

1) *Has the development of EU police and criminal justice competence over the years led to improved cross-border co-operation?*

Yes.

2) *What are the advantages and disadvantages arising from the UK's ability to opt in to new or amended EU policing and criminal justice legislation, and opt-out individually of new policing and criminal justice measures in relation to Schengen?*

Opting in – Advantages.

The only way we can influence such arrangements is to be part of the structures making them.

The intention of the various agreements at EU level is to harmonise a variety of arrangements between the member states, particularly extradition, border and visa controls, as well as police and judicial cooperation.

Making these procedures slicker, more streamline and less complicated will not only reduce costs but lessen the likelihood of mistakes with consequently fewer successful legal challenges which has got to be a good thing for the administration of justice (if not necessarily for the earnings of the legal profession).

As the UK previously had many such agreements in place with individual countries there should be nothing new in any of the proposals, other than being standardised across Europe, while there may be argument as to the level of those controls, a single agreement saves a lot of wasted time, effort and money.

UK policing powers have only relatively recently (1964) & (1994) been harmonised across the constituent countries of the Kingdom, by providing reciprocal powers of arrest (and other powers) across the Kingdom, while at the same time abolishing the requirement for local Magistrates to endorse a cross border warrant, while also extending their jurisdictions, surely all of this is a matter of trust that each jurisdiction maintains certain standards. It is not that long ago that the Constables' powers were limited to their own policing area and their adjacent areas. Stopping at the County line is nonsense and given the mobility of criminals particularly in the international arenas failing to remove such restriction in the larger arena is also ludicrous.

We have had Extradition treaties with numerous other countries, each of which were different in detail and extent, every difference being a practical tripping stone for someone to challenge the entire process, it cannot be right nor good for justice that, as in the case of Abu HAMZA, it takes so many years to either remove or receive a person just because matters are too complicated to progress, by their using "every opportunity, over many years, to frustrate and delay the extradition process". *¹

Opting out – Disadvantages

Opting out of such arrangements seems perverse when standardised rules and procedures will cut down the bureaucracy as well as the likelihood of miscarriages of justice and speed up the entire process of sending or retrieving fugitives to where they are wanted. Such standard rules guarantee the acceptable level of evidence required as well as the rights of a suspect. It also gives out a potent message to villains that they cannot just flee from their offending behaviour. That same knowledge is a reassurance to victims which is probably more important.

It has to be in the UK's national interest that villainy is swiftly contained, criminality reduced and offenders brought to justice without delay whether these individuals are our citizens or those of another state.

The legality of a warrant to arrest an individual, issued by a Magistrate's court in one part of England would not be pawed over at the point of execution, as we trust that each court is working to the same standard, once established that those standards are accepted across Europe, exactly the same procedure should apply to a warrant issued anywhere else in the EU.

An opt out clause distances ourselves from the process of agreeing what those standards should be, maybe there will need to be monitoring across the board particularly where the concept of justice is new but for most European countries such scrutiny is not routinely necessary.

The opt out provisions have led to inconsistent policy with a consequent inability to plan, particularly for the long term infrastructure, while there were no IT reasons to hold up the Schengen Information System (SIS) link to PNC this has been delayed repeatedly since 2005 leaving foreign criminals to roam free within the UK to the detriment of victims and our society.

3) *Are there any areas where the EU is looking to expand its competence (either by legislating or by other means) beyond the treaty?*

None that I know of. The only Policing and Judicial competency applicable at the moment is the area of "freedom, security and justice" which is a shared competence between the EU and member states but albeit that this is a political decision, whether the EU is competent or not in any particular area to take decisions or impose its will on the UK, this is probably largely irrelevant.

Take for example the history of the agreement made by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, The Netherlands and (West) Germany in what later became the Schengen agreement; later still part of the Amsterdam Treaty. Initially there was no general agreement between these and the other European countries, to the abolition of the internal border controls or the standardisation of the Visa requirements, after years of prevarication the five countries

decided not to wait for other EEC countries and created their own agreement. It took another ten years of vacillation before much of the rest of Europe agreed to join in. While that agreement had been made independently of and operated outside the EU, 30 years on all new applicant countries are required to sign up to it. With only Britain and Ireland having an 'opt out', no others will have this, nor will new members be able to cede from this or other agreements such as the single European Currency.

