

The Naked Truth

BY ELEEN CHUBB ©

Please note* This report contains evidence that has never been published before, including the words of Whistleblowers. Also note that vulnerable people have and will continue to be abused without effective Whistleblowing Law.

The events we have seen unfold in Parliament in relation to Whistleblowing and the Human Rights abuses in care homes on an unprecedented scale, demand we continue to speak out no matter what threats we are targeted with.

We have been maliciously attacked for whistleblowing on WBUK, we can prove that WBUK Halford Hall and associates have maliciously attacked this charity with unfounded allegations, and whilst we can prove the allegations are false we fear that WBUK, Halford Hall and associates are misusing their Parliamentary position of power to cause injustice to anyone that challenges their unethical, deceitful, self-serving agenda. Those who will be the most adversely affected are vulnerable people and those who speak out to protect them.

If we are silenced by the WBUK dirty tactics campaign and there is no one left to stop their agenda then please remember the next time there is,
An avoidable train crash,
Abuse in Care Homes,
Patients Harmed,
Or any other avoidable tragedy and people ask the word, Why?
This document tells you exactly why.

Background

I am a BUPA 7 Whistleblower, Founder and Director of the Charity Compassion in Care and Co-Founder of The Whistler. To date our national helpline has supported over 8000 Whistleblowers and 5000 families who have had a loved one abused because a Whistleblower was ignored or staff too afraid to speak out.

I was very briefly involved with the organisation WBUK in 2012, when myself and Gavin Macfadyen co-founded the organisation with a man called Ian Foxley. It quickly became apparent that Ian Foxley was pro the US system, the "Office for the Whistleblower" and pro bounty hunting. Gavin MacFadyen and I publicly resigned citing our serious concerns as did the majority of the founding membership of WBUK. This was my first encounter with this anti Whistleblower organisation.

We never gave WBUK another thought but then between 2015 and 2019 we started to receive concerns on our helpline about WBUK, this was a trickle at first but as time passed the number of concerns increased.

Whistleblowers can be very vulnerable even suicidal at the point they reach out for help, the potential for harm cannot be underestimated. At first, we thought that a public statement stating that we had no connection to WBUK might be a way of indicating there was a risk, but then we received a threatening letter from WBUK demanding we remove the statement, we said we could not and were quite happy for them to post identical statements.

Sir Norman Lamb MP described the allegations against WBUK CEO Georgina Halford Hall as "**extraordinary**". His public letters of resignation are included below. I think that this scandal has continued unchecked for so long in spite of all the documented evidence because onlookers, be they journalists, MPs, the public or other organisations have failed to read the

evidence and presumed wrongly this must be some kind of dispute.

Because of the sheer volume of evidence upholding our concerns of the dangers posed by WBUK and the APPG on Whistleblowing, to Whistle-blowers, vulnerable people and the public, I can only presume that because such a degree of dishonesty, malice, greed and misconduct is involved, those with the power to act have chosen to believe that “ **The Emperor Has New Clothes**” because to confront the naked truth means confronting their own gullibility and complacency.

Lamb letters





The Rt Hon Sir Norman Lamb MP
Member of Parliament for North Norfolk

A: Unit 4, The Garden Centre, Nursery Drive, Norwich Road, North Walsham, NR28 0DR
T: 01692 403752 E: norman.lamb.mp@parliament.uk W: www.normanlamb.org.uk @normanlamb NormanLambLibDem

*Please quote the reference in all
correspondence with this office*

Our Ref: NL43542-WC

24 October 2019

Dear Tracy Austin,

Re: Whistleblowing APPG

Thank you very much for taking the trouble to contact me with regard to the above.

These allegations against Georgina Halford-Hall seem extraordinary.

I wanted to let you know that I am standing down from the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Whistleblowing because I did not get responses from the secretariat to questions put to me by a concerned third party.

Unfortunately, I am not able at present to take up individual cases. I recently underwent a heart procedure and am currently recuperating.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

The Rt Hon Sir Norman Lamb MP
Member of Parliament for North Norfolk

Should We Publish the Evidence?

Before we took the step of publishing the evidence on WBUK, we asked ourselves the following questions:

- . If this were a care home company that we received concerns about we would act, so why should we treat WBUK any differently?
- . If we did not publish this information and learnt that someone had taken their life after coming into contact with WBUK, could we live with this?

We must make it clear that we have no other motive whatsoever for publishing this information.

