

COMPLICIT IN COMPLIANCE

Initial Response to the (Protect PCAW)
Whistleblowing Law Proposals

By Eileen Chubb © October 24th, 2019

This is only my initial response to the protect PCAW proposals, my full response is contained in my new book which will be published in the coming weeks. The book will include comprehensive witness testimony from those working on the front line of just one organisation. This witness evidence lays bare the ineffectiveness of the whistleblowing compliance industry, those who profit from it and those who promote it as a means to protect whistle-blowers, which includes Protect PCAW, whose main income is from the very compliance systems they are advocating.

Protect PCAWS proposals.

Who is covered,

These groups are already covered by the provisions of Ednas Law, which goes much further and proposes among many other safeguards, a public interest defence for those who have signed, The Official Secrets Act.

Increasing the range of disclosures.

Protect PCAW have entirely overlooked the ramifications of their proposals, which I will deal with fully in my book (With the supporting evidence) What I will say for now is that innocent or good employers are as likely to be targeted with Protect PCAW proposals as they were under PIDA. This is of no use to the genuine whistle-blower.

Mandatory compliance arrangements.

Protect PCAW have failed to declare the conflict of interest that their main income is from selling compliance packages to employers. Not to mention that compliance packages do **not** protect whistle-blowers and **never have nor ever will** protect whistle-blowers.

So, I would ask what motive could, Protect PCAW have for making such proposals? and should not that motive disbar them from playing any part in influencing whistleblowing Law?

There is also the question of Protect PCAW advocating whistle-blowers contact the APPG on whistle-blowing and their association with WBUK, a sham organisation which is masquerading as a whistle-blowers support organisation.

Protect PCAW drafted the current whistleblowing law, a law that relied on the protection of whistleblowing compliance and which fundamentally failed to provide protection when used in a court room. This law failed from the first case. 20 years of injustice cannot now be described as merely a blip or something that needs amending, it is something we fight to have put right by an *acceptable inquiry.

Unlike Protect PCAW, we will not let 20 years of injustice and harm be swept under the carpet. I have seen and continue to see the detriment that the current law has actively contributed to, and compounded, by its failure to protect whistle-blowers.

But **most** importantly, those who have suffered and died because whistle-blowers were ignored by employers who knew they would get away with it, because the law "Protect PCAW" wrote was useless.

Points 4 and 5 of Protect PCAW proposals. Trade unions are already included, as for regulators! Protect PCAW has played a fundamental part in the abuse and deaths of countless vulnerable people whose lives depended not only on a whistle-blower speaking out but, on a regulator, taking action.

The current law PIDA has been responsible for more abuse, suffering, corruption and avoidable death than any piece of legislation I am aware of. Yet the people who drafted this same legislation, Protect PCAW, still have the audacity to propose a new law along the same lines but with a lot more **mandatory**

profits for Protect PCAW and the rest of the compliance industry including WBUK.

The remainder of the protect PCAW proposals are inconsequential window dressing for the compliance complacency approach.

To sum up the current law, those who wrote it and those who now put forward these new proposals, the words of Albert Einstein come to mind,

"We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them"

I would go one step further by saying

"We can not put right the injustice of a law by getting those who wrote that law for their own self interest to rewrite the law, for the same reasons and therefore with same outcomes"

Eileen Chubb