Which leaves the UK with a dilemma, as any exit by the UK from the EU will lose us any rights currently accrued but when or if a future pro Europe government seeks re-entry Schengen and the Monetary union as well as all the other treaty obligations will then be mandatory in full.

Losing Scotland will be a minor inconvenience when compared with losing our fiscal control.

4) *Has the development of EU police and criminal justice competence helped or impeded the effectiveness of law enforcement?*

SIS was established in 2005 so we are getting there slowly, after an inordinate amount of faffing around by government, eventually ACRO has been set up to exchange information between law enforcement agencies across Europe; while this is a major advance it is still not particularly useful for operational officers.

The Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 has long established rules on the detention of suspects which dictates quite rightly in general terms, a 24 hour time limit in the holding of a person (while this can be extended in specific circumstances that is not usual) the average time a person is held in custody in Hertfordshire is around 11 hours.

The result of an ACRO check will rarely come back while the foreign national is still in custody, often it will be days before the investigating officer has a clue of who he is dealing with, having quite rightly bailed the suspect long before the result is available or there is any indication that we have been provided with false details. 18% of Hertfordshire detainees are foreign nationals; while all are subject to ACRO checks the numbers later failing to appear on Police Bail or at Court causes significant extra work and expense in trying to trace them. There is a rigorous identity assurance check process in place but this becomes of limited value where issues cannot be resolved in line with the PACE deadline.

Information which would have been readily available relating to our own citizens which is unavailable leaves serious foreign national criminals roaming free on the UK streets where earlier knowledge would have led to a more informed decision to protect vulnerable victims.

Lithuania is efficient with their results coming back in about three days, Germany not so but most other EU countries return results in a week to ten days which is not operationally very effective.

When SIS II eventually comes on line in October, “Wanted” offender information will be more readily available but not their past history. Immediate access to relevant data on our own criminals has been in place for the last 40 years, not to have this within a reasonable time frame for villains living, working or offending here, just because they were born elsewhere, places the UK at a significant disadvantage in controlling criminal behaviour. The immediate availability of data not only will give the police and judiciary but also the UKBA a true picture of the individuals offending behaviour, from which proper decisions can then be made of any risk posed by that individual, possibly even with the undesirable element being refused entry to the UK under the “Criminality” rules, measures which are available but rarely used, hundreds of times only, out of millions of entrants, better and quicker information would protect us earlier than using procedures to deport following conviction.

Romania, Poland, Republic of Ireland and Lithuanian nationals followed some way down by Bulgarians are the EU nationalities most frequently offending, when you need to start looking for them after they fail to turn up, we are already at least 10 days behind.

5) *Has the development of EU police and criminal justice competence benefitted or caused problems for the British criminal justice system?*

The abolition of the internal border controls within the European mainland affects us, whether we are within or outside the EU, being an island only makes it more difficult but not impossible to enter the UK illegally, we neither have the resources nor the will to affect the practical side of enforcing immigration checks at every port or harbour, the cost of which would be huge. To illustrate this is the fact that there is thriving drugs trade in the UK it is not unusual for villains to plonk their drugs onto the custody counter prior to being searched. Drugs were present long before the EU borders came down; our borders have never been wholly secure nor will be.

The vast majority of people whether our citizens or those entrants arriving in the UK from the EU are decent, honest, law-abiding citizens, a few will be villains but most will not but we seem to export considerably more villains than we import.

The benefit to joint ventures with those other EU authorities is sorting the wheat from the chaff, as the necessary checks should have already been completed by the continental authorities in identifying their criminality as they cross boundaries.

There are approximately 45 million adults in the UK, the then National Policing Improvement Agency disclosed to Parliament in October 2009 that there were 9.2 million personal records held on PNC, not all of which will be villains, as some records relate to missing persons or firearm licence holders for instance, but a very high percentage of our population are “Known to Police” a far higher proportion than any other country in the European union.

