

# Independence NEWS



## Freedom is in Peril

**D**o you want to be forced to pay for and carry an ID card? Well, keep your thoughts to yourself, whatever you think is of no interest to the government! It seems the Home Office made its decision long ago.

In its Strategic Plan for 2004-08, entitled 'Confident Communities in a Secure

Britain', the Home Office outlines its plans to rollout compulsory ID cards next year. In fact, the whole strategy, which affects the way we deal with crime, immigration, and social issues, seems to depend on us all carrying ID cards by 2008.

But wait! The legislation permitting the Government to compel us to carry ID cards had not even got through Parliament when this white paper was published. In these turbulent times, with crime and the threat of terrorist attack foremost in all our minds, **what kind of security strategy is dependent on non-existent legislation?** Even now the bill has finally gotten through the House of Lords, there are likely to be challenges, that is how democracy works.

The Government would have us believe that ID cards will:

- Provide better access to public services
- Prevent terrorism
- Prevent illegal immigration
- Fight organised crime
- Help build 'Strong, cohesive communities'

The Lords have won us a two year reprieve from this new legislation, but ID cards are now due to be in our hands by 2010. Not only is this an affront to our civil liberties, it will cost us all dear. According to the London School of Economics, "...if all the costs associated with ID cards were borne by citizens (as Treasury rules currently require), the cost per card (plus passport) would be around £170 on the lowest cost basis and £230 on

the median estimate."

If this initiative is all about building stronger communities, and helping us access public services, to which are already entitled, **then why is the government proposing a £2500 fine for failing to register for an ID card?**

There is, of course, far more to this that meets the eye. At

an EU summit held in Lisbon in April 2000 the member states collectively signed up to the 'eEurope Smart Cards Charter'. In October 2001 the EU Police Chiefs Task Force added their support to the project by urging that 'the EU should speed up the universal adoption of ID cards'. Here again, we see the hidden hand of EU interference.

**THE UK INDEPENDENCE PARTY IS TOTALLY OPPOSED TO THE INTRODUCTION OF COMPULSORY ID CARDS!**

FREEDOM IS  
IN PERIL  
DEFEND IT  
WITH ALL  
YOUR MIGHT



Reproduced by kind permission of [www.no2id.net](http://www.no2id.net)



"Tanks on the lawn!  
The launch of UKIP's local election campaign."

## The West Lothian Question

**H**ow can it be right that MPs elected to Westminster from Scottish constituencies have no ability to affect the issues of their constituents which have been devolved to the Scottish Parliament?

If power over Scottish affairs is devolved to a Scottish Parliament, how

can it be right that MPs representing Scottish constituencies in the Westminster Parliament will have the power to vote on issues affecting England (including those issues that don't affect Scotland), but English MPs will not have the power to vote on Scottish issues?

UKIP proposes a simple answer to this contentious problem: Three weeks each month our MP's are British MP's in Westminster; the remaining week, they become English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish MP's dealing with the affairs of their own countries in their own countries.

## INSIDE

Pollution and the Common Fisheries Policy

Britain Needs a Fair and Unbiased Immigration Policy

Flat-Tax: UKIP Shows the Way Forward

Take Political Correctness out of the Classroom



By  
**Roger  
Knapman**  
MEP

# Offshore Pollution

**T**he European Union's 'Common Fisheries Policy' (CFP) is widely blamed for the destruction of the UK's fishing industry, with wide scale job losses, and for the devastation of North Sea fish stocks, but how many people are aware of the environmental damage being inflicted off our shores as a result of lunatic edicts from Brussels?

Trawlermen are being forced to dump caught fish of certain species back into the sea, if they fall below the minimum landing sizes as stipulated by CFP. The fact that by the time they are put back into the water they are dead makes no difference to the Brussels bureaucrats. Fishermen also have to take account of quotas, which restrict the amount of fish they are allowed to land of any given species. This means that if they bring on board a mixed species catch, and they have insufficient quota for any of those species, the fish must be returned to the sea. Dead.

A single beam Trawler is likely to have to dump as much as two tonnes of dead fish in a typical 7 day fishing trip. It has been estimated that as many as three million cod alone will



be dumped each year as a result of the CFP. Dumping fish as waste on the seabed is highly damaging to an already fragile eco-system.

In 2003 the National Audit Office criticised the discards policy, saying that it ran the risk of bringing the entire CFP into disrepute.