If we are unable to raise genuine concerns about an organisation to the APPG on Whistleblowing, without retribution, detriment, slurs and malicious counter allegations being made against us, then what chance does any Whistleblower have?

The Evidence Published

We were passed copies of a WBUK contract which came from numerous unconnected sources, which caused us grave concern. A copy of both this contract and signed witness statements can be viewed [here](#).

[The Misconduct Of WBUK](#)

This contract has never been on the WBUK website. The website that implies WBUK are a whistleblowing support non-profit organisation. Clearly this is wrong as they are masquerading as a support organisation in order to target vulnerable people in a unregistered Case/Claims management business.

This contract appeared for the first time just after the Banerjee v Royal Bank of Canada case, in which WBUK submitted a claim for costs which the Judge questioned whether it was unlawful. It would be reasonable in all the circumstances to conclude that when the court route of obtaining money was closed to WBUK that they then produced this contract and it would be reasonable to assume they took this action as an alternative means of obtaining costs without the court being aware in future cases.

If there was any doubt as to the moral and legal questions with regard to this contract, then the question that must be considered is why has this contract never appeared on the WBUK website?

Below is the relevant Banerjee Case judgement.

23.1 £,8625 paid to Whistleblowers UK to sort the documents into chronological order, at £150 per hour, invoice dated 1 September 2017

23.2 payment to junior counsel for correspondence arising out of disclosure – £1,208.33 plus VAT

23.3 payment to junior counsel advising and drafting application to adjourn 17 August £1,750 plus VAT

23.4 first tranche of junior counsel's brief fee incurred 11 September – £5,000 plus VAT.

30. No material was before the tribunal as to the cost of today's hearing, which dealt both with specific disclosure and the costs application.
31. Before the costs application was heard I raised with the parties that I was concerned to establish whether the invoice from Whistleblowers UK covered regulated services as listed in regulation 4 of the Compensation (Regulated Claims Management Services) Order 2006, made under the Compensation Act 2006, which created offences, as if so, it did not appear at first sight that Whistleblowers UK, a company limited by guarantee, was registered as a charity or was a regulated claims manager, and it might be necessary to consider their status when deciding whether it was lawful or contrary to public policy to order payment of their costs. The claimant had not taken this point, but had argued that the invoice was not for legal services but represented preparation time, and the claimant could not claim both that and costs.
32. In the course of the hearing, without further discussion, the claimant withdrew the claim for the Whistleblowers UK invoice. This left the claims for junior counsel's fees.
33. Counsel's fee notes were not available, though junior counsel was present at the hearing. Mr Glyn stated he had seen the fee notes, further

We published our report and sent the evidence to the relevant authorities.

A Summary of that evidence is listed at the front of the

[The Misconduct Of WBUK report](#)

Extract,

“Firstly, I would like to thank all those who have come forward to give us evidence about WBUK, these witnesses have shown extraordinary courage in bringing this evidence to public attention.

Because we have been overwhelmed with concerns about WBUK and the sheer volume of evidence involved; this report will be in two parts to allow all those wishing to contribute evidence the opportunity and time to do so.

This report details the evidence on WBUK and includes signed witness statements from both whistle-blowers and potential volunteers who have come into contact with WBUK. The witness evidence commences on page 12. These concerns fall under the following categories,

Whistle-blowers who contacted WBUK for help but were never contacted back,

Volunteers who contacted WBUK offering to help as case workers who had serious concerns,

Whistle-blowers who contacted WBUK and whose details were passed to a law firm without their consent,

Whistle-blowers who were asked for money on the first call to WBUK,

Whistle-blowers who were asked to sign an agreement giving varying percentages of any legal award to WBUK in return for help that was never given. WBUK are not even licensed to provide such paid services.

Evidence that only those cases with monetary value are being cherry picked.

Whistle-blowers who were deliberately manipulated and exploited in their own whistle-blowing cases by Georgina Halford Hall in order to gain publicity for herself and WBUK with the intention of adding validity to her false claims of being a whistle-blower.

Evidence that Georgina Halford Hall and WBUK are profit driven to the point of informing a Whistle-blower that there were fees to be paid if they needed support reporting child protection and abuse issues."

It is now ten months since the above report was published and we have not been contacted by any MP or indeed WBUK themselves. Not even to ask if the child abuse had been reported. We went to the police and supported this Whistleblower to report these concerns, of course we did it in our own time and without charge.