We are a High Crime Society in comparison to other EU states, of the 36 OECD countries the UK is ranked the 3rd highest for serious injury assaults, 5th for Rapes (Ireland, Sweden, Austria and Germany are 1 to 4 respectively), 7th for Burglary and Robbery and Car thefts. Most of this may be to do with the UK's binge drinking culture but while the UK crimes are falling we still have some way to go to match the very low rates of crime in Spain, Hungary, Finland and Portugal.

With at least two million British Citizens living and working across the EU*², it is reasonably certain that a fair number are villains, with for instance at least a reasonable proportion of the three quarters of a million ex pat Brits currently resident in Spain being so, even, if only 10% are criminals, should the UK leave the union would 76,000 individuals returning to villainy from there to here from just one country, be coped with?

6) *What are the advantages and disadvantages to the UK of EU action on the field of judicial co-operation? You may wish to refer to specific examples*

Staffing our own borders if that means exclusion from the Schengen Information System (SIS) will not help identify those people coming here with the intent to offend; without any real time integrated system covering the entire EU, the UK will be left blind until after the fact. Would we reintroduce a visa system for all resident visitors from the EU which currently number about two and a half million, the expense would be enormous.

Internally the English and Welsh PNC is not routinely fully linked to the Policing Service of Northern Ireland to the same extent as other UK Police forces; their full membership of PNC is still being negotiated 40 years after the computerisation of English and Welsh policing records. Neither is the Northern Ireland driver and vehicle registration details, nor all the criminal convictions shown on PNC to the same extent as those in England and Wales. The primary Scottish PNC equivalent, the Criminal History System (CHS) processes the vast majority of the transactions some of which are subsequently transferred to PNC but should they vote for independence, what happens then if we are not part of Schengen? If we cannot co-operate within our own jurisdictions what hope have we elsewhere?

Should we withdraw from the EU what practical policing arrangements would have to be made between us and the other 27 individual EU states, would we really be able to negotiate 27 separate Extradition treaties with those countries with which we had previously had a single multilateral agreement? Would those countries even want to co-operate with us in this field after our departure from the union, would we still have any access to their data? The citizens of the UK would lose out because we would still have EU villains here who would just be considerably more difficult to identify as such.

7) *To what extent is EU action in this area effective in raising standards, or enhancing cooperation? And to what extent is it necessary? And to what extent is the EU the most appropriate level for judicial cooperation?*

The British legal system rightly holds the independence of the Judiciary and Magistracy sacrosanct together with their vital role in upholding the rule of law. Of course we see ourselves as leading the rest of Europe in all these standards as PACE has ensured for the last 30 years that minimum standards are in place from the beginning of the investigative process, discipline follows for Police Officers breaching such rules.

We are still the only country who uses the concept of an “Appropriate Adult” to look after the interests of both children and the “mentally disordered or otherwise mentally vulnerable people”.

These standards protect our values of fairness, but it would be mistaken to assume that no one else adheres to those same principles. Co-operation will introduce new concepts, while changes must be measured; blind obstinacy to those suggested changes across the criminal justice field will do the UK no good what so ever.

The ages of criminal responsibility for instance in all EU countries other than Ireland, Malta and Cyprus is considerably higher than ours, which at 10 was set by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. The same act also abolished the previous “doli incapax” rule for under 14 year olds; some other EU countries will see this measure, as us needing to raise ourselves, our standards up to their minimum standards in this area not the other way around? Should the EU impose such a change?

Different UK Parliaments have viewed the age of criminal responsibility in different ways some seeking retribution while others sought the rehabilitation of the youngsters. Would a young person abroad be arrested on our behalf for something even reasonably serious, committed here which they could not legally commit in the recipient country, probably not, so would there be co-operation in finding a way around this, probably yes but raising standards that is a very emotive phrase?

In the case of the Jeremy Forrest the school teacher who took his 15 year old pupil to France, the underage sex offence committed here was not and is not an offence in France so pragmatism prevailed he being arrested and extradited for alternative matters but who has the raised standards here, us with the child protection issue of a 15 year old? What if in the same circumstances Malta had tried to extradite from here a male for having sex with a 17 year old female. Their age of consent being 18 would we argue to raise our age of consent to their standards?

