a Westminster Hall debate.

I do welcome that, under the current proposals, the Government has outlined several ways in which the new qualification period can be reduced, for example that those working in public sector healthcare and teaching roles could still qualify after five years, and that volunteering in the community would allow indefinite leave to remain after five to seven years. It is very important that we recognise the large contributions many migrants make to our public services and society more broadly, and I am pleased that the Government has signalled that it is open to recognising meaningful contributions to this country beyond fiscal measurements such as income and tax contribution.

Thank you again for sharing your views and personal experience with me. Although I appreciate this is a complex and difficult issue, I hope that the above does set out my views on the proposed reforms, and what I am pushing for from the Government. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any other questions or would like to discuss this with me further.

Best wishes,

Peter Swallow MP

Member of Parliament for Bracknell, Crowthorne, Sandhurst and Whitegrove

From: Stella Creasy MP office@workingforwalthamstow.org.uk

Date: Monday, 2 February 2026, 13:52

Subject: The Future of Immigration Policy – Update for Walthamstow Residents from Stella Creasy MP

Hello

I'm writing to you as someone who has been in touch with my office about immigration legislation to update you on my ongoing discussions with Ministers about this topic. I apologise that this email is impersonal and lengthy - I have written it myself but as so many residents have written about this issue and raised a variety of concerns I wanted to try to update you all.

Getting this right in this country matters for many reasons and I know from your correspondence that Walthamstow residents hold a wide variety of views about immigration and what its impact is or should be. Debates in public life about immigration and asylum are increasingly toxic -both off and online making separating fact from fiction harder to achieve. You can see a short video I made recently about this here:

<https://www.facebook.com/share/v/16vfhScinM/>

As the Government also looks to reform the system again and is currently consulting on an 'earned citizenship' model I have also spoken out about past mistakes which continue to blight the lives of people in Walthamstow- you can read this here in the recent coverage of a Windrush case from our community:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2026/jan/26/im-part-of-this-country-windrush-man-left-homeless-by-home-office-inaction>

Above all I know our immigration system needs to change because I see so many local residents experience hardship and uncertainty with the status quo, and a wider society that struggles to plan effectively as a result. The time I give to this subject as your MP is therefore as much about how change should happen and finding a way through the sharp divisions on this topic, as it is to scrutinising any current proposals being put forward. Our community in Walthamstow has been enriched by those who have made it home- both economically and culturally- and I wish to ensure that we can continue to experience those benefits whilst addressing the problems that mean reform is required.

Thank you to everyone who sent me case studies of how the current proposals would affect them or their business- I had hoped to meet with Ministers before Christmas on this issue, but our meeting was delayed until the week before last. Following our

discussion the Minister has agreed to continue talking to me about these proposals and has asked for a copy of these case studies which I will anonymise so he can study them in more detail.

The case studies show the distress many of you feel that any change could be retrospective- such as increasing the time before which anyone can apply for settled status or removing the right to apply for citizenship even if you have status because you arrived through an irregular route. Walthamstow residents have consistently highlighted how this would put those affected in a precarious position – facing challenges to secure work and so be self sufficient, housing or with life administration such as getting a bank account.

I raised these concerns with the Minister and am pleased to say that he acknowledged the case that transitional protection for those already here in the UK must be included in any reforms. He committed that any changes must also take account of the age of applicants, their family status including periods of maternity and parental leave as well as illness. He was also clear that partners of British citizens would be exempted from these changes- though I recognise there are remaining concerns as to how this will be achieved.

I also highlighted to the Minister that the proposals themselves could deter those with skills and talents from coming to the UK. Many of you have shared with me your plans to potentially move because of the uncertainty these changes would create in your ability to progress in your chosen career or settle in the UK. I shared this with the Minister and the evidence of the negative economic and social impact this could have on our community and our country. I also set out my concerns about restricting benefits from those who have also made national insurance payments - given this is the basis for our contributory system – and plans that would increase even further the period before anyone here on a health and social care visa could apply for settled status and restrictions on their earning potential during this time. The minister agreed to look in detail at the practical implications of this for several Walthamstow residents.

Above all, I pressed the Minister that immigration reform should be focused on the decision to grant a visa, and the original conditions of securing one, rather than creating an environment which makes working and living in the UK once you are here more difficult and costly. In my ongoing work on this I will continue to press for proposals to focus on how to clarify purpose of travel and residency as an alternative to retrospective measures.

