



Library Note

Identity Cards in the UK

Identity Cards were first used in the United Kingdom during the two World Wars—first under the National Registration Act 1915 and then under the National Registration Act 1939. Following a High Court ruling that called into question whether it was right for authorities to continue to use a power given during a national emergency when the emergency no longer existed, May 1952 saw wartime identity cards formally ended.

In the period that followed, there remained some support for the reintroduction of identity cards and, in May 1995, the then Conservative Government published a green paper on identity cards. In June 1996, the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee published a report on identity cards, which was in favour of the introduction of some form of voluntary identity card, subject to a number of provisos. The Queen's Speech of parliamentary session 1996–97 included a commitment to publish a draft Bill on the introduction of voluntary ID cards. However, the May 1997 general election cut the session short and no draft Bill was published.

In 2002, the then Labour Government launched a consultation on entitlement cards (later referred to by the Government as “identity cards”). Of those who responded, the majority supported an ID card scheme. The Identity Cards Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by the Government on 29 November 2004. The Bill completed its Commons stages and received second reading in the House of Lords, but was dropped before it completed its remaining stages due to the timing of the 2005 general election. A similar Bill was introduced into Parliament on 25 May 2005 and received royal assent on 30 March 2006. The Identity Cards Act 2006 created a framework for national identity cards in the UK and a national identity register.

Following a change of government in 2010, the Identity Documents Act 2010 was passed by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government. The Act cancelled ID cards and enabled the disposal of information recorded in the national identity register. The UK national identity card ceased to be a legal document for confirming a person's identity on 21 January 2011 and all data was “securely destroyed” along with the national identity register on 10 February 2011. The current Government has said it has “no plans” to reintroduce identity cards for British citizens.

This Lords Library briefing provides background information ahead of the debate in the House of Lords scheduled for 14 January 2016 on the “potential use of identity documentation in dealing with the challenges of assuring the identity of individuals”. It does this through a short chronology of the history of ID cards in the UK over the last century. It then provides more information about two key pieces of legislation: the Identity Cards Act 2006 and the Identity Documentation Act 2010.

Mary Santo
8 January 2016
LLN 2016/002

House of Lords Library Notes are compiled for the benefit of Members of the House of Lords and their personal staff, to provide impartial, politically balanced briefing on subjects likely to be of interest to Members of the Lords. Authors are available to discuss the contents of the Notes with the Members and their staff but cannot advise members of the general public.

Any comments on Library Notes should be sent to the Head of Research Services, House of Lords Library, London SW1A 0PW or emailed to purvism@parliament.uk.

I. Identity Cards in the UK: Overview

Wartime Identity Cards

During the two World Wars, identity cards were in use in the United Kingdom. The National Registration Act 1915 was passed by Parliament on 15 July 1915, and a register was created a month later. The Act required everyone between the age of 15 and 65 to register and each registered person was provided with a certificate.¹ The information supplied under the Act “provided manpower statistics and also enabled the military authorities to discriminate between persons who should be called up for military service and those who should in the national interest be retained in civil employment”.²

In 1939, identity cards were reintroduced as a security measure under the National Registration Act 1939.³ The scheme continued after the war to assist in the administration of food rationing.⁴ From 1939 to 1952 it was compulsory to carry an identity card in the United Kingdom.⁵ The police had powers to see identity cards in certain circumstances and, if a person failed to show one, it had to be produced at a police station within two days. Failing this, an individual could be charged under the National Registration Act 1939.

Abolition of Wartime Identity Cards

In June 1951, an appeal case in the High Court called into question whether it was right for authorities to continue to use a power given during a national emergency when the emergency no longer existed. The appeal was by a man named Clarence Henry Willcock. Mr Willcock had refused to show his identity card following a minor motoring offence and had been subsequently charged. The High Court ruling noted that the police were “as a matter of routine” demanding the production of national registration identity cards “whenever they stop or interrogate a motorist for whatever cause”.⁶ The ruling concluded that for police “to demand a national registration identity card from all and sundry, for [...] some trivial matter [...] is wholly unreasonable. They ought not to use a Security Act, which was passed for a particular purpose [...]”.⁷

Following a change of government—from Labour to Conservative in October 1951—the National Registration Act was formally ended in May 1952.⁸

In succeeding years, there remained some support for the reintroduction of identity cards. For example, in 1975, Michael Mates MP (Conservative) asked the Government whether it was “making any contingency plans to introduce identity cards”, to which Roy Jenkins, the then Home Secretary, responded “no”.⁹ In 1989, a National Identity Cards Bill was introduced to the Commons by Conservative MP Ralph Howell. Although the majority of Members voted in

¹ [HC Hansard, 29 June 2015, col 1654.](#)

² The National Archives, ‘[General Register Office: National Registration: Correspondence and Papers](#)’, accessed 6 January 2016.

³ House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 30 July 2004, HC 130-I of session 2003–04, Vol I, p 7.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*, pp 7–8.

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ [HC Hansard, 31 July 1952, col 163W.](#)

⁹ [HC Hansard, 17 July 1975, col 580W.](#)

favour of the Bill at second reading (48 to 37), as fewer than 100 Members in total voted in the majority, the Bill did not proceed further.¹⁰ In May 1995, the then Conservative Government published a green paper on identity cards. The green paper set out a range of possible options with regards to ID cards, including: no card; a new voluntary identity card—which would also serve as a valid travel card within the European Economic Area (EEA); or a compulsory ID card.¹¹ The Government consultation ended in September 1995 and the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee undertook an inquiry on the issue. In June 1996, the Committee published its report and its overall conclusion was that:

[T]he balance of advantage to the individual citizen and to the public as a whole is in favour of the introduction of some form of voluntary identity card, subject to the proviso that the particular card is sufficiently reliable, is sufficiently widely held, is accompanied by protections for civil liberties, and does not entail disproportionate cost.¹²

The Committee did not recommend the introduction of a compulsorily held card on the basis that “none of the bodies who might have been expected to be in favour, such as the police and the financial and commercial sectors, had called for one”.¹³ However, the Committee also noted its view that only a compulsory card, or one that carried details of immigration status, would have an impact on preventing illegal immigration.¹⁴

The Government’s response to the Committee report stated that it intended to introduce a voluntary ID card scheme.¹⁵ The Queen’s Speech of parliamentary session 1996–97 included a commitment to publish a draft Bill on the introduction of voluntary ID cards. However, the May 1997 general election cut the session short and no draft Bill was published.¹⁶

Identity Cards Act 2006

On 3 July 2002, the then Labour Government launched a consultation on entitlement cards (later referred to by the Government as “identity cards”). Findings from the consultation showed that, of those who responded, the majority supported an ID card scheme. The Identity Cards Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by the Government on 29 November 2004. The Bill completed its Commons stages and received second reading in the House of Lords, but the Bill was dropped before it completed its remaining stages due to the timing of the 2005 general election. A similar Bill was introduced into Parliament on 25 May 2005 and received royal assent on 30 March 2006 as the Identity Cards Act 2006.¹⁷

¹⁰ [HC Hansard, 10 February 1989, cols 1265–331](#).