WBUKs conduct to date would be considered dishonest by ordinary decent people.

Who was informed?

. The report was sent to The BEIS Department who wrote back and informed us it should be sent to the FCA

. We sent the report to the regulator, the FCA and received a letter back from Andrew Bailey stating the evidence had been referred to their investigation Department

. We then heard that WBUK were to be on a Treasury Department panel to choose the next CEO of the FCA as Andrew Bailey was leaving to take another post.

. We wrote to the Treasury Department asking why an organisation referred to the FCA investigation department was to sit on a panel interviewing the replacement CEO of the FCA.

. We received a letter back from the Treasury saying that charities could operate unregulated as a claims/case management company.

. We wrote back and informed the Treasury that WBUK were not a charity and that the claims management business was being conducted on the side and as a result of vulnerable people contacting what they believed was a support organisation to **only then** discover the list of charges contained in the contract.

. The Treasury suggested we should contact the FCA as they had thought that WBUK was a charity but now they realised our concerns should be investigated by the FCA.

We also sent [The Misconduct of WBUK](#) to MPs and in particular repeatedly to all members of the APPG.

By this point WBUK had been Secretariat to the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Whistleblowing since 2018.

. Another threatening letter was received by our publisher from WBUK who threatened action if my new book was not removed from sale due to the FCA reference.

. Once my publisher informed me, I wrote back and referred to the FCA letter and did not hear back.

. Around this time WBUK CEO Georgina Halford- Hall was promoted to Director of policy and strategy for the APPG.

. Again, all MPs were sent the Report.

The Voices of Whistleblowers

The following extracts are from real helpline cases, the details have been anonymised to protect identities. They all contacted WBUK.

"I was so desperate for help, I had no money and lawyers did not want to know, I don't think they even read all the evidence just did a quick glance at it. I could not believe my luck when I came across the WBUK site, they seemed to be there to help people like me, I was really hopeful. I contacted them and they asked me to send my case details which I did. I really thought they were going to help me, I could not believe it when I got this agreement thing, at first glance it seemed ok and then my heart sank, £100 an hour for help, I cried for hours"

" I thought they helped Whistleblowers, that's what the site said then I got the agreement with the price for help, I could not afford that I can't even feed my kids, why are they allowed to do this? It can't be right"

" I felt they just wanted your information to suit them, I asked for my files to be deleted, I could not pay for help, I would never have contacted them had I seen what they were really up-to"

"I want to know before I give you any of my information, do you charge people for help?"

"They delay you getting help, give you hope and then waste your energy and time when you are at your weakest"

"I gave up trying to fight my case after seeing their hourly rate, the injustice of my situation, I felt soiled because it was just some fucking opportunity to make money, I felt totally gutted by the whole thing"

"How is it legal to say you help people and then come out with this hourly charge? There should be some law against it"

"I felt used and felt what I had been through meant nothing, you feel the world is shit when you are a whistleblower, like you were stupid for even thinking of speaking out. I just wanted someone to talk to who understood, all WBUK wanted was my information, when I saw the agreement to pay £100 an hour, I felt I must be stupid for contacting them. I really thought about killing myself because it really hit me because your confidence in people is already low after whistleblowing"

" God if I had thought about money before I whistle blew I don't think I would have done it, I haven't paid my rent am worried sick about being homeless, there's no food in the house and to top it all the people who I thought were going to help me hand me their price list"

I am ashamed that people now ring this charity's helpline and need to ask me if we charge money for help and support, I am ashamed because I should have done more to protect people from WBUK, I should have shouted louder and I should have sent all the evidence to MPs every day instead of just half a dozen times. I am ashamed that the attacks on this charity made me fearful enough to consider giving up trying to expose this scandal because I was so disheartened by how many people did not care.

What Happened Next?

Within two days of publishing The Misconduct of WBUK, a campaign of harassment by WBUK commenced against this charity. Within two days Halford-Hall made a subject request. This was followed by malicious allegations to the ICO and in the middle of a pandemic we were reported to the Charity Commission.

We have openly published all our concerns about WBUK backed up with robust evidence. The question is why have WBUK only raised these malicious false counter allegations in secret?

WBUK could **only** make unfounded malicious allegations in private because if they published the same allegations on their website, they know they would be committing libel.