We have recently had UK officers working in Portugal; the Policing Service of Northern Ireland has reciprocal arrangements with the Republic for the routine exchange of officers who keep their policing powers for the three year term while working in the others territories.

British Officers have patrolled the French Motorways in support of French colleagues during the summer season to help with the British motoring tourists; French and Belgium Police / immigration officials regularly enter Britain on the shuttle, we have immigration officials based at the “juxtaposed controls” at the ferry and channel tunnel embarkation points in France and Belgium, so there is nothing new in cooperating where it suits us, this in general has got to be a good thing operationally.

As all UK officers now have their home country powers while operating in other UK jurisdictions; maybe it is time to be bold and extend this across Europe?

8) *Could the EU use its existing competence in a different way which would deliver more in the national interest?*

Should we be co-operating, making suggestions and bringing to fruition ideas that will help all policing and judiciary across the continent, the problems are very likely to be same or similar across all jurisdictions the solutions will be very similar also.

Our own system of policing and Judiciary has been a long time in the making, a question of trial and error, some things have worked others haven't. Modern Policing from the 1860's after the imposition of compulsory Policing by the 1856 County and Borough Police Act eventually took root although fragmented with 243 separate independent forces having few standards, limited jurisdiction and less co-operation. A strong central authority in the guise of the then newly formed HMIC dragged English and Welsh forces over the next eighty years, principally through to the 1946 Police Act into a number of mergers and efficiencies. These “collaborations” are still advancing. How many more generations will we have to wait until we are forced to come to terms with Europe?

9) *What future challenges do you see in the field of judicial co-operation and what impact might this have on the national interest?*

Our legal system is based on very different practicalities to most other European countries where their examining Magistrates play a significant role in Policing; The UK police operate independently of the Judiciary and Magistracy all be it now with some CPS oversight of the charging decisions, would harmonised arrangements affect this, there is no need that it should.

Scotland has operated its own distinct legal system in parallel to that in England and Wales for Centuries without major problems. Most of what is considered a “crime” in one area will similarly be a crime in another.

Obviously there will be exception but overtime these will be identified and considered for acceptance or rejection, mapping all offences across jurisdictions as they arise is a relatively simple but time consuming process, but just as every part of every offence in England and Wales has been mapped across from HO offence codes to a CCCJS code as the Policing, CPS

and Courts' computer systems have been linked, it is not difficult. With all these codes being listed in the "Orange book" for decades, these are now routinely embedded within computer systems so that no organisation has had to change from the way they were already working, there may be other ways to achieve this but the end result would be no different across Europe.

Once we agree that a particular action mirrors an offence within our jurisdiction, there should be no need or desire to constantly revisit it and co-operation will work well.

10) Are there any general points you wish to make in relation to the field of judicial co-operation which are not captured above?

Basically the policing problems are the same the world over, Murder, Rape, Robbery, Theft, Burglary will be investigated differently but stealing a car or an assault will be the same where ever it takes place, as individual offences are reviewed by parliament the UK should take the opportunity to look at whether a move closer to our partners or them to us would benefit everyone.

A proactive approach by our negotiators would reduce the need to argue constantly about opt ins or opt outs, having participated in the drafting, consensus would be reached long before hand. Parliament changes our laws on a daily basis; consideration of where everything fits into the wider context should be standard practice as all EU governments are just as accountable to their own electorates for precisely the same law and order issues. We have local Bye laws which only addresses specific issues in a small locality. Raising the Nazi flag is a particular issue in Austria so the local implementation solely there would be in order and similar arrangement can be made for other specific problems across Europe, not everything has to be Europe wide but most things will be.

11) What are the advantages and disadvantages to the UK of EU action in the field of policing, internal security, and customs co-operation in criminal matters? You may wish to refer to specific examples

There are around 45 million adults in the UK, around 9 million of whom are "Known to the Police" on PNC with around 100,000 actively, routinely offending within the UK.

In 2011, 3.6% of our resident population (2.24 million people) were born in another EU member state, are we going to start some bureaucratic process issuing each of those wishing to stay, with a visa if the right to freely enter and remain is abolished by leaving the EU? A mass migration into and, at the same time out of the UK would cause chaos and if we didn't enforce it, what would have been the point in leaving?