¹¹ House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 30 July 2004, HC 130–I of session 2003–04, Vol I, p 8.

¹² House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 26 June 1996, HC 172–I of session 1996–7, Vol I, pp xxxix, para 126.

¹³ House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 30 July 2004, HC 130–I of session 2003–04, Vol I, p 9.

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p 10.

¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁷ Parliament UK website, [‘Draft Bills 2003–04’](#), accessed 23 December 2015.

The Identity Cards Act 2006 created a framework for national identity cards in the UK and a national identity register. A Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) published alongside the Identity Cards Bill in November 2004 explained that the Bill would result in achieving the following:

- less illegal migration and illegal working; and better community relations as a result;
- an enhancement to the UK's capability to counter terrorism and serious and organised crime;
- reduced identity fraud;
- more efficient and effective delivery of public services.¹⁸

Identity Documents Act 2010

Following a change of government in 2010, the Identity Documents Act 2010 was passed by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government. The Act cancelled ID cards and enabled the disposal of information recorded in the national identity register.¹⁹ The UK national identity card ceased to be a legal document for confirming a person's identity on 21 January 2011.²⁰ The UK national identity card also ceased to be a valid travel document. The personal details of everyone issued with a national identity card had been recorded on a national identity register. The data was "securely destroyed" along with the national identity register on 10 February 2011.²¹

Although identity cards were repealed by the Identity Documents Act 2010, the UK Border Agency (UKBA) continues to issue biometric residence permits to non-European Economic Area (non-EEA) foreign nationals—formerly known as identity cards for foreign nationals.²² A biometric residence permit is issued to non-EEA nationals staying in the UK for more than six months to provide evidence of the holders' immigration status in the UK.²³ The biometric data is not kept on a national identity register.²⁴

Current Government Policy

In November 2015, Lord Campbell-Savours (Labour) asked the Government "what further consideration they are giving to introducing national identity cards".²⁵ Lord Bates, the Home Office minister, replied that the Government had "no plans" to reintroduce identity cards for British citizens. He noted that the decision to abolish identity cards and the national identity register in 2010 had been taken on two grounds:

[F]irst, on cost, because it cost £85 million to run and nearly £1 billion was required to maintain the register; and secondly, in terms of effectiveness, because the very people

¹⁸ Home Office, [Identity Cards Bill Regulatory Impact Assessment](#), 29 November 2004, para 1.

¹⁹ House of Commons, [Identity Documents Bill: Explanatory Notes](#), 27 May 2010.

²⁰ Home Office, [Identity Cards and New Identity and Passport Service Suppliers](#), 26 March 2013.

²¹ *ibid.*

²² *ibid.*

²³ [HL Hansard, 'Identity Cards: Written Question', 19 October 2015, col HL2396.](#)

²⁴ Home Office, [Identity Cards and New Identity and Passport Service Suppliers](#), 26 March 2013.

²⁵ [HL Hansard, 26 November 2015, col 808.](#)

whose identity we might want to have would be the last people in the queue to comply with the requirement for the ID card.²⁶

Although the Government has ruled out introducing identity cards, periodic calls for their re-introduction occur. In August 2015, for example, Philippe Mignonet, deputy mayor of Calais, was reported to urge the UK to introduce identity cards as part of efforts to deter migrants from gathering at the French port in attempts to cross the Channel and to prevent illegal working by immigrants in UK.²⁷

Sections 2 and 3 of this briefing provide further information about the Identity Cards Act 2006 and the Identity Documentation Act 2010, including background to their introductions and the arguments made during their passage through Parliament. Section 4 concludes with brief summaries of recent contributions in Parliament with regard to identity cards.

2. Identity Cards Act 2006

2.1 Policy Development 2002–2006

Entitlement Cards and Identity Fraud: Consultation (2002–2003)

On 3 July 2002, David Blunkett, the then Home Secretary made a statement about the launch of a Government consultation on entitlement cards (later referred to by the Government as “identity cards”) and identity fraud. He explained that:

Since the terrorist atrocities in the United States [on 11 September 2001], I have been asked a number of times whether the Government would introduce identity cards. I have made it clear that any debate must not focus on issues of national security alone. Of equal importance are the issues of citizenship and entitlement to services. The focus should therefore be on whether entitlement cards would be genuinely useful to people in their daily lives and in affirming their identity.²⁸

Among the possible benefits of introducing entitlement cards which were highlighted by the Government, Mr Blunkett noted in particular that:

Crucially, an entitlement card could help us to tackle illegal working. Illegal working undermines the minimum wage and the rights and conditions of the lowest paid. An entitlement card could give businesses and employees a simple, straightforward and verifiable way of establishing the right to work legally. It could thereby assist us in tackling the sub-economy.²⁹

Entitlement cards were also proposed as a possible powerful weapon in the fight against identity fraud—which at that time was noted to be a “growing criminal activity” which amounted to £1.3 billion a year and was a “genuine concern among the public”.³⁰ Mr Blunkett added, however, that it “would take time for a card to make its full impact” so the consultation

²⁶ [HL Hansard, 26 November 2015, col 808.](#)

²⁷ Alicia McCarthy, ‘[Calais and the UK’s Lack of ID Cards](#)’, BBC News website, 4 August 2015; and Claire Duffin, ‘[UK Must Do More to Help Calais, Says Town’s Deputy Mayor](#)’, *Telegraph*, 22 October 2014.