In the middle of a pandemic knowing that we had over 300 live helpline cases, WBUK targeted this charity with false allegations for no other reason than to harm us and cause as much malicious disruption as possible to both this charity, Whistleblowers and the vulnerable people we support.

We know the Charity Commission has to investigate the allegations but the disruption this has caused is considerable and whilst we can prove the allegations are false, we are still at the mercy of a regulator when we have an established reputation of exposing other regulators as incompetent and dishonest.

We are not saying we believe the Charity Commission is untrustworthy in any way and we know they have to investigate but we are seriously concerned that Georgina Halford Hall and WBUK who have a Parliamentary email and are in a position of power have mis-used their public office to target a charity with false allegations and misrepresentation. Our concern is that their Parliamentary position could too easily result in unfair bias against us in any investigation.

The allegations themselves have not been disclosed to us but they include the previous allegations to the ICO.

We were never informed by the ICO that a complaint had been made. We obtained a copy of the complaint submitted via FOI which amounts to one single page, with no evidence to support the malicious allegations.

The ICO confirmed to me in an email that Halford- Hall had **not** informed them of the nature of our work running a confidential helpline and that now that the ICO was aware they could see the difficulties caused to us by the complainants omission of this fact.

The ICO also confirmed in writing that on receiving a SAR request from Halford Hall, that I wrote back after taking ICO advice, asking Halford Hall to confirm that she was asking me for confidential information sourced from the helpline. The response from Halford Hall which amounted to confirming she was asking for confidential information, was also omitted from the Halford Hall complaint.

The ICO apologised for not informing us there was a complaint and not allowing us any chance of a defence. The ICO failed to apply the Rule of Law safeguards.

The remainder of the malicious wild allegations were not even investigated by the ICO as there was absolutely no supporting evidence.

Regulators in such cases as this should have a policy to deal with these kinds of malicious unfounded allegations. The ICO should have made a statement about this case and said clearly the allegations were not investigated due to a total lack of evidence, as this would have stopped Halford Hall making the same allegations to the Charity Commission.

The only action the ICO asked us to take was to write to Halford Hall again and state we had no data other than Helpline information raising concerns about WBUK.

The Halford Hall malicious complaint to the ICO is on the next page. This letter contains some very important information.

DETAILS OF THE COMPLAINT

I am raising a complaint against the registered charity Compassion in Care (registered charity number 1102282) as a result of its refusal to comply with a Subject Access Request.

Copies of my request dated 21.11.19, the charity's initial response dated 25.11.19, my further request dated 29.11.19 and the charity's letter of 9.12.19 refusing to comply have been uploaded with this complaint.

This charity appears - whether willfully or otherwise - to be ignorant of its responsibilities and obligations under GDPR and has used entirely spurious reasons to refuse to comply with the SAR.

Specifically, in the letter dated 9.12.19 Ms Chubb states that "I am a journalist" and therefore claims exemption from GDPR. This SAR was not addressed to Ms Chubb personally, it was addressed to the registered charity Compassion in Care whose charitable objects, as registered with the Charities Commission, are:

1) TO RELIEVE THE PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL DISTRESS OF THE ELDERLY WHO HAVE SUFFERED ABUSE OR NEGLECT IN CARE SETTINGS. 2) TO ADVANCE THE EDUCATION OF THOSE WORKING IN THE CARE TO ENABLE THEM TO RECOGNISE AND REPORT ON ELDERLY ABUSE OR NEGLECT.

Journalism is not mentioned nor, would I suggest, is that a charitable purpose. Whether or not Ms Chubb regards herself as a journalist is neither here nor there as far as data held by the charity is concerned.

The charity should know perfectly well that in asking for the sources of data this is not a request for (as an example) the names of individuals or "sources" but a means of understanding how personal data is obtained. This may be a further indication that the charity does not understand its responsibilities, but it also suggests that it is trying to avoid disclosing matters which might be embarrassing to it. In any event, even if some kind of journalistic exemption relating to "sources" were in fact to apply - which I do not for one moment accept - this would not prevent disclosure of all the other information requested.

I consider this to be a deliberate attempt to avoid complying with the SAR and request that the ICO take up this matter immediately. Furthermore I can find no reference on the charity's website or elsewhere as to its Data Protection policies, privacy statement and so on.