I also flagged with the Minister how recent changes around visas for skilled workers and the increase in the threshold from RQF level 3 to RQF level 6 in order to apply for one did not reflect the high regard we should all have for vocational skills and qualifications. I shared with the Minister that many of you have experienced

difficulties with recruitment or employers because this change doesn't reflect either the incomes that these roles generate, or a category that means you know you can renew your visa if you wish. Finally I also highlighted my concerns at the treatment of refugees, and the proposal to refuse citizenship, but not leave to remain, to those who had travelled by irregular routes to the UK as an automatic decision.

In my next meeting with him I hope to be able to explore how reform will impact EU citizens, those who came from Ukraine and on British National Overseas visas, questions around student visas, domestic worker visas, ECAA visas and the healthcare surcharges and costs of application. I do not have a date for this discussion as yet but will keep residents informed as and when I do. If you had intended to send me a case study but had not yet done so please do respond to this email so that I may add to my evidence dossier on this matter.

I hope even if you do not agree with the concerns that I have raised it is of interest to hear of these ongoing debates within parliament. Please do feel free to share with other local residents interested in immigration policies. I would also encourage you to join our in person 'town hall style' discussions to share your views on these matters as this issue has come up frequently. The next one is scheduled for Thursday 19th February at 7pm in a central Walthamstow location – if you can make it please reply to this email to RSVP and for the venue details.

With kind regards

Stella Creasy MP

From: Office of Margaret Mullane MP

Date: 17 February 2026

Subject: Government's proposed changes to UK immigration policy

Type: MP response

Personal data removed: recipient details, case reference and email metadata.

Thank you for contacting me regarding the Government's proposed changes to UK immigration policy.

I share your concerns about the proposed changes, particularly in relation to fairness within the settlement system and the long-established five-year route to Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) for skilled workers. Any changes to settlement pathways must be transparent, proportionate, and fair to those who have made significant contributions to our country and communities.

As soon as the proposed changes were announced, as your Member of Parliament, I wrote to the Home Secretary requesting that a 'grandfather clause' be added to the incoming changes. This would mean that those already on the five-year route to settlement would be unaffected by the proposals, with the incoming changes only applying to new routes.

This is something I continue to promote. I share concerns that this change, if implemented in full, would move the goalposts for thousands of workers, creating insecurity and undermining the ethos which underpins the new "earned settlement" model.

In response, the Department stated:

"The earned settlement model will, however, allow earlier settlement for those who meet criteria linked to contribution, integration and residence.

"Shorter pathways will remain for dependents of British citizens (five years), and safeguards will be retained for vulnerable groups, including victims of domestic abuse."

In December, I met with UNISON members from Dagenham and Rainham working in the care sector to hear directly from individuals on work visas and settlement routes. Their experiences reinforced the very real anxieties that these proposed changes are creating for care workers and their families. In the coming weeks I am also hosting members of UNISON in Parliament to discuss again their Fair Visa Campaign and what I can do to support them.

In January and February, I further escalated my concerns as a member of the Home Affairs Select Committee, where I questioned Professor Alan Manning (London School of Economics and Political Science), Nicolas Rollason (Partner, Kingsley Napley LLP), and Dr Madeleine Sumption (Director, Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford) about the implications of changes to settlement routes, particularly for care workers and other key sectors.

Through Home Affairs Select Committee I also had the opportunity to question the Home Secretary directly regarding the issue of fairness. You can see my contributions on the committee via the links below.

PANEL: <https://www.facebook.com/reel/2880692578801911/>

HOME SECRETARY: <https://www.facebook.com/reel/2050825005759006>

Please be assured that I will continue to press the Secretary of State and the Government to ensure that any proposed changes to immigration policy uphold fairness, recognise contribution, and provide clarity and security for those who have built their lives here.

Thank you again for taking the time to write to me about this important matter.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Mullane MP

Cameron Thomas MP



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Hon. Shabana Mahmood MP

Secretary of State
Home Office
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

17 February 2026

Dear Home Secretary,

I write regarding the injustice represented by your immigration reforms, and to urge you to reconsider.

I believe that when we make a deal with somebody, we are honour-bound to keep it. For one party to thereafter alter the terms of said deal would, and should bring into question the reliability and integrity of that party, and in the context of the UK's international reputation, the prevalence of that question should not be underestimated.