²⁸ [HC Hansard, 3 July 2002, col 228.](#)

²⁹ [ibid., col 227.](#)

³⁰ [ibid.](#)

also sought views on several other projects that could provide “rapid gains” against identity fraud.³¹

Other suggested advantages of introducing entitlement cards highlighted by the consultation included:

- better and more appropriate access to services;
- a convenient travel document;
- proof of age;
- new ways of voting;
- carrying fewer cards.³²

Although the consultation set out a possible scheme for the cards, Mr Blunkett explained that the Government had “an open mind” on how a card scheme could operate: “the key issue is the use to which a card might be put, so a genuine consultation exercise is aimed at hearing from the public what services people would like to be linked to a card”.³³ The consultation considered a universal entitlement card, which everyone would register for and be issued with and would “be required for the purpose of gaining access to services or employment”.³⁴ The consultation also considered the pros and cons of a voluntary card scheme that people could choose to opt into “based primarily on their wish for secure and verifiable identification”.³⁵ Mr Blunkett explained that a compulsory card scheme had been ruled out by the Government and would not therefore be consulted on—compulsory was defined by the Government as “a card that would have to be carried by each individual at all times”.³⁶

The infringement of personal freedoms and “historic concerns” about a legal requirement to carry a card were recognised by the Government to be “real worries” for some. The Government, Mr Blunkett noted, would need to ensure that any scheme complied with the Data Protection Act 1998. The consultation period ended on 31 January 2003.

Consultation Findings Published (November 2003)

A summary of findings from the 2002–03 consultation were published on 11 November 2003.³⁷ The findings showed that, by the beginning of March 2003, there were 2,606 views that were in support of a card scheme (61 percent of those who expressed an opinion), 1,587 views that were against a card scheme (38 percent) and 48 who were neutral (1 percent).³⁸ It also noted that the public preferred the use of the term identity card rather than entitlement card.³⁹

³¹ The Cabinet Office published a separate paper about Identity Fraud on the same day that it launched the consultation. See [Identity Fraud: A Study](#), July 2002.

³² *ibid.*

³³ [HC Hansard, 3 July 2002, col 228](#).

³⁴ *ibid.*

³⁵ *ibid.*

³⁶ *ibid.*

³⁷ Home Office, [Identity Cards: A Summary of Findings from the Consultation Exercise on Entitlement Cards and Identity Fraud](#), November 2003, Cm 6019, p 16

³⁸ *ibid.*

³⁹ *ibid.*, p 27.

Identity Cards: the Next Steps (November 2003)

At the same time as publishing the findings of the 2003 consultation, the Government announced its decision to “begin the process of introducing a national identity card scheme as a key part of a comprehensive strategy to contain [...] threats and ensure more reliable means of authenticating people’s identity”.⁴⁰ The Government explained that a national identity cards scheme would help contain “growing threats to the security and prosperity of British citizens from illegal migration and working, organised crime and terrorism, identity theft and fraud, and fraudulent access to public services”.⁴¹ Some of the reasons set out by the Government as to why it felt identity cards were needed included, in summary:

- A lack of internal immigration controls which resulted in people being drawn to the UK illegally;
- A need to encourage people to come to the UK legitimately to work;
- The promotion of a more cohesive society as a result of an inclusive scheme which would cover everyone who had the right to be in the UK and would result in people being more welcoming of new arrivals, helping to promote a more cohesive society;
- To help prevent terrorists who use false and multiple identities;
- To help prevent organised crime that facilitates money laundering, and other crimes such as drug-related crimes and people-trafficking;
- To help to tackle identity fraud;
- To assist public services which require individuals to provide proof of identity, and to give individuals who are entitled to services a more convenient way to access them without needing to carry numerous cards of documents while also preventing unauthorised access to services.⁴²

The Government contended that the cards scheme was “designed to protect, not erode, civil liberties, by protecting people’s true identity against fraud and by enabling them to prove their identity more easily”.⁴³

It was proposed that the scheme would take place in two phases. The first phase would involve publishing draft legislation, which provided for: establishing a national identity register; proceeding towards more secure passports and driving licences based on biometric technology; making available a voluntary plain identity card for individuals who do not need a passport or driving licence and choose to take it up; and introducing mandatory biometric identity documents for foreign nationals coming to stay in the UK for longer than three months.⁴⁴ The second phase provided an opportunity to move to a compulsory card scheme, in which it would be compulsory to have a card but not to carry one. The Government explained that a move to compulsory cards would require a “full debate and a vote in both houses of

⁴⁰ Home Office, [Identity Cards: The Next Steps](#), November 2003, Cm 6020, p 4.

⁴¹ *ibid.*

⁴² *ibid.*, pp 6–7.

⁴³ *ibid.*, p 4.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, pp 4–5.

Parliament” and would only take place after a “rigorous evaluation” of the first stage of the scheme.⁴⁵

The Government intended that the introduction of plain identity cards would start from the year 2007/08 and, together with the incremental roll-out of biometric passports and later possibly driving licences, “might be expected to cover 80 percent of the economically active population within five years”.⁴⁶

House of Commons Home Affairs Committee Report (July 2004)

In November 2003, the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee announced an inquiry into identity cards to “inquire into all aspects of identity cards, including the practical aspects of the Government’s proposals and of any future schemes”.⁴⁷ The Committee would also carry out pre-legislative scrutiny of the Government’s draft Bill.⁴⁸ A draft Identity Cards Bill was published on 26 April 2004 and gave effect to the Government’s proposals for the introduction of identity cards throughout the UK. In July 2004, the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee published a report on both its inquiry and on the Government’s draft Bill.

The Committee concluded that it believed that the Government had “made a convincing case for proceeding with the introduction of identity cards”, although noting that the introduction of identity cards carried with it “clear risks”.⁴⁹ The Committee suggested ID cards could make a “real and important contribution to fighting organised crime and terrorism by disrupting the use of multiple identities, identity fraud and related activities like money-laundering” and that full benefits would come with a compulsory scheme.⁵⁰ According to the Committee, ID cards could also bring a “significant” contribution to tackling illegal working, and a contribution to reducing illegal immigration, if accompanied by other measures.

