Please reply to the Human Rights Bill questionnaire - if this goes through, we’re in trouble. Answers are as below. Feel free to use, preferably with little changes to avoid algorithms…..

1. The U.K. is one of the worst transgressors of Human Rights and has been held to account by the ECHR and ECJ on numerous occasions. This is quite simply a ‘Get out of Jail’ Bill so as to allow our judiciary - that is failing in its role as one of the main checks and balances on an authoritarian Government. This Government also wants to avoid Judicial Reviews and any challenges to its authority. In effect, a failure of democracy, our unwritten constitution and indeed, the Rule of Law..

2. It will have full autonomy, with no comeback - that is not healthy. The threat of Strasbourg and Brussels kept the focus on fairness, proportionality and the Rule of Law. The people will be purely at the mercy of a Judiciary that was given a £65,000 pay rise by their paymasters; the very people they are being asked to judge - there is a breakdown in the separation of powers, a critical element in our unwritten constitution as we have no written constitution upon which to rely and challenge. The Government wants all eggs in one basket…..and is stopping at nothing

3. Provided by HRA “Article 6 protects your right to a fair trial you have the right to a fair and public trial or hearing if: you are charged with a criminal offence and have to go to court, or a public authority is making a decision that has an impact upon your civil rights or obligations.”

Some judges want to replace this with a panel and urge. This is against the Rule of Law and in favour of the Government, not the little person. A person’s right to a fair trial could be lost.

Why do I get the feeling I’m wasting my words, Government gets what

Government wants…..?

4. Keep the Human Rights Act. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.

5. Article 10” Article 10 of the Human Rights Act: Freedom of expression 1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.”

The Government is open and honest that it wishes to curtail our freedoms. In asking this question, it is laying itself bare. Article 10 is clear, so keep it in its entirety. Keep the HRA 1998 as an important check on Government. To not do so shows that the question is being asked disingenuously

6. No comment, other than the press is currently paid for by Government so there is a complete breakdown in trust and true investigative journalism. In protecting the journalists, the Bill is protecting them as and when they see fit.

7. Simply to keep the HRA 1998 that empowers the people, not Government and its servants.

8. A person may have not suffered a ‘significant disadvantage’ in a subjective or even objective examination of the facts. The case, however, may be of greater importance than just the personal effect but it may be discontinued at a whim, should the authorities decide to do so

9. as 8. Above

10. Each case on its merit. The current system works, but not always as Government wants.

11. The threat of such litigation is a check and balance against the authorities. The HRA 1998 manages this in its protocol. Change nothing. Protect people, not bullying power mongers.

12. “So far as it is possible to do so, primary legislation and subordinate legislation must be read and given effect in a way which is compatible with the Convention rights.”

It is critical to keep this in its entirety, otherwise the checks and balances of our Government and Authorities disappear. That is obviously the plan here, the question being total evidence of that. There will be no comeback at all for the little person

]

13. When Governments are able to prorogue Parliament illegally and at will, as done in getting the CV Act 2020 through, Section 3 will be removed or at least diluted by introducing these measures. Again, critical to keep this as is..

14. Reference for all is important

15. Another loss of power for the people and power to the Government…..this is all about the transfer of power to government- shameful.

16. Convention rights must be upheld

17. it’s an important right

18. Section 19 is again critical so as to ensure that Bills are compatible and protect the public. It’s important that the introduction is examined fully and the declaration puts a name to this. Keep it!

Section 19 of the Human Rights Act 1998requires the Minister in charge of a Bill in either House of Parliament to make a statement about the compatibility of the provisions of the Bill with the convention rights (as defined by Section 1 of that Act).

19. Keep the HRA 1998 as it already does this. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it!

20. Keep it unchanged

21. it’s a closed question designed to mirror what Government wants Acts of public authorities.

(1)It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention right.

(2)Subsection (1) does not apply to an act if—

(a) As the result of one or more provisions of primary legislation, the authority could not have acted differently; or

(b) in the case of one or more provisions of, or made under, primary legislation which cannot be read or given effect in a way which is compatible with the Convention rights, the authority was acting so as to give effect to or enforce those provisions

22. What kind of a question is that? “Extraterritorial jurisdiction is the legal ability of a government to exercise authority beyond its normal boundaries.”

What you’re asking is “How can we introduce a law that allows us to act outside the law?” That sums up this Bill, your intention and the ridiculous, unconstitutional and undemocratic intentions of Government. Do you recall the Rule of Law? I hope so, as you’re killing it slowly

23. This is another steamrolling of Human Rights. It is giving authority to Government to rely on the fact that Parliament enacted a Law so important that nothing should undermine it = autocracy, not democracy.

24. Each case on merit - you cannot generalise.

25. Each case has to be on merit.

26. Each case must be decided on the facts.

27. We have case law in the form of Contributory Negligence claims that could provide guidance. Judges judge, Governments govern - not very well at present - keep that separation of powers, and strengthen them further.

28. A mere lip service to Strasbourg and the HRA to lay the information of breaches or concerns of HR. The Government can carry on unabated, the whole intention of this shameful Bill

29. The costs to human rights are immeasurable. The loss of checks and balances on our Unwritten Constitution is massive. Democracy is failing and the Rule of Law is collapsing as this Governments legislative will is enforced.

The costs to human rights are immeasurable. The loss of checks and balances on our Unwritten Constitution is massive. Democracy is failing and the Rule of Law is collapsing as this Government’s legislative will is enforced..

Keep the HRA 1998.