

Re: Aargh!

## Re: Aargh!

---

*Source:* <http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Uk/uk.media.radio.archers/2005-08/msg03388.html>

---

- *From:* David Boothroyd <[david@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:david@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 24 Aug 2005 23:08:38 +0100
- 

In article <6LyO4XOETLDDFw4v@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,

Iain Archer <[me@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:me@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

> Iain Archer wrote on umra on Wed, 24 Aug 2005:

>> "The criteria used to exclude or deport individuals on the basis that  
>> they are not conducive to the public good are implemented through  
>> policy, and the Home Secretary may vary that criteria ...".

>>

>> [http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/ind/en/home/news/press\\_releases/tacklin\\_g\\_terrorism.html](http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/ind/en/home/news/press_releases/tacklin_g_terrorism.html)

>>

>> When even the Home Office mangles English, it's time to leave ...

>

> Even more to the point, where did Charles Clarke actually publish  
> this list?

The original consultation is at

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs4/deportation.pdf>.

The revised list is in the press release published by the Government News Network.

> Everywhere I've looked so far, even the Home Office and  
> IND sites and the BBC, simply parrots a Press Release (from which the  
> above comes), without any reference to the original material or its  
> location. Nor does the press release even claim to be a complete  
> regurgitation of whatever it was the Home Secretary has actually  
> published.

"The list of unacceptable behaviours is indicative rather than exhaustive", as the press release says. The list in the press release is the full list – the press release says "including" and then gives the list. (Compare it with the original list on which the government consulted)

> I'm not very keen on government by press release.

Press releases do not themselves confer legal powers. The Secretary of State already has the legal power to exclude people from the UK on grounds that their presence is not conducive to the public good,

Re: Aargh!

Re: Aargh!

and it is up to the discretion of the Secretary of State as to when he uses that power. What is being announced here is a change in the general policy. I don't see what the problem is here: the Secretary of State could change this policy without announcing it, if he wanted to.

The policy is subject to judicial review, incidentally.

--

<http://www.election.demon.co.uk>

"We can also agree that Saddam Hussein most certainly has chemical and biological weapons and is working towards a nuclear capability. The dossier contains confirmation of information that we either knew or most certainly should have been willing to assume." – Menzies Campbell, 24th September 2002.

.

---

• **References:**

- ◆ **Aargh!**  
◇ From: Iain Archer
- ◆ **Re: Aargh!**  
◇ From: Iain Archer

- Prev by Date: **Re: Ask EU – Broad beans – PRIORITY**
- Next by Date: **Re: Spoiler Wednesday**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Aargh!**
- Next by thread: **Re: Aargh!**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**