



# STRAIGHT TALK

THE NEWSLETTER OF VERITAS

No. 5  
January 2007

**PARTY LEADER**  
Patrick Eston

**DEPUTY LEADER**  
Howard Martin

**PARTY SECRETARY**  
Therese Muchewicz

**PARTY TREASURER**  
Basil Fulcher

**HEAD OFFICE**  
Catherine Cracknell

**SPOKESMEN/WOMEN**

**Defence**  
Robin Drinkwater

**Education**  
Therese Muchewicz

**Environmental Affairs**  
Stephen Morrison

**Health**  
Patrick Eston

**Home Affairs**  
Robin Drinkwater

**Trade, Industry &  
Transport**  
Graham Morris

**Treasury**  
Tony Byrne

**Scotland**  
Gustav Colliander

**Wales**  
Iain Sheldon

---

**Veritas website**

Veritasparty.com

## CONTENTS

<b>From the Party Leader</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Articles</b>	
<b>A Letter to Mr. Reid</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Party News</b>	
<b>Results of the NEC elections</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>New Core Value</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Head Office News</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Letters</b>	
<b>New member chips in</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>You'll get what you are given</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Prison reform</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Editorial</b>	<b>6</b>

---

## From The Party Leader

Dear readers

I trust you will find this latest edition of Straight Talk just as informative as the previous issues that we have all read and enjoyed.

You will also probably have noticed some changes to the lay out of the newsletter; this is due to the fact that we have a new editor Stephen Morrison.

Stephen is a member of our NEC and we all, I am sure, would like to thank him for taking this task upon himself and wish him well for the future.

Can I ask members to please try to assist Stephen by sending him items of general news and articles that you wish him to consider printing in further editions of Straight Talk.

2007 will be an important year for our party as we strive to establish Veritas and its beliefs on the political stage in the UK. We ended 2006 on a high, due to my interview on Talk Sport. Veritas have managed to gain a great deal of publicity for our cause not to mention a large number of new members.

When one writes an article like this for their own newsletter there is always the possibility that some readers may think that what is written is spiced up or spun in some way. Having had the misfortune to read some of the fantasy tales and promises of the mainstream politicians and parties in the past I can understand completely how they feel.

I therefore think that instead of you having to read what I say, I thought it would make a pleasant change to guide you to an e-mail (typical of many) which we have posted on the Veritas website that we received after the Talk Sport interview. The original e-mail is available should anybody wish to see it. Veritas is not like any of the main parties and I am not like other politicians, I can assure you this e-mail is genuine and was completely un-solicited.

The comments of this writer express the frustration that many of us feel in the UK today (the people who live in the real world I mean).

*Patrick Eston,*  
Veritas Party Leader

---

## HEADQUARTERS

Veritas. 5 Little Gregwartha, Four Lanes, Redruth, Cornwall. TR16 6LN. Tel: 01209 313240

## Articles

---

### **A Letter to Mr. Reid**

From May 2006 those working with vulnerable people are required by law to complete a Criminal Records Bureau Disclosure Application Form. I have in the last six months been asked to complete two such documents. If I had not done so, the newly introduced legislation would mean that I could not be considered for the position for which I had applied.

I have been informed by a member of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) Customer Correspondence Team that the CRB cannot currently access overseas criminal records or other relevant information as part of its disclosure service. It is my understanding that in cases such as this the requirement for the completion of a CRB Disclosure Application Form and subsequent checks are waived by clearances obtained from the Home Office.

The CRB form forces me to divulge information of a personal nature; information which can be handed on - as described in the form to 'other organisations'. I would also draw your attention to the 'Disclosure by the CRB guidelines for applicants' fifth paragraph, headed, 'Can you refuse to apply for a Disclosure' which says: "The Group will only make offers of appointment subject to received satisfactory disclosure. If an individual refuses to apply, the offer of appointment will not be made."