## An Eye on Brussels

**W**hen UKIP's Nigel Farage exposed French EU Commissioner Jacques Barrot, in 2004, as a convicted fraudster who had been banned from holding public office, the European Parliament erupted in fury.

Not at being duped by the Commission into accepting Barrot, but at Farage for daring to talk about it. In fact, the French media had been formally banned from discussing the matter at all.

Fast forward to 2006 and we have the story of another Commissioner, (again French), charged with fraud by the Belgian authorities, being partly excused on the grounds that the climate was such in the Commission that effectively they were all at it!

As reported By Jeffrey Titford MEP, the EU's own auditors have refused to sign off their accounts for 11 years in succession, as they simply cannot account for billions of missing euros.

And still the three 'main' parties continue to support this project, immersing us deeper and deeper into the abyss that is 'Euro-federalism'.

The enthusiasm of New Labour and the Lib-Dems for the EU is well documented; they do not try to hide their true loyalties at all. But what of her Majesty's opposition, the Conservative party? They told us they wanted to 'wreck the constitution', whilst belonging to a European political group, the EPP, which fully endorses the constitution, and which provided funding for the 'Yes' campaigns in France and the Netherlands. Funny way to wreck it! When under Mr Howard, the Tories told us that immigration from the new east European member states is a problem which needs to be addressed urgently. As he told us this, a Tory MEP was beavering away in Brussels authoring a report that forms an important part of the accession process for Bulgaria next year. The accession of Romania and Bulgaria will open Britain's doors to around 30 million people.

Labour, the Lib-Dems, and the Tories think that all of this is a jolly good idea. What do you think?

**Roger Knapman is  
Leader of the UK  
Independence Party.**

## Carbon Emissions Set To Rise

**T**he European Commission has put forward proposals on road safety which include forcing us all to drive with dipped

headlights on at all times of the day. The resultant extra fuel consumption will lead, according to estimates, to a 3% increase in

carbon emissions.

Western Europe currently generates slightly under 900 million tons of carbon per annum.



**Independence NEWS**

is printed and published by the UK Independence Party

UK Independence Party  
PO Box 9876  
Birmingham B6 4DN

**Tel: 0121 333 7737**

**www.ukip.org**

**Editor: G. Cartwright**  
e-mail: ukindependence  
@hotmail.co.uk

## UK Independence Party Force Tory U-turn on IMF



**O**nly a month after calling for the UK to give up its seat on the International Monetary Fund board, Conservative MEPs have been forced into an embarrassing u-turn by UK Independence Party MEPs.

Nigel Farage MEP said, "I am delighted that the

Tories have come around to our way of thinking today". He went on "Admittedly it is only after I had written to the shadow Chancellor to point out that the Conservative MEPs were supporting handing over our IMF seat to the EU that they changed their line, but we have to be thankful for small mercies".

In Strasbourg in February, John Purvis

MEP, the Tory spokesman had said that a single European seat on the IMF was 'an aspiration for the long term'. This of course is in line with the strictures of the defunct European Constitution where it says in Article III-196 X "The Council, on a proposal from the Commission, may adopt appropriate measures to ensure unified representation

within the international financial institutions and conferences. The Council shall act after consulting the European Central Bank".

The Conservative policy on International trade is at sixes and sevens. It now appears that they will only defend the national interest when embarrassed into doing so by the UK Independence Party" said Farage.

# Britain needs a fair and unbiased immigration policy



by GERARD BATTEN MEP (London)

**C**harles Clarke, the Home Secretary, recently announced a new immigration policy based on a points qualification system. A points system has been UKIP policy for a long time, and while we are flattered that the Government have stolen it, but in the form they have done

13,000 people, mainly from Eastern Europe, would arrive each year. In fact 345,000 people have arrived in just under two years. As EU citizens they have automatic right of entry, no discrimination is exercised in terms of educational or professional qualifications, criminal records, or their

stay but only 85,000 have been recorded as having gone home. As for the total number of illegal residents in the UK no one knows the true figure. It is estimated at around 800,000, but is possibly much higher. One only has to look at the strain on housing, the road and transport systems, the health services, and all public

limits on the number of economic migrants.

We are told that we must have unlimited immigration to sustain economic growth, and to pay the pensions of an ageing population. But what economic theory is it that states that prosperity can only be provided by unlimited immigration? And of course, using the same argument, immigrants themselves grow old and their pensions will have to be paid by yet more waves of immigration: forcing more and more people onto our already overcrowded island. Yet still the Government tells us there must be no limits.