The Committee considered opposition to identity cards on principle and practical grounds. It did not believe that an ID card scheme should be rejected on constitutional grounds alone, but it did express its view that the scheme proposed by the Government would “undoubtedly represent a significant change in the relationship between the state and the individual” in the UK.⁵¹ It noted that international experience did not suggest that objections of principle were “overwhelming”, but made the point that the development of a biometric based scheme would introduce elements that had not been tested elsewhere.⁵² The Committee also noted that it could not be assumed that approaches tested elsewhere would equally work in the UK. The Committee’s view was that “the test should be whether the measures needed to install and operate an effective identity card system are proportionate to the benefits such a system would bring and to the problems to be tackled” and if such a system was the most effective way to do so.⁵³

⁴⁵ Home Office, [Identity Cards: The Next Steps](#), November 2003, Cm 6020, p 5.

⁴⁶ *ibid.*

⁴⁷ Parliament UK website, [‘Home Affairs Committee Press Notice’](#), 11 November 2003.

⁴⁸ *ibid.*

⁴⁹ House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 30 July 2004, HC 130-1 of session 2003–04, Vol I, p 5.

⁵⁰ *ibid.*, p 3.

⁵¹ *ibid.*, p 22.

⁵² *ibid.*, p 3.

⁵³ *ibid.*, p 22.

The Government's proposed system was seen to be "unprecedentedly" large and complex by the Committee. It reiterated that the Government had a "lack of clarity" about the scope and practical operation of the scheme, and the nature of the procurement process, which it described as a "serious weakness".⁵⁴ Among other conclusions, the Committee expressed the view that the Government's stated aims had "changed over time" and it criticised the use of the term "voluntary" to describe the first stage of the scheme (though it believed that an incremental approach was warranted).⁵⁵

The Committee summarised that its consideration of the draft Bill was "not as detailed" as it would have wanted. However, it concluded that the draft Bill "gives the Government powers to register a wide range of information not obviously related to establishing identity and allows wider access to the database than is justified by the fight against organised crime and terrorism".⁵⁶ It added that:

It is unacceptable to leave to secondary legislation questions over the degree of access to the database, especially since the purposes of the Bill need to be made less broad. We believe that the move to the compulsory stage should be subject to primary legislation [...].⁵⁷

The Joint Committee on Human Rights also scrutinised the Bill. In its report published in February 2005, the Committee stated:

The provisions of the Bill raise a number of serious questions of human rights Compatibility [...]. The report raises concerns about the compatibility of provisions of the Bill with the right to respect for private life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and the right to non-discrimination in the protection of the Convention rights under Article 14 ECHR.⁵⁸

Draft Identity Cards Bill Consultation (April 2004)

A Government consultation was also launched at the same time that the draft Identity Cards Bill was published. Although the consultation on the draft legislation officially ended on 20 July 2004, discussion with some organisations continued after the end of the consultation period as the Government was "keen to see the debate continue".⁵⁹ Correspondence received after 20 July 2004 continued to be noted and recorded.

In October 2004, the Government published a summary of findings from the consultation on legislation on ID cards. The consultation reported a "relatively small number of responses", with 766 in total which included 109 from organisations rather than individuals.⁶⁰ There were 370 responses (48 percent) to the consultation which were overall opposed to the scheme and 240 (31 percent) which were overall in favour of the scheme.⁶¹ There were 60 responses

⁵⁴ House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 30 July 2004, HC 130-I of session 2003–04, Vol I, p 23.

⁵⁵ *ibid*, pp 3–5.

⁵⁶ *ibid*, pp 3–4.

⁵⁷ *ibid*, p 5.

⁵⁸ Joint Committee on Human Rights, [Identity Cards Bill](#), HL Paper 35 of session 2004–05, 2 February 2005, p 3. For a summary of issues that the report particularly questioned, see pp 3–4.

⁵⁹ Home Office, [Identity Cards: A Summary of Findings from the Consultation on Legislation on Identity Cards](#), October 2004, Cm 6358, p 8.

⁶⁰ *ibid*, p 11.

⁶¹ *ibid*, p 12.

(8 percent) that were supportive in principle, but had reservations about some aspects of the Bill, and 96 (13 percent) were neutral.⁶²

Although the responses to the consultation itself were greater in opposition to the Bill, the report also noted the Government had received 1,316 items of general correspondence during the consultation period. Of these, 272 (21 percent) of the correspondence was reported to be opposed, and 410 (31 percent) were reported to be in favour, with 634 (48 percent) being neutral.⁶³ The report explained that the majority of those who were against the introduction of identity cards “objected to the general principle of it being compulsory to own a proof of identity” and were often supported with “generalised assertions that the identity cards scheme and/or the Register would not work”.⁶⁴ The main themes which arose from those who were against a scheme included concerns about: national identity register and “function creep”; privacy; and costs.⁶⁵ Of those who were supportive of the introduction of identity cards, main themes which arose relating to benefits included: assist in the fight against crime and anti-social behaviour; support counter-terrorism; and help in proving identity.⁶⁶ Of those who supported, “many” were noted to believe the proposal would benefit from amendment with common suggestions being to: make the carrying of an identity card mandatory; combine existing documents to create a universal identity document; and to include medical information on the card.⁶⁷

2.2. Parliamentary Passage of Bill

On 29 November 2004, the Labour Government introduced an Identity Cards Bill in the House of Commons.⁶⁸ The Bill passed its stages in the House of Commons and received a second reading in the House of Lords, but ran out of time when Parliament was dissolved, prior to the general election in May 2005.

In 2005, the Labour Party election manifesto contained a commitment that, if re-elected, a Labour Government would “introduce identity cards, including biometric data like fingerprints, backed up by a national register and rolling out initially on a voluntary basis as people renew their passports”.⁶⁹

Following the general election, the Identity Cards Bill was published on 25 May 2005. The Bill proposed the legal framework for national identity cards, and powers to introduce a compulsory ID card scheme at a future date. The Home Office had confirmed in 2003 that the ID card scheme would be introduced in two phases: the first on a voluntary basis where a person was only required to register for a card if they applied, or re-applied, for a passport; the second phase would move to a compulsory card scheme, following a “rigorous evaluation” of the first stage, and Parliamentary approval.⁷⁰

⁶² Home Office, [Identity Cards: A Summary of Findings from the Consultation on Legislation on Identity Cards](#), October 2004, Cm 6358, p 12.

⁶³ *ibid.*

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, p 16.

⁶⁵ *ibid.*

⁶⁶ *ibid.*, p 13.

⁶⁷ *ibid.*, p 13.