A foreign national unable to adequately complete a CRB form and comply with CRB checks might still be considered as an applicant for the same job as myself, a British national, even though their personal history had not been subjected to the same 'mandatory' scrutiny. The government has introduced a law which insists that before I am allowed to carry out work which brings me into contact with vulnerable people, I must submit personal information for close scrutiny by the appropriate authority. These regulations do not apply to foreign nationals. Based on these observations I believe that I am the victim of

indirect discrimination. Furthermore, since it is the government which has made CRB checks mandatory it is the government who is responsible in this instance for my victimisation.

In view of this, I have taken independent legal advice as to whether it would be feasible to challenge the government through the courts. It has been suggested to me that although my case would appear valid, the cost and recourses required to do this would be beyond my means, and I would be unlikely to receive legal aid. I would however be interested to know if you could explain to me why the Home Office believes that the completion of a CRB Disclosure Form should be necessary if, as part of their job, British subjects are to come into contact with vulnerable people, but unnecessary for foreign nationals doing precisely the same job.

I take the view that if the completion of a CRB form and subsequent checks are an imperative for the safety of children, the elderly, the infirm, etc., it should be an imperative which applies to all. If this is not the case the law is in fact putting vulnerable people at risk by not insisting that all foreign nationals comply with what for British people is an absolute requirement of law.

*Tony Backhouse*  
Veritas member.

---

This letter to Mr. Reid, current Home Secretary, has been included here as an article, not only to bring to light a loop-hole in the law but also as an example of what members can do for themselves and others. Tony Backhouse should be congratulated and supported for his efforts.

It is hoped that this section of the newsletter will carry articles of an informative and constructive nature.

*Editor.*

## Party News

---

### *Results of the National Executive Committee Elections, October 2006*

A little late but here are the results of the NEC elections of October 2006. The percentage of the vote was spread as follows.

Catherine Cracknell	16.27%
Howard Martin	12.96%
Stephen Morrison	12.96%
Andrew Taylor	11.96%
Robin Drinkwater	11.63%
Frank Kelly	9.97%

The candidate with the highest number of losing votes was,

Carl Faulkner	9.63%
---------------	-------

However, Howard Martin resigned his position, as elected by the party members, to fill his ex-officio position as Deputy Leader. This brought Carl Faulkner onto the NEC. However, Andrew Taylor resigned from the party at the end of Dec. 2006, for personal reasons, followed by Frank Kelly in Jan. 2007. This left the candidates with the highest number of losing votes, Robert Maxwell ( 7.31%)

and James Roberts (7.31 %), eligible for the final positions on the NEC.

In accordance to the election results, the current member-elected seats on the NEC are to be taken up by:

Catherine Cracknell  
Stephen Morrison  
Robin Drinkwater  
Carl Faulkner  
Robert Maxwell  
James Roberts

Ex-officio members of the NEC are Patrick Eston (Party Leader), Howard Martin (Deputy Leader), Therese Muchewicz (Party Secretary), and Basil Fulcher (Party Treasurer).

Finally, in the mandate put forward, 99% of the votes were in favour of Patrick Eston continuing as party leader.

---

### *New Core Value*

The following Core Value was voted in by the NEC in December 2006.

**‘Veritas is committed to a moratorium on immigration and the repatriation of all illegal immigrants’.**

---

### *Head Office News*

I want to thank everybody for the messages of condolence on the death of my brother and for the tolerance for the lateness of my dealing with various items due to the time I have had to spend organising the funeral and starting towards probate of his estate.

We are in the process of getting the Annual Statements from the Branches.

Next, the Straight Talk Newsletter will need to be sent out to all members.

Then we will be able to finish the task of amending the database to make it more useful to the needs of Veritas.

*Catherine Cracknell*  
Head Office Manager

## **Letters**

Opinions expressed herein may not necessarily be the views of the editor.

### **New member chips in**

I hope that I have found a new political home in Veritas. I joined in September 2006, having moved from the Conservative Party. I had decided that I was unable to identify with David Cameron's vision for the future of the party, nor with his wish to declare some issues of genuine concern to many people to be 'off limits' as far as discussion was concerned. It was then either a matter of 'retiring' from the world of politics, or finding a new home from which I could fight to defend those ideas that I feel are precious. I was attracted by the quality of the Veritas web site, which won hands down against the confusion of the UKIP web site. The UKIP message seemed to be heavily focused on its antipathy to the European Union, whereas Veritas demonstrated a wider view in expressing its concerns and objectives. I was impressed, too, to receive replies from both the Party Leader (Patrick) and Party Secretary (Therese) in response to my initial 'e-mailed' enquiries. Of course, the party was still strongly associated in my mind with Robert Kilroy-Silk. I had been impressed with his preparedness to challenge the *status quo* and to engage head-on with issues that other politicians were loathed to discuss. I hope that this fearlessness remains a key element of the party's disposition.