At the same time I draw your attention to a further issue raised by the charity's response. It claims to be an organisation relieving distress and advancing education, and on its website it invites individuals to share their experiences. Given Ms Chubb's claim to be a journalist it appears that the charity may be misusing data and information given to it in confidence for journalistic purposes without this being disclosed to those who share their data with it. I request that the ICO also investigate this breach of GDPR.

It is of interest to note that on the charity's website correspondence has been posted by the said Ms Chubb making complaints about the handling of her personal data by others, and the ICO's subsequent handling of her complaints about that. It seems she believes that the rules she expects others to follow do not apply to the organisation she apparently controls.

My Response to the above allegations.

. Accusation that we refused to comply with SAR,

Completely untrue. We pointed out that the only information held on Halford Hall came via our confidential helpline. We note that our work running our confidential helpline and the fact we were receiving concerns regarding Halford Halls conduct are completely omitted from the above complaints.

. Accusation that we had given spurious reasons for refusing to comply.

Untrue, the request for information by Halford Hall was made two days after we published "Misconduct of WBUK". It would be reasonable to assume that the 11 anonymous cases and the reference to further witness statements being published in Part Two, were the motivation for the SAR request. I rang the ICO for advice and they referred me to the relevant guidance. I was advised that the confidentiality of our helpline callers out weighted Halford Halls right to that information.

. Accusation that we refused to provide information on the grounds I was a journalist.

Clearly untrue. We refused to provide confidential helpline information when Halford persisted with her attempts to obtain this confidential helpline information only then did I also mention the fact that as an author of

books and researcher I am entitled to be a member of the NUJ.

I have never worked as a journalist but was first referred to as a print journalist by the CQC. My style of writing maybe journalistic but that is not a crime.

I told Halford Hall we only held confidential information on her and had been advised by the ICO that she was not entitled to this. Furthermore, I said I was a member of the NUJ.

Halford Hall gave no indication of what evidence she believed we held in her request, that is why we asked her to confirm she was asking for helpline information. The omission of this crucial fact that this charity runs a confidential helpline in Halford Halls complaint was a deliberate attempt to mislead the ICO. If this fact had been mentioned, it would have put a very different slant on things. This is stated by the ICO in an email to me.

Accusation that we are in breach of the objects of the charity.

Completely untrue. The objects of the charity are fully met in the work we do every day, there are thousands of pages of work on these issues on our website. No one could read the contents of our website and conclude that what Halford Hall is asserting is true.

There is absolutely no evidence to support these wild allegations but there are thousands of pages of evidence to the contrary. Given all this evidence it could only be concluded the allegations are malicious.

Halford Hall fails to note that this charity is listed on the Charity Commission website as “undertaking research” to further its objects. Research is considered a journalistic method. The methods we use to serve our objects are not in any way breaching our objectives, on the contrary they help us meet them more effectively.

Accusation that we are denying Halford Hall the means to know how her data is obtained and that I am hiding embarrassing information.

Completely unfounded. There is no evidence to support this malicious allegation. Halford Hall knows exactly how we obtain information about her, i.e. unsolicited via the confidential helpline. As for how that information is handled, it is published on our website. We have nothing to hide. In fact, quite the opposite, we publish everything with the exception of confidential evidence.

Accusation that we invite people to share experiences and we misuse their evidence,

Completely untrue. None of these wild malicious allegations, were upheld by the ICO as there is no evidence whatsoever for any of them. Note the terminology, again a deliberate attempt to avoid the words "confidential helpline"

Firstly, we do not invite people to share experiences, we ask people if we can help them, which is entirely different. Obviously by their track record the concept of giving, not taking, is alien to WBUK.

But the primary motive for this wording was to intentionally mislead the ICO by deliberately avoiding the term "confidential helpline" throughout every paragraph of the complaint, persistently avoiding the fact that she was asking for confidential information that would breach the rights of others.

Many charities raise issues from their helpline data to demonstrate that there is a certain problem emerging from the data, e.g. our data on care home evictions and visiting restrictions resulted in evictions being halted and a marked reduction in the number of concerns. It had a direct impact on changing things for the better.

We have been consistently told over many years that the information on our website has been hugely comforting to people, to know that they were not alone, and that other people had experienced similar issues.

WBUK this week tweeted

“Conversations with the ICO relating to organisations who fail to meet their obligations under the legislation are ongoing. It has been confirmed that Charities are not exempt from providing personal data”

If no allowance is made for charities who hold confidential helpline information then you can see why Halford Halls tweet is so chilling, if no information is exempt, no one is safe.