⁶⁸ For a timeline of policy development since 1988 with regard to UK national identity cards, see House of Commons Library, [Identity Documents Bill: Bill 1 of 2010–11](#), 4 June 2010, pp 3–6.

⁶⁹ Labour Party, [Britain Forward Not Back: the Labour Party Manifesto 2005](#), pp 52–3.

⁷⁰ Home Office, [Identity Cards: the Next Steps](#), November 2003, Cm 6020, p 5.

At second reading, the then Home Secretary, Charles Clarke, explained to MPs why the Government had brought forward the Bill:

We live in a society where information is held about all of us—everyone in this House and everyone in this country—on a scale unfamiliar to our predecessors even as recently as 10 years ago. [...] We need to protect our society in this globalised world, for the simple reason that, in many cases, identity can be stolen, whether it is a fraudster getting money from a bank account, a people trafficker providing false documents for a trafficked person, or a smuggler pretending to be their own father to deal with data. Such identity can be stolen. In other cases, complicated processes are now needed to check identity because it is not secure—there are examples as simple as opening a bank account, getting a pass from the Criminal Records Bureau or getting a passport or driving licence [...] I argue that the identity card has real benefits to the individual and society, and that it is a means of limiting abuse in our modern information society rather than a means of adding to it and creating it in a more complex way. It gives individuals the right to secure verification of their identity.⁷¹

For the Opposition, the then Shadow Home Secretary David Davis said that:

[T]he Home Secretary's proposals represent a fundamental shift in the balance of power between the citizen and the state. [...] The system that the Home Secretary is proposing will be far more sophisticated than that of the 1940s, the 1950s or the first war years. That makes it all the more important that what he is proposing is not open to misuse. The identity card itself is just the plastic embodiment of a much greater and potentially more pernicious thing—the new national identity register. That is what the Bill is essentially about. The register is a massive database containing detailed personal information about every person in the country—a database that can be accessed by officials and public bodies without permission and without the person whom they are looking up ever knowing that it has happened.⁷²

He added that:

I accepted that we should listen to the Government's case, just as we should consider any possible device that could make our country and our people safer. Having done so, including considering what the Home Secretary said today, I conclude that the Government's identity card will be little more than an expensive waste of time and money. [...] ID cards were originally presented as a response to the terrorist threat after 9/11, which is why I was prepared to listen in the first place. Despite the Home Secretary's comments today, the Government no longer make that case—they know that ID cards would not take effect for many, many years and that terrorists would not be deterred by them. Furthermore, the cards will not be compulsory, so they will not have any effect. [...] The purpose of ID cards remains unclear [...] It is now clear that ID cards will not fight terrorism, tackle crime, control immigration or stop fraud. They have no effective purpose.⁷³

⁷¹ [HC Hansard, 28 June 2005, cols 1152–3.](#)

⁷² [ibid, cols 1171–2.](#)

⁷³ [ibid, cols 1173–4.](#)

The Liberal Democrats also opposed the Bill. Mark Oaten, the then Home Affairs spokesperson for the Liberal Democrats, argued that:

We need to be convinced in the first place that we understand and agree with the purpose of legislation; then we have to believe that the costs are not excessive either to society or the individual. Thirdly, we need to be convinced that any measure can work and be effective. Finally, and most importantly for Liberals, we need to be convinced that the impact on society and civil liberties will not be extensive. On all four counts, we believe that the Identity Cards Bill fails.

The Bill passed the Commons on 18 October 2005. On consideration in the House of Lords the Bill was amended. Among other amendments, Baroness Anelay of St Johns (Conservative) moved an amendment at Lords report stage on 23 January 2006 to ensure that the move from a voluntary ID card scheme to a compulsory one could only be achieved by new primary legislation. The amendment was passed in the Lords by a vote of 198 to 140.⁷⁴ When the Bill returned to the Commons for consideration of Lords amendments on 13 February 2006, the Government accepted that a separate Act of Parliament would be required for the compulsory registration of the entire population.⁷⁵ The Bill eventually passed with an amendment to the effect that primary legislation would be required for a move to compulsion.⁷⁶ The Identity Cards Bill received royal assent on 30 March 2006.

2.3 Implementation

Key provisions of the Identity Cards Act 2006 included establishing a national identity register and powers to issue identity cards (either linked to existing designated documents or as stand-alone ID cards). The Act also provided powers to make it compulsory for an individual to register—with sanctions against a failure to register. It ensured that checks could be made against other databases to confirm an applicant's identity as well as what information would be held. Other provisions included: setting out safeguards to protect an individual's data; enabling public and private sector organisations to verify a person's identity with the person's consent before providing services; and defined circumstances in which specified agencies (such as the police) could be provided with information held on the register without an individual's consent. The Act also created a new criminal offence relating to misuse of identity cards and included powers to link future access to specified public services to production of an identity card.⁷⁷

The Act came into force on 30 March 2006. The roll-out of compulsory ID cards for foreign nationals began in November 2008 and the roll-out of the ID card to UK residents began on a voluntary basis in November 2009.

Much of the Identity Cards Act 2006 consisted of enabling measures to provide for the introduction of identity cards and, consequently, the detailed roll-out of ID cards relied on secondary legislation. On 8 July 2009, five sets of regulations were approved by the House of Commons as a result of a series of deferred divisions, to give effect to the introduction of identity cards to parts of the UK population. On 13 July 2009 these regulations were also approved by the House of Lords. However, a sixth order, the draft Identity Cards Act 2006

⁷⁴ [HL Hansard, 23 January 2006, cols 980–96.](#)

⁷⁵ [HC Hansard, 13 February 2006, col 1169.](#)

⁷⁶ For a list of debates in the House of Commons and the House of Lords which lead to the Identity Cards Act 2006, see House of Commons Library, [Identity Documents Bill: Bill 1 of 2010–11](#), 4 June 2010.

⁷⁷ House of Commons, [Identity Cards Bill: Explanatory Notes](#), 27 May 2005.