I wonder if, like me, you are filled with a certain sadness arising from some of the changes taking place in Britain: an increasing sense of loss, unease, insecurity, disunity, fragmentation – a sense of being bullied by those who wish to break our culture, our confidence and our connection with our heritage before imposing their own vision of a future on us. The state becomes evermore overbearing: we are instructed on 'correct' thinking and behaviour, our language is manipulated and abused so as to marginalise dissent and independent thought and expression, our customs and traditions are challenged, mocked and debased. For me it is not about wanting to turn the clock back, but of creating a path of progress that ensures the integrity and well-being of Britain and its people within a framework of community, freedom, fair

play, democracy, creativity, enterprise and pride in our nation and its heritage. In Orwell's *1984*, we observed the destruction of the human spirit by authoritarianism, the crushing of the freedom to be an individual. It is a warning that we should not forget.

I look for dignity in our dealings, a demonstration of our wish to establish competence and credibility in our work rather than to rely on negative campaigning and character assassination. And I hope that we can develop an ideological heart to our work, with messages that sit comfortably and consistently within an agreed philosophical framework. I don't want flimflam, a superficiality that evidences lack of clear, well thought-through policy positions.

We must limit our ambitions to targets that are achievable given the resources that we have, by focusing – rather than dissipating – our energies we will achieve more. We must differentiate our offering from that of UKIP: I believe that we can be more imaginative in our thinking. We must be clear about our target audience; we should not try to be all things to all people – our propositions are based on a particular point of view.

Veritas has no baggage from the past with which it has to struggle; we have a blank slate on which we can write a new message. We must demonstrate that democracy is alive and well. We will not accept a political 'elite' dictating to us on what we can and can't discuss; if we want to 'bang on' about something we will 'bang on' about it because it is of concern to us and those who feel as we do.

If you love Britain please maintain your support for Veritas. Stick with us. We have an important mission to fulfil. Spread the word that we are on our way.

*Brian Everett*  
Party member.

---

## **You'll get what you are given**

The current media frenzy in respect of the rights of

same sex couples to adopt children via Christian adoption agencies misses the point completely. It is not about 'gay rights' or anti-discrimination; the legislation is just another plank in the despicable Labour Party's obsession with social engineering. It is one more law to undermine the position of the natural family, i.e., mother, father and children.

So desperate are the movers and shakers behind what was once (and is still called) the Labour Party, that they are quite content to put into action what I would term a form of mental cruelty which will surely affect the child when he or she reaches adulthood and looks back.

The abuse I write of is to deliberately consign a child to a lifetime of never having a mother or a father. Two dads or two mums, but not the natural one of each. What sort of organisation would deliberately set out to achieve this? If the natural one of each is not required then why not three of each or two dads and one mum, etc.?

We are bombarded with the murmurings from weak and sinister politicians who tell us that it is better for a child to be in a loving home than an abusive one. Of course it is, but they always stop short of adding that the best, most secure, loving home of all, is that with one mother and one father. We are told that too many young children are in homes because nobody wants to adopt them but yet nothing is produced to demonstrate that same sex couples would be any different in preferring a 'babe in arms', rather than a small child and the obvious complications in assuming the parental role. No figures are produced to demonstrate the number of same sex couples who even want to adopt.

Of course, there are those who, without hesitation, blurt out the usual accusations of homophobia and discrimination at anyone who dares to question this nasty piece of social engineering.

How wrong they are. I know of no reason why sexual orientation should prevent a man or a woman being the 'world's best mum or dad' just as it has no bearing on how good a son or a daughter is. It is simply that a man cannot take the place of a mother and a woman cannot take the place of a

father.