Given that we are a High crime society with more Homicides, Rapes, Robberies, Thefts and Burglaries compared to almost all other EU countries getting our fugitives back should be a concern, the abolition of the European Arrest arrangements would revert us to individual

agreements such as the “Backing of Warrants (Republic of Ireland) Act 1965” (repealed in 2003) or the similar provision previously in force for the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands.

I am not aware of the relevant Spanish law but the Maastricht treaty provided for the free movement, settlement and employment of nationals across the EU.

On the 2009 figures, at least one and a half million UK citizens lived permanently in another EU country; withdrawal from the EU would remove their right to be there. With at least 761,000 alone permanently in Spain, if any country is, may be less willing to cooperate it may be Spain, particularly in light of the tensions over Gibraltar. Would Spain expel either all of those “Brits”, or even if they chose to rescind residence of the 10% who are known criminals? 76,000+ villains returning to Britain would cause significant problems for the UK authorities, whether it would be from crime or with their extended criminal networks and connections, simply housing such an influx in an overcrowded housing market it is reasonably certain such an ex pat community would cause problems.

12) *To what extent is EU action in this area effective in raising standards, or enhancing cooperation? And to what extent is it necessary? And to what extent is the EU the most appropriate level for cooperation on policing, customs co-operation on judicial matters, and internal security?*

The setting up of the Criminal Cases Review commission was to some extent prompted by the number of cases going before the European Court does this count as being effective in forcing the raising of our standards?

While we see our system as the best in the world we would also have to consider that there have been numerous miscarriages of justice with by June 2013, some 16,458 cases out of many millions, being referred to the Criminal Cases Review Commission, 341 of those convictions were later quashed by the Court of Appeal.

13) *Is EU competence in this area appropriate or are there any areas where it may have led to unintended and / or undesirable consequences for individuals and their civil liberty rights?*

Almost certainly there will be unintended consequences, every law does have them as it is tested through the courts, take the Dangerous Dogs Act for instance, the protection of citizens from injury became mired in the legality of the breeds mentioned in the act to the point that it became unenforceable. That is the principal of our justice system to test the extent of the law. Whether unintended consequence arise from particular EU competences will be an almost certainty as the wording is interpreted differently in different parts of Europe as their different perspectives arise let alone with the compromises of language.

A recent English Court ruling on the meaning of the wording relating to Police bail being part of the overall PACE time, caused chaos throughout England and Wales necessitating a

specific Act, the Police (Detention and Bail) Act 2011 to redress it and that was decades of the act passing daily through our courts.

Our own Supreme Court takes its time in its judgements on the exact meanings of words so why, particularly with the difference in numerous languages should we think that other courts abroad would be different but if everyone is working to the same principles the outcomes should be similar.

All citizens of member states are automatically EU citizens; would that remain the case for UK nationals after any withdrawal from the EU? If it were not to be, would we be looking to deport the 2.5 million EU citizens from the UK when we can barely cope with those immigrants already identified as being here illegal or would other EU Countries be looking to repatriate our nationals back to the UK? Even if this were to happen over a relatively long period of time the transfer of such large numbers would cause chaos within the jobs market, the housing market and for criminality. Do we as a Country want our own villains back to carry on their villainy here? How would we cope re assimilating tens of thousands of active criminals particularly after they have formed a network of associations on the “Costa del Crime” or elsewhere on the continent?

14) Could the EU use its existing competence in this area in a different way which would deliver more in the UK national interest?

As this is a shared Competence, does the Schengen agreement mean that the “Union has already exercised its competence” in this area, if so member states cannot exercise theirs otherwise, No they cannot without agreement. And we would only agree to something which we think is in our interest?

15) What future challenges do you see in the field of policing, internal security, and customs co-operation in criminal matters and what impact might this have on the national interest?

The free movement of villains, their assets and money across frontiers is going to occur, chasing these down will be time consuming and costly unless standard requirements are in place. The national interest requires co-operation whether we are in or out of the European Union.