(Designation) Order 2009, was withdrawn. The withdrawal followed a written ministerial statement by the then Home Secretary, Alan Johnson, on 30 June 2009—the consequence of which made the acquisition of ID cards by British citizens entirely voluntary:

[...] [H]olding an identity card should be a personal choice for British citizens—just as it is now to obtain a passport. Accordingly, I want the introduction of identity cards for all British citizens to be voluntary and I have therefore decided that identity cards issued to airside workers, planned initially at Manchester and London City airports later this year, should also be voluntary [...] The Government will, therefore, be withdrawing the Identity Cards Act 2006 (Designation) Order 2009 which was laid before Parliament on 6 May 2009. This would have made it a requirement for anyone applying for a criminal conviction certificate, as part of the process for obtaining an airside pass to access the restricted area at a specified airport, also to obtain an identity card.⁷⁸

Although the Labour Government had originally intended the ID card scheme to become compulsory, it never became so.⁷⁹

3. Identity Documents Act 2010

Party Manifesto Commitments 2010

The Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition agreement in May 2010 announced that the Coalition Government would “scrap the ID card scheme, the national identity register [...] and halt the next generation of biometric passports”.⁸⁰ This reflected a consensus present in each of the two separate party 2010 general election manifestos.

The Conservative Party 2010 manifesto said:

Labour’s approach to our personal privacy is the worst of all worlds—intrusive, ineffective and enormously expensive. We will scrap ID cards, the National Identity Register and the Contactpoint database.⁸¹

The Liberal Democrat Party 2010 manifesto promised:

Through making tough choices, as well as increasing efficiency and reducing bureaucracy across government, our savings will include [...] [s]crapping ID cards and the next generation of biometric passports [...] The Liberal Democrats will [...] [p]ay for 3,000 more police on the beat, affordable because we are cutting other spending, such as scrapping pointless ID cards [...] and] protect and restore your freedoms. We will [...] [s]crap intrusive Identity Cards and have more police instead, and also scrap plans for expensive, unnecessary new passports with additional biometric data.⁸²

⁷⁸ [HC Hansard, 30 June 2009, cols 11–13WS](#).

⁷⁹ For a chronology of Identity Cards in the UK, including details on its roll-out, see House of Commons Library, [Identity Documents Bill: Bill 1 of 2010–11](#), 4 June 2010, pp 4–6.

⁸⁰ Cabinet Office, [The Coalition: Our Programme for Government](#), 20 May 2010, p 11.

⁸¹ Conservative Party, [Invitation to Join the Government of Britain](#), April 2010, p 79.

⁸² Liberal Democrats, [Liberal Democrat Manifesto 2010](#), April 2010, pp 16, 72 and 93–4.

The Labour Party 2010 manifesto stated Labour’s intention to continue with the voluntary scheme:

The new biometric ID scheme which already covers foreign nationals will be offered to an increasing number of British citizens, but will not be compulsory for them. It will help fight the growing threat of identity theft and fraud, as well as crime, illegal immigration and terrorism. In the next Parliament ID cards and the ID scheme will be self-financing. The price of the passport and ID cards together with savings from reduced fraud across the public services will fully cover the costs of the scheme.⁸³

3.1 Parliamentary Passage of the Bill

The Identity Documents Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 26 May 2010. At second reading, Theresa May, the Home Secretary, explained why the Coalition Government was legislating to abolish identity cards. She said:

The national identity card scheme [...] is intrusive and bullying, ineffective and expensive. It is an assault on individual liberty which does not promise a greater good. The Bill is, therefore, partly symbolic. It sends a message that the Government are going to do business in a different way. We are the servants of the people, not their masters, and every action that we take must be considered in that context.⁸⁴

Theresa May explained that, if an overwhelming case could be made that ID cards would keep people safe without intruding on civil liberties, the Government “would find the funding”.⁸⁵ But she contended that case could not be made. Included in her arguments against the cards was that, should databases be compromised, so too would the security of it and noted previous instances where data held by the Government had been lost.⁸⁶ She also argued that ID cards would not make people safer or beat benefit fraud: “Benefit fraud usually involves people lying about their personal circumstances rather than their identity. Turkish and Spanish ID cards stopped neither the Istanbul bombers in 2003 nor the Madrid bombers in 2004; nor did German ID cards prevent terrorists plotting 9/11 in Hamburg”.⁸⁷

Alan Johnson, the then Shadow Home Secretary, explained his party would not vote against the Bill at second reading:

We believe that the 15,000 cards already in use should continue to be a legitimate form of identity [...] We think a version of the national identity register must continue to exist in some form, and that second generation biometric passports need to go ahead. However, we will pursue those arguments in Committee and at other stages of the Bill’s passage.⁸⁸

Dr Julian Huppert (Liberal Democrat MP for Cambridge) spoke to oppose identity cards:

I have always thought that there are three main reasons why we should not have them: the issues of principle, practice and price. [...] Lord Goddard, the Lord Chief Justice,

⁸³ Labour Party, *The Labour Party Manifesto 2010*, April 2010, p 5:5.

⁸⁴ [HC Hansard, 9 June 2010, col 345.](#)

⁸⁵ [ibid, cols 350–1.](#)

⁸⁶ [ibid.](#)

⁸⁷ [ibid.](#)

⁸⁸ [ibid, col 352.](#)

said that the use of identity cards “tends to make people resentful of the acts of the police, and inclines them to obstruct the police instead of assisting them.” That was true in 1952, and it is true now.

[...] They, and the much worse identity register, are part of a complex Government IT project. We know what happens to such projects—they tend not to work very well, they cost too much, there are a security problems, and they are hard to implement [...] this is a general problem of Government IT projects across the world. Mission creep is also a problem, because one starts off by collecting only a little information and gradually more and more is obtained.