For the UK to alter the terms offered to migrants over Indefinite Leave to Remain, after those migrants have settled, often with their families, would be a grave misjudgement and betrayal of our values. Beyond the reputational damage such an alteration would make, it would further damage the social contract which the Conservative Party did so much to denigrate, and increase pressure on an already crippled social care sector.

I agree with you on the requirement for a controlled approach to immigration and will consider each of your reforms on its own merit. I hope that you would agree with me, that we should execute our duty to the country respectfully, and that is why I am hopeful that you will honour the terms of ILR for those already contributing to the UK. To retrospectively change the terms that those families were offered, would be to minimise their contribution and undermine our values of fairness and respect.

I urge you to rule out blanket, retrospective application of changes to ILR.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Cameron Thomas".

Cameron Thomas
Member of Parliament for Tewkesbury

From: Office of Apsana Begum MP <officeofapsanabegum@parliament.uk>

Date: 25 March 2026

Type: MP response / Parliamentary correspondence

Personal data removed: recipient details, case reference, email metadata and forwarding information.

Thank you for contacting me about this important matter.

I value the contribution made by those who come to live in the UK. I have always acknowledged that the movement of people around the world has enriched our society, our economy, and our culture.

I am therefore alarmed at the increasing use of anti-migrant rhetoric across the mainstream political and media landscape.

I strongly disagree with assertions that migration has a negative impact on our public services and housing supply. I note that it is not migrants, but Governments, who have underfunded and privatised the NHS, failed to build council housing or enforce rent controls on landlords.

As such I share concerns regarding the Government's proposals laid out in 'A Fairer Pathway to Settlement', and currently open for consultation, which explicitly seeks views on "options to reduce the current forecast volumes" of people migrating to the UK.

I am aware that the consultation includes plans to extend the standard qualifying period for permanent residence, also known as indefinite leave to remain, ILR, or settlement, from five to ten years, as part of plans for a new "Earned Settlement", which, as the Work Rights Centre has pointed out, "effectively penalise people who get sick, are exploited, or become destitute".

It is particularly troubling to me that the Home Secretary proposes to apply these changes retrospectively, so that everyone who is currently in the UK and not settled yet will be affected once the rules are updated.

I am all too conscious of the anxiety that these proposals, which the Workers' Rights Centre has called "an extraordinary betrayal of migrant communities", has caused to people in the UK who now face years of uncertainty over their status. The charity Praxis, which works to support migrants in the UK, explains that "attaining settlement means no longer having to worry about visa fees, being turned away from state support, or waiting for Home Office decision" and that the doubling of the qualifying period means that "most people will be forced to wait an entire decade before they can have any certainty about their future."

I understand that more than 45 human rights groups including the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) and Asylum Matters have published a statement opposing the proposals and the accompanying consultation "in its entirety", calling

them “fundamentally racist and classist”, and that trade unions including Unite and Unison, the UK’s largest unions have opposed the proposals.

I am utterly opposed to all of these proposals.

I spoke at the Westminster Hall Debate on Indefinite Leave to Remain on 8 September 2025.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2025-09-08/debates/25EC2767-BBFF-4FE8-8F52-65B2C28CED10/IndefiniteLeaveToRemain>

I also spoke on Immigration Reforms during a debate on Tuesday 17 March 2026.

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2026-03-17/debates/4F72CE9C-6D61-4E45-BC07-E520ACF795B7/ImmigrationReforms>

In both debates, I have firmly highlighted the concerns above and the issues you have raised.

The incredible efforts of refugee and migrant rights campaigners across the UK have demonstrated that overall, many want a fair asylum system, based on compassion and human rights.

I have and will always stand up for refugee and migrant rights - both in Parliament and beyond.

Thank you for contacting me about this important issue.

Yours sincerely,

Office of Apsana Begum
Member of Parliament for Poplar and Limehouse

Please note we will try to reply to your e-mail within **21 working days** of having received it. Each case is dealt with in the order received, except urgent and emergency cases which will be dealt with as a priority.

Parliamentary Office:
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

T - 0207 219 6826

E - apsana.begum.mp@parliament.uk

F - www.facebook.com/ApsanaBegum

Twitter: @ApsanaBegumMP

Website: <https://apsanabegum.com/>

Data Protection & Privacy Policy: <https://apsanabegum.com/data-protection-and-privacy-policy/>

From: Paul Davies MP <Paul.Davies.MP@parliament.uk >

Date: 1 April 2026

Subject: Case Ref:

Type: MP response

Personal data removed: recipient details and salutation.

