

Response To the Whistleblowing Bill

Eileen Chubb©

Compassion in Care

*What is most important to note about the Whistleblowing Bill is its merely the setting up of the office that will be the beneficiary of the bounty provisions that WBUK, Kevin Hollinrake and the APPG for Whistleblowing are inserting into the Economic Crime Bill.

The Whistleblowing Bill was all too predictable, so we have previously addressed much of the contents in our earlier work, we ask that you note our previous work.

Some in Parliament, will and indeed have said regarding both this Bill and at the time PIDA was being enacted, “ Well its better than nothing” or “An important first step” which is the equivalent of telling a man having his leg amputated that an aspirin for pain relief was better than nothing.

Whistleblowing law is far too important to get so wrong again. The Whistleblowing bill in its entirety is completely unacceptable in any form. Those who wrote it and those who enabled them should never be allowed to influence law again.

The Preamble to the Whistleblowing Bill

“To establish an independent office for the whistleblower to protect whistleblowers and whistleblowing and uphold the public interest”

Wrong, you uphold the public interest first.

Page 4 “ Share information with relevant regulatory and other bodies in the United Kingdom and abroad so far as it may judge this necessary or desirable to enable its objectives or perform other functions”

Would this for example include sharing information with SEC? or sharing potentially lucrative information with office

for the whistleblower accredited lawyers? Lawyers such as Constantine Cannon for example, funder of both WBUK and the APPG on whistleblowing, who happen to have offices in the UK and the US?

Sharing information could clearly identify the whistleblower to third parties and what is the point of the Office for the Whistleblower if it is merely an entity that passes the information to the same regulators that whistleblowers are already contacting?

“Independent Office for the whistleblower”?

No organisation is independent that answers to parliament or a government department, or where the government appoints those running that organisation.

The revolving door of cronies of the government of the day plagues all our regulators and other institutions, the rot from the top down.

The whistleblowing bill states,

“The office shall be led by an independent person to be appointed by the Secretary of State”

This is not independent and exactly the same phrase can be found in countless other acts of parliament that set up other toothless, pointless, wasteful, organisationally corrupt, self-serving regulators.

Our call for evidence on regulators has received over twenty thousand responses highlighting serious concerns about the failures of such regulators.

Throughout the whistleblowing bill the ominous words are regularly repeated

“Any other matters as may to the office seem appropriate”

As in making the rules as you see fit.

This office will decide who is a whistleblower and who is not. Presumably relying on the instigator of this act, WBUK and their alleged expertise in this area.

I refer you to the reality of this expertise [Blackmail Greed and Revenge V Genuine Whistleblowing](#)

The Office for the Whistleblower will be funded by the fines it has referred to in all their previous documented evidence, namely from financial institutions.

As we have repeatedly said in all our published work, if the income of the office for the whistleblower comes from big fines as stated in the bill below then which cases will be prioritised?

“ In the case of an individual 10% of that individuals gross annual income not to exceed £50,000

In any other case 10% of annual global turnover, not to exceed £18,000,000

Are we really supposed to believe that the case of the whistleblower who for example works in a corner shop is going to have the same priority as a case that brings in £18,000,000 for the Office for the Whistleblower?

The whistleblower who works in the corner shop takes the same risk, has as much to lose as someone who works in the financial sector.

The low paid whistleblower will have no savings, they will not be living in a million-pound house, they will have no buffer, if anything they risk more because whistleblowing can push them to the point of no return. They can often face being reliant on foodbanks, homelessness and worse. But Edna’s Law asks only that all whistleblowers are protected equally in accordance with the rule of law.

The Office for the whistleblower shamelessly gives priority to the financial sector.

Throughout this poorly written bill, we can actually see the people who will be suffering and dying whilst the inept

procedures listed play out. We can say much more and will do a more detailed response as soon as possible.