

## Our Response, David's Law (Draft Online Harms Bill)

We send our sincere condolences to the family of Sir David Amess.

Following the tragic murder of the MP David Amess, there have been calls by MPs to rush through the online harms bill without further consultation or debate.

Whilst no individual should be subjected to online abuse, bullying or harassment whether they be an MP or an ordinary member of the public, we have grave concerns how this bill in its present form could be widely abused leading to injustice.

Like many other organisations and campaigners, we have grave concerns how this bill would potentially impact on free speech and charities and campaigners rights to challenge proposed laws or government policies that impact on their beneficiaries.

For example, how someone in a parliamentary role could potentially misuse the term "harassment" for their own personal advantage in silencing all challenges to an agenda they were pursuing.

There will be those in parliament that will argue that this would never happen, it has already happened, and we have robust evidence to uphold the following facts,

The Secretariate of the APPG on Whistleblowing, has taken the following actions with the full knowledge of the APPG members.

They have responded to one of our elderly volunteers who asked polite, evidenced questions by publicly calling her a "troll" for asking those polite questions.

They have reported one of our volunteer whistleblowers to the police for online "harassment" when one police force said there was no action warranted, the individual reported me to a different police force.

This charity was also reported to the Charity Commission with completely malicious complaints, in order to delete the book [There is no ME in whistleblower](#) which directly challenged **all** the concepts of law present in the complainants proposed law, the office for the whistleblower.

The fully evidenced conduct of this public office holder in defining evidenced concerns of harm to whistleblowers and the vulnerable as "harassment" clearly shows why our concerns about this bill are extensive and well founded. Simply crying harassment would be enough to silence all valid polite challenges.

When such an abuse of power takes place, a public office holder is given undue credence by regulators (Fully Evidenced) because of their position of power, the harm such malicious tactics can cause is extensive.

We were able to prove our innocence because we established a clear solidly evidenced paper trail to prove our case. Not everyone has been so fortunate. However, to date no action has been taken against this secretariate nor the MPs that aided and abetted them.

The fact that we were completely innocent and could prove it is of no account to parliament, who continue to allow this individual to cry "Harassment" at any question or challenge to this individuals conduct.

This individual attacked this small charity in the middle of a pandemic, with a 60% increase in helpline calls from vulnerable beneficiaries. Has shouted "Harassment" at the slightest reference to her conduct. This individual has clearly been linked to an anonymous twitter account unless anyone can explain how the below, Speaker of truth,

**WhistleblowersUK** @WB\_UK · Jan 27  
This is why it is so important to support root and branch change putting protection and penalties at the heart of our WB policy.  
[#OfficeOfTheWhistleblower](#)

**From the Pen Of** @thepenof · Jan 27  
cool, & may i ask what are your policies to tackle the [#redflagprofessionalbehaviour](#) directed at [#whistleblowers](#)

**SpeakerOfTruth**  
@YearOfJustice

Replying to [@thepenof](#) [@WB\\_UK](#) and 48 others

We help [#whistleblowers](#) to challenge retaliation & discrimination professionally providing appropriate support through the flawed process [#PIDA](#) - we have published our proposals for [#OfficeOfTheWhistleblower](#)  
We do not make protected disclosures on behalf of people

1:42 PM · Jan 28, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

1 Like

There is also the recent matter of WBUK conducting a Twitter poll in relation to the evidence in a live court case. Which the regulator the ICO engaged with.

Let us not forget for a moment that these are the very public figures that MPs are calling to be protected from online harm.

These are just a small summary of our concerns. Full evidence bundles are available on request. The abuse of power that; The on-line harms bill would allow is of grave concern.

Whilst MPs are clamouring for this bill to be enacted immediately in order to protect those with a parliamentary role **from** members of the public.

We ask who will protect members of the public **from** those in a parliamentary role?

In its current form this bill opens the door to unprecedented freedom of speech abuses and the potential to criminalise or completely silence charities or campaign groups from raising valid concerns.

Eileen Chubb on behalf of the trustees of Compassion In Care