Britain has an immigration system that seems to exist for the benefit of foreigners and not Britain. We should indeed have a fair and unbiased system based on points awarded for age, educational and professional qualifications, and the ability of migrants to provide for themselves financially. It should be a genuine system that applies equally to all, EU citizens and non EU citizens alike. We should invite those people who have the skills and qualifications that we need, not

have an open door policy to anyone that wants to come.

Mr Clarke's points policy will not address the fundamental issue: that Britain now has an unsustainable level of immigration. When Bulgaria and Romania join the EU in 2007 another 31 million people will have an automatic right of entry; and if Turkey joins in a few years time 64 million Turks will have right to come here. Only a small percentage will come but that will be hundreds of thousands or possibly even millions of people, and that will place a tremendous strain on Britain. Any 'immigration policy' that does not address these numbers is essentially irrelevant.

Mr Clarke is just playing a PR game aimed at fooling some of Labour's core voters: the kind of people at the bottom of the economic ladder who suffer most from uncontrolled immigration. As with almost everything else that Labour does it is a cynical exercise in lies and manipulation. Britain desperately needs an immigration policy designed to meet our needs, **we can only have such a policy outside of the European Union.**

**“We are told that we must have unlimited immigration...”**

so it is too little, too late, and largely irrelevant.

While a points system will make entry harder for those seeking legitimate entry from countries outside the European Union, such immigration is not the main source of the migration into Britain every year. The main sources of immigration to Britain are: people from EU member states, who have unrestricted right of entry; asylum seekers; and illegal entrants - people who arrive as visitors and tourists and who simply disappear.

When ten new countries joined the EU in 2004 Labour told us that between 5,000 to

ability to support themselves financially. Many of them seek work in the building and catering industries, driving down wages for existing workers, and driving up the cost of property and rented accommodation, particularly in London which receives 70% of migrants.

“We are told that we must have unlimited immigration...”

Asylum applications are out of control and the Government has no idea how many genuine or bogus asylum seekers there are in the country. Since 1997 about 370,000 asylum seekers have been refused permission to

infrastructures to realise that unlimited immigration is not a sustainable option.

**Britain is one of the most densely populated countries in the world, and the third most densely populated country in the EU.** It has nearly twice the population density of Germany, four times that of France, and twelve times that of the USA. Yet the Government tells us we must have more and more immigration. David Blunkett, when he was Home Secretary, said that there was “no limit” to immigration, and Charles Clarke in a recent debate in the House of Commons refused to put any

## UKIP - Flat out for Tax Reform!

**Is there anyone out there who wants to cut taxes?** Since Gordon Brown became chancellor in 1997, taxes have gone up and up. Meanwhile, David Cameron has abandoned the Conservatives' traditional tax-cutting agenda, saying, “stability is more important,” while the Lib-Dems have flirted both with upping the top rate and putting an extra penny on the basic rate. All this while our unfair and costly tax system gets even more complicated each year.

It has been left to the UK Independence Party to champion the hard-hit British taxpayer. UKIP policy is one of gradual tax-cuts with the aim of eventually moving over to a single rate for income and corporation tax, also known as a flat tax. It's

simpler, fairer, results in virtually everyone becoming better off, and has brought prosperity to the countries that have adopted it, such as Hong Kong, Slovakia and the Baltic states

Along with having just one rate, the personal allowance would be raised, and many unfair taxes like Inheritance tax and the tax on share dividends would be scrapped altogether.

**But doesn't this sound like a windfall for the rich and a recipe for a public spending disaster?**

Experience suggests otherwise. When tax rates are cut, as they were in the 1980's, the rich actually pay more, as they don't bother with tax avoidance schemes. It's those on lower incomes who gain most, by the higher

tax-free allowance. As for there being less money for schools and hospitals, yes, there would be a shortfall for a year or two which would have to be covered by extra borrowing. However, **cutting taxes has been proven to make the economy grow**, so the extra money required would soon be made up.

One of the main appeals of flat rate taxation is its simplicity, so why haven't the other parties considered it? **Perhaps because if any future chancellor tries to bring in allowances to favour minority groups whose votes they are chasing, or to introduce stealth taxes, they will be easier to spot!**

**Sadly it seems only UKIP believes in open government these days.**



# Take PC out of the Classroom

**B**lair may have succeeded in pushing through his recent education reforms thanks to a helping hand from the Tories, but many real reforms that education urgently needs were not on his agenda. Top of the list is that education should educate, not indoctrinate. It's time to scrap the "Personal, Social, Health and Citizenship Education", part of Key Stage 3 (11-14 year olds) of the National Curriculum, which encourages children to "clarify their own values" by being offered a range of moral options from which to make their own "informed choices".