16) Are there any other general points you wish to make in relation to this area which are not captured above?

No.

17) *What are the advantages and disadvantages to the UK of EU action in the field of minimum standards in criminal law and procedure? You may wish to refer to specific examples*

While there may be doubt about Justice in specific cases once we as a nation are satisfied of the level of competence across Europe, the trust should be automatic with there being no difference to a warrant or process issued in Marseille or Turin, Bonn or Brighton being executed here as business as usual, standardised wording would not even require translation in much the same way as driving licences and passports are universal. Given the technology available via Video link simple matters can be dealt with over this, or matters referred locally to be dealt with as appropriate.

Minimum standards apply in both directions, in some thing we are far behind most of the rest of Europe.

18) *To what extent is EU action in this area effective in raising standards, or enhancing co-operation? And to what extent is it necessary? And to what extent is the EU the most appropriate level for action in the field of minimum standards in criminal law and procedure?*

Please see the previous answers given at number 7 & 12.

Separately to these answers it should be noted that the National Telephone numbering scheme, telecom arrangements for emergency calls although not widely known about since we as a government tend to ignore it, have been standardised across Europe and beyond to the universal 112 number for the last 20 to 30 years, whether this was prompted through Europe or elsewhere it has raised the standards of safety for travellers in distress through agreement, similar standardisation in many fields would be welcome for both business and tourist travellers.

19) *Could the EU use its existing competence in this area in a different way which would deliver more in the UK national interest?*

Please see the previous answers given at number 7 & 12.

20) *What future challenges do you see in the field of minimum standards in criminal law and procedure and what impact might this have on the national interest?*

Enforcement of UK fines and court orders within Europe in much the same way as would happen here, way beyond European Arrest warrants but routine day to day matters, whether it be drink drive disqualifications or the imposition of whatever the equivalent is of probation orders, all of this needs to become business as usual. Speeding tickets are not followed up because the vehicle has an EU registration plate or the person appears to have left the country, leaving them to drive dangerously without consequence both here and abroad, let alone the loss of revenue. No Vehicle Excise Licence fee is levied on hundreds of

thousands of vehicles because there is no mechanism to collect it for instance unless the person bothers to register it themselves? No checks can be made to make sure that those vehicles are mechanically sound or even insured because the information is just not available.

I do not see any of the minimum standards as challenges but as opportunities. Where risks are identified for instances, of low levels of human rights, these will have to be addressed for the benefit of all not just the UK national interest. If something is going to be in the UK national interest within policing it is very likely to be in the interest of others also. We should not be selfish about this. Some of our citizens disgrace themselves particularly while drunk most that do this, do so during the weekends, which can be routinely seen in any of our principal towns and cities. Others however venture away for stag and hen dos to other countries, who while making money out of them also have to deal with the trouble and upset they cause, while our diplomatic staff on hand to assist, the Brits are just as likely to be as difficult for European officers to deal with as foreign nationals are for us, the standardisation of something similar to PACE would give all tourists the benefit of knowing where the line is drawn.

Simple misunderstandings can lead to huge consequences, for instance the group of Plane spotters arrested in Greece who were accused of spying had hit upon different sensitivities by taking photographs at a military airport. The Greek sensitivity to this, given the difficulties between them and Turkey is understandable but their ordeal would have been less of an international incident had consistent rules been in place.

21) *Are there any other general points in relation to this area you wish to make in relation to this area which are not captured above?*

There are various figures in official documents as to the numbers of foreign persons resident both here or from here resident in Europe. Foreign National Offenders are extremely difficult to deal with particularly within the PACE time limits Parliament imposed decades ago. The unforeseen consequence is that in the main we as a country have no idea of which villains we have roaming around and very little way of routinely identifying them. No doubt the same applies the other way around. I am aware of the frustrations of the French Police with English offenders.

The removal of the right to live and work anywhere within the EU from citizens living here or UK citizens living across Europe would create a potential mass movement of people totalling many millions. The figure below are to some extent out of date but will probably have increased in the meantime, any hope of policing this or registering individuals for Visas would be impossible before it dropped into chaos. Given that a significant proportion of those deported (because that is the implication) from Europe back to the UK are already drawing their Old age pensions how are we going to cope with accommodating them or with the provision of Health or Social services? The policing problems of the returning villains will pale into insignificance by comparison.