Thank you for your follow up on this. I hope the response from the Minister for Migration and Citizenship provided some clarity.

You are right that the Government is consulting on the proposed reforms, and that the consultation specifically seeks views on whether transitional arrangements should apply to those already on a pathway to settlement.

In my view, it is important that our migration system works and that it is fair and properly managed. I recognise that we are at a moment of crisis, with continued pressures on living standards, the rise of the far right, and the impact of unpredictable geo-politics dividing our society. When faced with this division, we must work together to build integrated, cohesive, and resilient communities, and it is critical that we view reform of the asylum system in this way.

With this in mind, I believe that the new earned settlement policy should not apply to individuals who are already on the current five-year route. As you say, many of these people have already made serious life decisions based on the existing framework, and I believe it would be unfair to disrupt that.

It may interest you to know that I have joined many of my colleagues to call on the Government to carefully consider the importance of integration, cohesion, and fairness in its asylum reform, particularly as it analyses feedback from the public consultation.

I appreciate the concerns you have raised. Please be assured that I am doing all I can to ensure our system reflects the goal of building a shared sense of belonging and Britishness. I believe this is essential to our national renewal.

Kind regards,

Paul Davies MP
Member of Parliament for Colne Valley Constituency
House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

From: Office of Apsana Begum MP <officeofapsanabegum@parliament.uk>

Date: 6 May 2026

Subject: ILR Pathway

Type: MP response

Personal data removed: recipient details and salutation.

Thank you for contacting me about this important matter.

I value the contribution made by those who come to live in the UK. I have always acknowledged that the movement of people around the world has enriched our society, our economy, and our culture.

I am therefore alarmed at the increasing use of anti-migrant rhetoric across the mainstream political and media landscape.

I strongly disagree with assertions that migration has a negative impact on our public services and housing supply. I note that it is not migrants, but Governments, who have underfunded and privatised the NHS, failed to build council housing or enforce rent controls on landlords.

As such I share concerns regarding the Government's proposals laid out in 'A Fairer Pathway to Settlement', and currently open for consultation, which explicitly seeks views on "options to reduce the current forecast volumes" of people migrating to the UK.

I am aware that the consultation includes plans to extend the standard qualifying period for permanent residence (also known as indefinite leave to remain, ILR, or settlement) from five to ten years, as part of plans for a new "Earned Settlement", which, as the Work Rights Centre has pointed out, "effectively penalise people who get sick, are exploited, or become destitute".

It is particularly troubling to me that the Home Secretary proposes to apply these changes retroactively, so that everyone who is currently in the UK and not settled yet will be affected once the rules are updated.

I am all too conscious of the anxiety that these proposals, which the Workers' Rights Centre has called "an extraordinary betrayal of migrant communities", has caused to people in the UK who now face years of uncertainty over their status. The charity Praxis, which works to support migrants in the UK, explains that "attaining settlement means no longer having to worry about visa fees, being turned away from state support, or waiting for Home Office decision" and that the doubling of the qualifying period means that "most people will be forced to wait an entire decade before they can have any certainty about their future."

I understand that more than 45 human rights groups including the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) and Asylum Matters have published a statement opposing the proposals and the accompanying consultation “in its entirety”, calling them “fundamentally racist and classist”, and that trade unions including Unite and Unison, the UK’s largest unions have opposed the proposals.

I am utterly opposed to all of these proposals.

I am aware that the Government has clarified that people from Hong Kong on British National Overseas (BNO) visas, and spouses and dependents of British citizens who meet core family requirements (such as a minimum income requirement), will keep a five-year route to settlement. They will, however, be subject to new mandatory requirements for settlement, which include making any debt to the Government, including NHS debt, grounds for refusal of settlement.

There is also a new requirement that people on BN(O) visas have an earned income above £12,570 for 3-5 years prior to applying for settlement is new. As charities and campaigners have pointed out, this is likely to discriminate against anyone who is more likely to be in a low-paid, part-time role or unable to work, namely women, people with disabilities or mental and physical health conditions, and people with caring responsibilities.

I am extremely concerned that the introduction of these new mandatory criteria may exclude a significant number of existing BN(O) visa holders from ever reaching ILR. As commentators have noted, this risks shutting many people out of eligibility entirely. I agree that it is deeply unjust that people who have moved from Hong Kong to the UK under the promise that they would be offered settlement and stability, should have their lives disrupted in this way.