[...] The price of ID cards was also an issue, and we heard some argument about the exact cost to the public purse earlier. I say to the shadow Home Secretary that it is not just the public purse that matters; we should also care about the cost to all the people who had to buy the cards and would have continued to buy the cards under the Labour Government's scheme. We are limiting the cost to them as much as we can, as well as limiting the cost to the public purse [...] [T]here would have been continued costs for them in the form of fines and the cost of keeping the database going.⁸⁹

Following legislative scrutiny of the Bill, the Joint Committee on Human Rights (JCHR) concluded in its October 2010 report that the abolition of the ID card scheme would resolve a number of concerns raised by the JCHR in earlier reports on the Identity Cards Bill and that the Bill reflects a “major step in reducing the ability of the state to collect voluminous personal information” from individuals.⁹⁰

The Bill passed its stages in the Commons on 15 September 2010 and passed through the Lords on 24 November 2010. On 17 November 2010, the Lords agreed to an amendment to the Bill which would have provided compensation to ID cardholders whose cards were due to be cancelled, by a majority of 220 to 188.⁹¹ On consideration in the Commons, on 14 December 2010, the amendment was rejected on the basis of financial privilege.⁹² Deputy Speaker, Nigel Evans, explained:

Having given careful consideration to the amendment, Mr Speaker is satisfied that it would impose a charge on the public revenue that is not authorised by a resolution of this House. The amendment is therefore deemed to be disagreed to, and is not available for debate, in accordance with Standing Order No. 78(3).⁹³

On consideration in the Lords on 21 December 2010, Lord Hunt of Kings Heath, Shadow Spokesperson for the Cabinet Office and Home Affairs, summarised that because the amendment had been sent back on the grounds of financial privilege, it would be contrary to convention to send back another amendment to the Commons.⁹⁴ He noted, however, that “12,000 or so members of the public purchased a card for £30” and that the cards were for a

⁸⁹ [ibid. cols 401–2.](#)

⁹⁰ Joint Committee on Human Rights, [Legislative Scrutiny: Identity Documents Bill](#), HL Paper 36 of session 2010–11, 18 October 2010, p 21.

⁹¹ [HL Hansard, 17 November 2010, col 797.](#)

⁹² [HC Hansard, 14 December 2010, col 876.](#)

⁹³ [ibid.](#)

⁹⁴ [HL Hansard, 21 December 2010, col 998.](#)

period of ten years—and that the debate on consideration “none the less affords an opportunity to the House to indicate to the Minister the strength of feeling on this matter”.⁹⁵

The Identity Documents Bill received royal assent on 21 December 2010.

Validity of Pre-Existing National ID Cards

Among issues raised during the passage of the Identity Documents Bill through Parliament was the question as to whether identity cards that had already been issued should still be valid for the ten-year period that citizens had originally purchased the card for. This was not agreed to. The identity card is no longer valid for official purposes, but it is not, however, against the law to use a previously issued identity card as proof of identity after 21 January 2011.⁹⁶ The Government has noted, for example, that some organisations may still be willing to accept them as proof of identity without the ability to check against the national identity register.⁹⁷

3.2 Reaction

The move by the Coalition Government to abolish the national ID card was supported, in particular, by a number of civil liberty groups—such as Justice, Liberty, Charter 88, and NO2ID, who had campaigned against Labour’s proposed measures for a national identity card. Liberty—a cross party, non-party membership organisation promoting rights and freedoms in the UK—said that it was opposed to the ID card scheme and the national identity register because it thought it would have been:

- Ineffective: There was no evidence to show that ID cards would have cut crime, in fact they could make things worse;
- Unfair: It is likely that ID cards would have heightened existing inequalities;
- Expensive: The Government estimated in November 2008 that the ID Card scheme would cost £5bn;
- Intrusive: A huge amount of information would have been held on individuals, and shared with many agencies within the government.⁹⁸

The Police Federation was recorded to note that:

Although [ID cards] would undoubtedly create another hurdle for terrorists we have never claimed them to be a panacea for all forms of criminality. Nevertheless, we live in an age in which security will be paramount for the foreseeable future and all available measures should therefore be taken.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ [HL Hansard, 21 December 2010, cols 998–9.](#)

⁹⁶ Joint Committee on Human Rights, [Legislative Scrutiny: Identity Documents Bill](#), HL Paper 36 of session 2010–11, 18 October 2010, p 21.

⁹⁷ *ibid.*

⁹⁸ Liberty, ‘[ID Cards](#),’ accessed 11 December 2015.

⁹⁹ Police Federation policy, *Identity Cards*, (accessed by House of Commons Library, [Identity Documents Bill: Bill 1 of 2010–11](#), 4 June 2010).

Earlier, in 2004, when giving evidence to the Home Affairs Committee, the Police Federation had said that, while identity cards prevented neither 9/11 nor the Madrid bombings, it was “equally pertinent that identity cards were a vital link in the Spanish police’s investigation that successfully led to the suspects, thereby perhaps preventing further atrocities”.¹⁰⁰ The Police Federation had argued that people who had feared that identity cards would be an infringement on people’s liberties had resulted in a scheme not being “pushed hard enough”, and that carrying identity cards would bring benefits to all:

If an individual is stopped by the police, they would be able to confirm their identity instantly; the result of which is that they would not have to report to a police station—a lengthy process that would amount to a far greater infringement of their liberty [...] Other advantages exist including the added security individuals benefit from, by freeing up police time, helping in the prevention of fraud, reducing the problems of bogus callers as well as providing proof of age for pubs, clubs and other age-restricted areas.¹⁰¹

The Police Federation was also quoted to state that there would “need to be a constant review of procedures to ensure that identity cards cannot be forged and that legitimate possession is as secure as possible”.¹⁰²

Liberty has expressed hopes that ID cards for foreign nationals would also be abolished and has suggested that ID cards are “even more divisive when only one group in society is required to hold them” and that passports and visas are sufficient for immigration control.¹⁰³ However, the Government has noted that “European law requires non-EEA foreign nationals to be provided with biometric residence permits”.¹⁰⁴

4. Recent Parliamentary Questions

4.1 Lords Question on Identity Cards (November 2015)

In November 2015, Lord Campbell-Savours (Labour) asked a parliamentary question about government policy on identity cards. In a follow-up question, he noted that the UK differs from most European countries by not having a national identity card:

Nearly all European countries now have national identity cards. Germany’s latest card, which is highly secure, includes a digital photo, an electronic data function and biometric data, which can include a fingerprint. In these difficult circumstances, when identity is at the heart of our problems, should not all the political parties now reconsider their positions on the introduction of national identity cards? If other European countries can have confidence in their ID card systems, why cannot we do the same? Times are changing—the world is very different.¹⁰⁵

For the Government Lord Bates explained the Government had “a different approach”. He stressed that in the UK, 84 percent of the population had passports and over 60 percent had

¹⁰⁰ House of Commons Select Committee on Home Affairs, [Written Evidence—Memorandum Submitted by the Police Federation of England and Wales](#), January 2004.

¹⁰¹ *ibid.*

¹⁰² *ibid.*

¹⁰³ Liberty, ‘[ID Cards To Be Scrapped—But Must Be Scrapped For All](#)’, 27 May 2010.