Life's uncertainties mean a child may well grow up without a mother or a father. This however, is by circumstance or accident not by the design of a sinister and nasty political party that puts its own agenda before the genuine well-being of a child.

If we are to talk of rights in this matter, it should not be of the rights of adults to deliberately deny a child a mother or father in order to satisfy their own needs, no matter how kind and compassionate they may be.

The only rights that matter are those of the child. In circumstances where the state is to find a family for that child, the overriding right must be that every child has a right to a mother *and* a father.

No doubt by the time the adopted children of a same sex couples have become adults, the perpetrators and supporters of this despicable legislation will have either passed away or retired from public life. They will not be around or be obliged to answer the question from adopted children, which I am certain will be asked:

"What gave you the right to deny me the chance of having a mother *and* a father?"

*Carl Faulkner*  
NEC member.

---

### **Prison reform**

We are again gripped by the farce that is this Government's inability to tackle the crime levels in the UK. Despite their headline-grabbing claim to be "tough on crime", the people of this country know the reality behind that fatuous statement. Labour's version of being tough on crime is to tie our police forces up in EU driven red tape, shackle them with Health and Safety directives, and have them led by people more interested in political correctness than the protection of the public. Then, in the increasingly unlikely event that anyone guilty of a crime is actually detected and brought before the courts, we now have the situation where our judges are instructed to keep

criminals out of jail at all costs. Meanwhile the people have to suffer the devastation of the continuing high crime levels.

Labour's answer to all this is to fiddle with the figures, in order to fool us into believing that they are actually fulfilling the role that they were elected to.

It is a well documented fact that countries which imprison large numbers of its criminals have a lower crime rate than those who do not. In Labour however, we have a government which is blind to reality and continues to talk big but deliver little.

We hear a lot about the costs of keeping people in prison; as if the inconvenience of financing such institutions is some barrier to their existence. What we don't hear so much about is the savings in police time and money, resulting from not having to continually investigate the crimes of a small minority who remain at large through Labour's revolving door policy on crime. Or for that matter, of the savings in compensation payments to the victims of crime, the saving in insurance payouts to burglary victims or simply the peace of mind that goes with a decent crime free society.

All of this matters little to those who would advocate a big hug for those poor unfortunates who find themselves in the position of being a criminal. It may well be that many end up as criminals through a lack of moral guidance in their youth, or some perceived mental trauma at not having come first in the school egg and spoon race. This is no comfort to those who suffer at the hands of the criminal. When we reach the situation where it is safe to walk down the street late at night without fear of attack, or when we can leave our home without having to turn it into a small scale Fort Knox first, then we can redirect funding to re-programming criminals to be decent members of society. To try and modify their behaviour, when every sign is telling them that there is very little down-side to their actions, is to invite their contempt and derision.

It does not have to carry on this way. The people have, in the ballot box, the most powerful weapon for change there is. All that is needed is the courage to make that change.

*Robin Drinkwater*  
Home Affairs Spokesman.

---

## **Editorial**

As you will have noticed, there has been a change to the look of the newsletter. This issue is a little thin and not particularly colourful, due in part to a recent change in editor.

It is aimed to bring you up to date with news and other business relating to the party and its members. Articles and letters will continue to be run and will be topical and, above all, informative.

This newsletter will now be produced quarterly with the publication dates being the last day in January, April, July, and October. Any articles, letters, or other material suitable for the newsletter should be submitted by the 15<sup>th</sup> of these months for inclusion in the subsequent newsletters.

This newsletter is supplied as a PDF to members who are able to receive e-mails, and as a hard copy to members who are not able to receive e-mails.

## **Submission guidelines:**

If material is supplied electronically as an e-mail, please submit as a word document or text only. Photographs are also welcome and should be supplied as high quality JPEG files (no larger than 1Mb). As always, any submissions by post will be welcome.

All submissions by e-mail should be sent to the editor at:

[straight-talk@veritasparty.com](mailto:straight-talk@veritasparty.com)

or by post to:

Straight Talk  
Veritas Headquarters,  
5 Little Gregwartha, Four Lanes, Redruth, Cornwall.  
TR16 6LN

*Editor.*