I spoke at the Westminster Hall Debate on Indefinite Leave to Remain on 8 September 2025 as shown here-

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2025-09-08/debates/25EC2767-BBFF-4FE8-8F52-65B2C28CED10/IndefiniteLeaveToRemain>

and can be viewed here-

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rxLxQHSeKL8>

I also spoke at a Westminster Hall debate on 02 February 2026 on ILR, demanding, “When will the impact assessments be published? Given the potentially wide-ranging impacts on all our communities and the economy, including on local authorities and voluntary service providers, how does the Home Office reconcile the

potential impacts of the proposals on migrant families with the Government's wider commitments to reduce child poverty and homelessness in particular, as laid out in their respective strategies published last year?"

Also asking, "How can the Home Office justify retrospective applications of the changes to more than 1 million people who came to the UK on the understanding that they would be able to settle after five years? For the educators in my constituency, many of whom contacted me over the weekend, I ask: will the changes apply to all staff in the education sector? As we know, professional services staff in the education sector play an essential role, but their salaries make alternative settlement routes inaccessible."

Please view the Hansard transcript of my key asks here-

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2026-02-02/debates/A0693D73-AD95-418E-86A6-FAB882454522/IndefiniteLeaveToRemain>

Further, I also spoke on Immigration Reforms during a debate on Tuesday 17 March 2026, asking questions about survivors of domestic violence, as well as those on EECAA routes as outlined here-

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2026-03-17/debates/4F72CE9C-6D61-4E45-BC07-E520ACF795B7/ImmigrationReforms>

On 11 March 2026 I met constituents at a lobby on the changes to ILR, specifically 'Lobby Day: The Government's "earned settlement" proposals', to speak to them directly.

In addition, I attended the UNISON Lobby Day of Migrant Carers on December 17th 2025.

<https://x.com/ApsanaBegumMP/status/2001297737719988361>

The incredible efforts of refugee and migrant rights campaigners across the UK have demonstrated that overall, many want a fair asylum system, based on compassion and human rights.

I will always stand up for refugee and migrant rights as I have always done - both in Parliament and beyond.

Thank you for contacting me about this important issue.

Yours sincerely,

Apsana Begum MP

Member of Parliament for Poplar and Limehouse

Please note we will try to reply to your e-mail within **21 working days** of having received it. Each case is dealt with in the order received, except urgent and emergency cases which will be dealt with as a priority.

Parliamentary Office:

House of Commons

London

SW1A 0AA

T - 0207 219 6826

E - apsana.begum.mp@parliament.uk

F - www.facebook.com/ApsanaBegum

Twitter: @ApsanaBegumMP

Website: <https://apsanabegum.com/>

Data Protection & Privacy Policy: <https://apsanabegum.com/data-protection-and-privacy-policy/>

Thank you for sharing your concerns about the consultation on the new asylum and settlement plans and in particular the proposal to extend the timeline for ILR.

I appreciate you sharing your own story, describing the contributions you and your wife have made to this country, the roots you have established, and the enormous disruption a change to ILR would cause.

Your experiences and contributions highlight the positive impact immigrants have made to our country. Like the Windrush Generation's work building our NHS, people from all over the world have helped to grow the UK's economy and strengthen our public services.

I am concerned about the Government's decision to extend the route to Indefinite Leave to Remain from five years to ten years. This sudden change creates unnecessary uncertainty for thousands of people – like you – who have made their lives here and are now worried about their future.

My Liberal Democrat colleagues and I are urging the Government to provide urgent clarity and reassurance to those affected.

On May 12, Lisa Smart – the Liberal Democrat Home Affairs Spokesperson – [asked the Home Secretary](#) to clarify changes to immigration policy, including a clear timetable for any changes to visa rules.

We will keep pushing for an immigration system that works for our country and our economy, while ensuring that everybody is treated with dignity and respect.

That includes scrapping the Conservatives' arbitrary salary threshold and replacing it with a more flexible merit-based points system for work visas, similar to those used by Canada and Australia.

We are also calling to move policymaking on work visas and international students out of the Home Office and into the Departments for Business and Education respectively. This would prevent the sort of cruel and counterproductive immigration policies that became too commonplace under the previous Conservative government.

Thank you again for contacting me about this important issue and taking the time to explain your concerns in detail.

Best wishes,

Calum

Calum Miller MP

Member of Parliament for Bicester and Woodstock
Liberal Democrat Spokesperson for Foreign Affairs

Office telephone: 01869 520 123

[Facebook](#) | [BlueSky](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Website](#)