It is reasonable to believe that Halford Hall, WBUK and associates may have also misused their public office to unduly influence the Charity Commission in the same way. This is cause for real concern to us and has caused huge distress and worry that any investigation could, whether deliberately or inadvertently, be compromised by bias due to the omission of vital evidence to the contrary.

When this attempt to attack this charity via the ICO failed, WBUK Halford Hall and associates went to the Charity Commission with **identical allegations** and a number of new outrageous allegations.

The only investigation taking place in this whole scandal is an investigation into the charity that exposed misconduct of Halford Hall WBUK, i.e. a charity with nearly two decades of hard work helping thousands of people on a budget of less than 10k a year and a spotless record.

GENERAL INFORMATION

This Charity is openly challenging Boris Johnson on the thousands of avoidable care home deaths.

Our Covid crisis reports continue to be published regularly, please see www.compassionincare.com and compare the content of our website with the contents of the WBUK website. Let the evidence speak.

It is only after questions were asked about the lack of any evidence or work on the WBUK website that recent efforts were made by them to pad out their site by putting leaflets belonging to another organisation on the site.

The truth is that WBUK have been masquerading as a Whistleblower support organisation since 2015. Halford Hall describes herself on "LinkedIn" as overseeing the telephone calls to their helpline but no helpline telephone number is listed on the site. There are numerous other lies and misleading statements.

WBUK have cherry picked a few cases with financial potential and **just** enough cases to give the appearance of a genuine whistleblowing support organisation. The cases picked tend to be people higher up the career ladder. The cleaners, care workers, nurses and other front-line staff are abandoned to their fate because statutory sick pay for example cannot buy even one hour of help from WBUK who charge £100 an hour.

No matter how many witnesses come forward and no matter how much evidence is produced by us, WBUK take the stance of playing the victim, mimicking our concerns with a chilling lack of empathy or remorse for their actions.

The funding of both WBUK and the APPG on Whistleblowing is from Navex Global and Constantine Cannon. It was only when we referred to this that their names were removed from the WBUK site. The APPG secretariat role is also funded by Constantine Cannon. More evidence on this can be found in chapter one of my book "There is no ME in Whistleblower". All royalties from my books have always been given in full to Compassion in Care.

Could the conduct of WBUK be more dishonest, underhand, malicious and perversely unjust?

What does it say about WBUK and the APPG on Whistleblowing, in fact the whole political system, a system that has remained silent throughout this scandal and which now aids and abets WBUK malicious attacks on this charity by default, by simply doing nothing?

We have been targeted with aggressive threatening tweets from what appear to be white “knight accounts” and we are asking the police to investigate these anonymous accounts.

The frightening thing is that WBUK are directly influencing whistleblowing law.

WBUK have always been pro bounty hunting and there is a wealth of evidence on this available.

When WBUK are confronted with this they quickly change tack and call bounty compensation, which is disingenuous as they are completely different things and we are totally in favour of compensation.

The APPG on Whistleblowing state they are consulting Whistleblowers on what system they want but “The Office for the Whistleblower” has featured on the WBUK site for a number of years and is a foregone conclusion.

WBUK are unaware of what a whistleblower actually is and have along with Constantine Cannon appeared on the same platform with bounty hunters such as Bradley Birkenfield and Mark Lillie and have wrongly described them as Whistleblowers when neither of them are Whistleblowers.

Please read the full facts here from the genuine Whistleblower Kevin Fitzgerald whose amazing integrity is held in contempt every time bounty hunters are referred to as Whistleblowers.
<https://recallawareness.com/the-takata-whistleblowers/#:~:text=by%20Kevin%20Fitzgerald%20on%20September,mandated%20restitution%20fund%20for%20automakers.>

The two reports published by the APPG are full of flawed data and errors.

Whistleblowing law is the difference between life and death, the difference between vulnerable people being abused or safe, public safety or avoidable tragedy.

Do you want to trust such decisions to an organisation that serves its own interests at all times, knows nothing about genuine whistleblowing and cares even less?

Because this charity raised genuine concerns, we have been targeted with malicious allegations in an attempt to destroy us. Do you want such an organisation telling employers not to behave in exactly the same way?

Yes, I am angry, hearing Whistleblowers crying their heart out because they put their trust in WBUK, but the real question is not why I am angry but why are those in power not.