¹⁰⁴ Home Office, ‘[Identity Cards and New Identity and Passport Service Suppliers](#)’, 26 March 2013.

¹⁰⁵ [HL Hansard, 26 November 2015, col 808](#).

driving licences—and that all people who come from outside the EEA to live in the UK for a period in excess of six months are required to have a biometric permit to do so.

Lord Reid of Cardowan (Labour)—a former Home Secretary—urged the Government to reconsider its position on ID cards “before it is too late”.¹⁰⁶ He highlighted that circumstances had changed considerably over the last decade, “not only as regards immigration and the introduction of digital services for individuals and citizens but particularly in regard to the national security and the protection of all of our citizens in counterterrorism and the assurance that we can give that to them”.¹⁰⁷ He added that, in his view, identification cards were “now a matter of national security”.¹⁰⁸

Speaking on behalf of the Government, Lord Bates, the Home Office Minister, stated that identity cards would not be effective in tackling national security, contending that “the very people you would want to catch would be the people who would not comply”.¹⁰⁹ He explained that was why the Government had decided that any money that would have been spent on an identity cards scheme would be better spent on: security and surveillance; better use of intelligence; investments in national security that the Government had previously announced; and improvement to the funding of cybersecurity and the police.¹¹⁰

Lord Bates added that the Government’s view was that ID cards had been tried: “we did try it; investment was put in place for it”.¹¹¹ He also explained that the Government’s conclusion “was that it did not work; it did not tackle the problems that we wanted it to tackle, it was very expensive and there was no compliance from the very people that we wanted to be protected from”.¹¹²

4.2 Lords Question on Immigration (December 2015)

In December 2015, during oral questions in the House of Lords on the subject of people who assist migrants who attempt to reach the UK via the Channel Tunnel terminal in Calais, Lord Tomlinson (Labour) asked the Government whether it was “about time” that the Government changed its mind with regard to ID cards.¹¹³ He suggested it should revisit “the role that identity cards can play in the fight against terrorists and illegal immigrants, and, by doing that, in the fight against the gangs that are organising these activities”.¹¹⁴ Lord Bates commented that the principal concern for the Government was national security and that it had chosen to spend the investment that would be required to put in place a system of ID on “better equipping” security forces and “better securing” borders to ensure that people were kept secure and safe:

We are now saying that we believe that the best security is achieved through a stronger, intelligence-led approach to tackling serious and organised criminals who have dealings in immigration crime or terrorists seeking to do us harm. We believe that the solution

¹⁰⁶ [HL Hansard, 26 November 2015, col 809.](#)

¹⁰⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *ibid.*

¹¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹¹ *ibid.*

¹¹² [ibid, col 810.](#)

¹¹³ [HL Hansard, 1 December 2015, col 1032.](#)

¹¹⁴ *ibid.*

should be intelligence led, which is why we have announced an additional £2 billion for the security services over the lifetime of this Parliament.¹¹⁵

4.3 Other Questions

Questions have also been raised by parliamentarians with regard to the possibility of a national identity card assisting in a range of other policy areas.

On 21 January 2015, Lord Hunt of Chesterton (Labour) asked the Government what assessment it had made of the impact of introducing identity cards “as a means of tracking the use of public services, monitoring anti-social and criminal behaviour, and collecting immigration statistics”.¹¹⁶ Lord Bates responded on 28 January 2015 that the Government had “no plans to introduce an identity card system for British citizens”.¹¹⁷ He added that:

Biometric Residence Permits are issued to non-EEA nationals staying in the UK for more than six months. These provide evidence of the holders' immigration status in the UK. The Government has also introduced a series of robust new measures through the Immigration Act 2014 to prevent those migrants here illegally from accessing a range of public services to which they are not entitled.¹¹⁸

Another recent question, on 15 September 2015 by Jim Shannon (Democratic Unionist Party MP for Strangford), asked the Secretary of State for Health if he would “hold discussions with representatives of the pharmaceuticals industry on the potential merits of the use of identity cards for the use of prescription drugs to minimise misuse of such drugs”.¹¹⁹ Again, the Government responded that it had “no plans to do so”.¹²⁰

¹¹⁵ [HL Hansard, 1 December 2015, col 1032.](#)

¹¹⁶ [HL Hansard, 'Identity Cards: Written Question—HL4344', 21 January 2015.](#)

¹¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*

¹¹⁹ [HC Hansard, 'Prescription Drugs: Written Question—10257', 15 September 2015.](#)

¹²⁰ *ibid.*

Further Reading

Below is a selection of Library briefings, committee reports and Government reports in relation to identity documents which may be of interest for further reading:

- Joint Committee on Human Rights, [Legislative Scrutiny: Identity Documents Bill](#), 18 October 2010, HL Paper 36 of session 2010–11
- House of Lords Select Committee on the Constitution, [Identity Cards Bill](#), 24 October 2005, HL Paper 44 of session 2005–06
- House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, [Identity Cards](#), 30 July 2004, HC 130-I of session 2003–04, Vol I; and [Government response](#), October 2004
- Home Office, [Identity Cards: A Summary of Findings from the Consultation on Legislation on Identity Cards](#), October 2004, Cm 6358
- House of Lords Library, [Identity Documents Bill \(HL Bill 19 of 2010–11\)](#), 14 October 2010
- House of Commons Library, [Identity Documents Bill: Committee Stage Report: Bill 1 of 2010–11](#), 18 August 2010
- House of Commons Library, [Proposed Invalidation of ID Cards](#), 18 June 2010
- House of Commons Library, [Identity Documents Bill: Bill 1 of 2010–11](#), 4 June 2010
- House of Commons Library, [Identity Cards: Status](#), 14 August 2009
- House of Commons Library, [The Identity Cards Bill: Bill 9 of 2005–06](#), 13 June 2005
- House of Commons Library, [Draft Identity Cards Bill](#) 29 November 2004
- House of Commons Library, [Identity Cards Bill: Lords Amendments](#), 10 March 2006
- House of Commons Library, [Identity Cards: Background](#), 12 December 2003
- House of Commons Library, [Constituency Casework: Identity Theft](#), 7 December 2015
- Government Office for Science, [Future Identities: Changing Identities in the UK—the Next 10 Years](#), January 2013
- Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, [Managing Online Identity](#), 25 April 2013