Balance of Competencies – Ministry of Justice & Home Office review – Police & Criminal
Justice – response from Hertfordshire Criminal Justice Board – 24th July 2014

**“2011 Census table QS213EW – Country of Birth”
(EU member countries only extracted)*2**

Place of residence

Data from BBC "Brits abroad" 2006						2001 Census	2011 Census		
British nationals resident in European Union countries -					EU Member state		EU nationals residence in England and Wales		
Full time	part time	Total	Pensioners as a %				England	Wales	Total
8,500	800	9,300	4,937	53.09%	Austria	19,511	18,587	500	19,087
28,000	3,000	31,000	4,660	15.03%	Belgium	21,498	24,762	710	25,472
800	9,200	10,000	73	0.73%	Bulgaria		45,052	841	45,893
890	90	980	324	33.06%	Croatia		8,072	127	8,199
59,000	6,000	65,000	11,742	18.06%	Cyprus	77,156	75,769	1,204	76,973
6,800	700	7,500	195	2.60%	Czech Rep.	12,077	34,615	1,256	35,871
11,000	1,000	12,000	1,694	14.12%	Denmark	18,493	21,079	366	21,445
750	80	830	51	6.14%	Estonia		7,687	177	7,864
2,800	200	3,000	621	20.70%	Finland	11,228	11,908	241	12,149
200,000	61,000	261,000	33,869	12.98%	France	94,178	127,601	2,203	129,804
115,000	11,600	126,600	33,034	26.09%	Germany	262,276	262,356	11,208	273,564
18,000	6,000	24,000	3,182	13.26%	Greece	35,007	33,267	1,122	34,389
5,200	600	5,800	678	11.69%	Hungary		47,167	1,141	48,308
291,000	29,000	320,000	104,650	32.70%	Ireland	494,850	395,182	12,175	407,357
26,000	8,000	34,000	33,989	99.97%	Italy	107,002	131,195	3,424	134,619
370	0	370	129	34.86%	Latvia		53,977	692	54,669
290	30	320	51	15.94%	Lithuania		95,730	1,353	97,083
5,500	500	6,000	253	4.22%	Luxembourg	1,236	1,688	36	1,724
9,000	3,000	12,000	3,597	29.98%	Malta		26,695	1,093	27,788
44,000	4,000	48,000	7,811	16.27%	Netherlands	39,972	57,439	1,642	59,081
5,600	600	6,200	1,602	25.84%	Poland	60,680	561,098	18,023	579,121
38,000	11,000	49,000	6,257	12.77%	Portugal	36,402	85,845	2,316	88,161
4,500	500	5,000	29	0.58%	Romania	7,617	78,192	1,495	79,687
740	70	810	26	3.21%	Slovakia		56,165	1,659	57,824
330	30	360	111	30.83%	Slovenia		1,964	44	2,008
761,000	229,000	990,000	74,636	7.54%	Spain	54,105	77,554	1,630	79,184
18,000	1,000	19,000	2,052	10.80%	Sweden	22,366	30,151	543	30,694
1,661,070	387,000	2,048,070	330,253	16.13%		1,375,654	2,370,797	67,221	2,438,018

Balance of Competencies – Ministry of Justice & Home Office review – Police & Criminal
Justice – response from Hertfordshire Criminal Justice Board – 24th July 2014

- *¹ - *Home Secretary – Mrs Theresa May 20th May 2014*
- *² – Table of EU Residents compiled a) from the BBC “Brits Abroad 2006 and b) 2011
Census data
- *³ High crime society.

Of the 36 OECD countries the UK is ranked the

3rd highest for serious injury assaults.

5th for Rapes (Ireland, Sweden, Austria and Germany are 1 to 4 respectively)

7th for Burglary and Robbery

Car thefts

Most of this is to do with our binge drinking culture

While the UK crimes are falling we still a long way to go in matching the very low rates of
crime in Spain, Hungary, Finland and Portugal.