**What garbage!** Children from time immemorial have been guided by their parents and peer groups to work out

their own values **without any aid from the State.** Behind all this rhetoric is a desire to undermine any value system which teaches absolute right and wrong, Christianity being a particular target. The reasoning is simple: - people without strong convictions are easier to manipulate and exploit.

Children as young as five have to suffer sex education. 14 to 16-year olds are told taught about anal and oral sex. Do they really need to know about this? Yet it - and drug education too - comes with the supposed aim of "Harm reduction." Its effects can be seen on our streets - Graffiti, binge drinking, and a lack of respect for authority, besides a massive rise in drug use and the highest rate of teenage

pregnancies in Europe - in other words, the absolute opposite of the objectives. Sheer incompetence alone could not have produced as a disastrous a result. It is time that Political Correctness was taken out of our schools and children allowed to think for themselves. The Nanny State is proving an appalling hindrance to sensible parenting and the British taxpayer is having to pick up a pretty massive tab in consequence.

## Selection

**What is wrong with selection?** Isn't it better for children of similar abilities to be taught together? Parents seem to think so. Look how popular our surviving Grammar schools are, even though their future under Labour is anything

but assured.

Opponents of selection claim that it puts the less academically able at a disadvantage, but is this really true? Suppose on a "level playing field" we had a mixed ability team of 11 footballers, five of whom were capable of playing in the Premier league, whereas the other six were enthusiastic, but would never remotely make their school's First Eleven. Would the less able six improve their footballing skills better by being in a side like this where the more able five would barely let them touch the ball, or one where all 11 players were of similar ability? Would not the very able five feel frustrated by the less able six?

The answers are obvious, just as it is obvious why Grammar schools, Faith schools and other schools that stream pupils are so over-subscribed. Sadly, it is not obvious to those who, under the guise of "equality for all" want to see education dumbed down to a lowest common denominator.

UKIP believes that state

education must try to ensure that knowledge and a capacity for judgment are not restricted to one group in society but diffused as widely as possible. We want a quality education and equal opportunities for all, but we recognise that what is best for one group of children may not be the best for another. Choice is the key to successful education, and this means there must be real alternatives to choose from. For this to be a reality, besides pupils having a choice regarding their schools, those schools must be free to select pupils by ability.

This does not and must not imply that grammar schools would receive a higher level of funding than other types of schools; it simply means that to unlock the potential of the children and young people in Britain, **Government must take its hands off, stop trying to micro-manage education and concentrate simply on providing the funds to let the professionals get on with their job.**

## It's our future - let's control it ourselves

**U**nlike Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat Parties the UK Independence Party believes in Britain running its own affairs as a nation independent from the European Union (EU).

Our Party has a clear sense of direction but has in the past

lacked the resources to develop policy in depth. The party has matured and over the coming year will roll out domestic policies in a number of fields, some of which will address areas of policy recently abandoned by the Conservative Party.

The UK Independence Party declares its belief in:

- parental choice, equality of opportunity, equal status of academic and vocational abilities, and the freedom of schools to select pupils;

- The ability for our country to conduct our own international trade in the British national interest;

- Controlling the volume of immigration with common sense solutions;

- Lower taxes in a greatly simplified system;

- Solving what is known as the West Lothian Question, and to address the question of representation for the English.

## Want to Participate in Exposing, Rebutting, Mocking and Attacking the EU Institutions?

**E**very two weeks I send a summary of our activities in Brussels and Strasbourg to those who have provided their emails. I include MEP speeches, copies of verbal confrontation with europhiles, news on the 'period of reflection', EU projects in the pipeline, outrageous statements made in committee and our role as the only real opposition in the Parliament. We expose, rebut, mock and attack what is going on and if

you would like to share this with us then please let us have your email.

Send an email to [ukip@k8t.co.uk](mailto:ukip@k8t.co.uk) or call to enquire **0800 0727730** how to receive regular letters from Brussels and Strasbourg if you **do not** have email

**David Lott**  
Chief of Staff UKIP Brussels,  
The Independence and  
Democracy Group

Please send me information on membership of the UK Independence Party/  
I enclose a donation to UKIP (delete as applicable)

Name.....

Address.....

..... Postcode.....

Tel:.....

E-mail:.....

Please send this coupon (photocopies acceptable) to:

UK Independence Party, PO Box 9876, Birmingham B6 4DN