



House of Lords
House of Commons
Joint Committee on
Human Rights

Legislative Scrutiny: Parliamentary Standards Bill

**Nineteenth Report of Session 2008-
09**

Drawing special attention to:
Parliamentary Standards Bill



House of Lords
House of Commons
Joint Committee on
Human Rights

Legislative Scrutiny: Parliamentary Standards Bill

**Nineteenth Report of Session 2008-
09**

Report, together with formal minutes

Ordered by The House of Lords to be printed 30 June 2009

Ordered by The House of Commons to be printed 30 June 2009

HL Paper 124

HC 844

Published on 30 June 2009
by authority of the House of Lords and
the House of Commons London:
The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

Joint Committee on Human Rights

The Joint Committee on Human Rights is appointed by the House of Lords and the House of Commons to consider matters relating to human rights in the United Kingdom (but excluding consideration of individual cases); proposals for remedial orders, draft remedial orders and remedial orders.

The Joint Committee has a maximum of six Members appointed by each House, of whom the quorum for any formal proceedings is two from each House.

Current membership

HOUSE OF LORDS

Lord Bowness
Lord Dubs
Lord Lester of Herne Hill
Lord Morris of Handsworth OJ
The Earl of Onslow
Baroness Prashar

HOUSE OF COMMONS

John Austin MP (Labour, *Erith & Thamesmead*)
Mr Andrew Dismore MP (Labour, *Hendon*) (Chairman)
Dr Evan Harris MP (Liberal Democrat, *Oxford West & Abingdon*)
Mr Virendra Sharma MP (Labour, *Ealing, Southall*)
Mr Richard Shepherd MP (Conservative, *Aldridge-Brownhills*)
Mr Edward Timpson MP (Conservative, *Crewe & Nantwich*)

Powers

The Committee has the power to require the submission of written evidence and documents, to examine witnesses, to meet at any time (except when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved), to adjourn from place to place, to appoint specialist advisers, and to make Reports to both Houses. The Lords Committee has power to agree with the Commons in the appointment of a Chairman.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Joint Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the two Houses. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the internet at www.parliament.uk/commons/selcom/hrhome.htm.

Current Staff

The current staff of the Committee are: Mark Egan (Commons Clerk), Rebecca Neal (Lords Clerk), Murray Hunt (Legal Adviser), Angela Patrick and Joanne Sawyer (Assistant Legal Advisers), James Clarke (Senior Committee Assistant), Emily Gregory and John Porter (Committee Assistants), Joanna Griffin (Lords Committee Assistant) and Keith Pryke (Office Support Assistant).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk of the Joint Committee on Human Rights, Committee Office, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 2467; the Committee's e-mail address is jchr@parliament.uk

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	3
Bill drawn to the special attention of both Houses	5
1 Parliamentary Standards Bill	5
Background	5
Significant human rights issue: the right to a fair hearing	5
<i>The issue</i>	5
<i>The effect of the Bill</i>	6
<i>The Government's position on the right to a fair hearing</i>	6
<i>Assessment of compatibility with the right to a fair hearing</i>	7
Conclusion and recommendation	11
Conclusions and recommendations	13
Formal Minutes	14
Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	15

Summary

The Parliamentary Standards Bill, which was introduced to the House of Commons on 23 June and is expected to complete all of its Commons stages on 1 July, is intended to create a system of independent regulation of MPs' salaries, allowances and financial interests. It creates a new Commissioner for Parliamentary Investigations, to investigate breaches of the rules on allowances and interests, and an Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority which, amongst other things, can sanction MPs in response to a Commissioner's report, or recommend sanctions to the House of Commons.

We note, with a certain irony, that although the Bill is designed to restore public confidence in the House of Commons, it is being rushed into the statute book and will not receive proper scrutiny, as a result. We have been unable to write to the Government to ask for its views on the issues we raise.

In our view, the Bill is not compatible with Article 6(1) of the European Convention on Human Rights, in respect of an MP's right to a fair hearing. We recommend that the Bill should be amended to include procedural safeguards – such as the opportunity to call and examine witnesses – where disciplinary action is being considered. Such measures were recommended by the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege in 1999 and endorsed by the Committee on Standards in Public Life in 2002.

We also recommend that there should be a right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council against decisions of the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority and the House of Commons which amount either to the determination of a criminal charge or which determine an MP's civil rights.

Bill drawn to the special attention of both Houses

1 Parliamentary Standards Bill

Date introduced to first House	23 June 2009
Date introduced to second House	
Current Bill Number	HC Bill 121
Previous Reports	None

Background

1.1 This is a Government Bill which was introduced in the House of Commons on 23 June, received its Second Reading on 29 June and is scheduled to complete all its Commons stages on 1 July.

1.2 This legislative timetable makes it impossible for Committees such as ours to perform our important role of subjecting Government Bills to careful scrutiny and reporting to Parliament to inform its debate. We understand the political imperative for the Government and Parliament to act swiftly in response to widespread and acute public concern about the current system of MPs' allowances and the regulation of parliamentary standards. Public confidence in the institution of Parliament is the lifeblood of our representative democracy. There is a certain irony, however, in a measure designed to restore public confidence in Parliament being rushed onto the statute book in a way which makes it impossible for it to receive the proper scrutiny and deliberation such an important measure deserves by the very institution in which we wish to restore public confidence.

1.3 In the time available between the Bill's publication and the completion of its passage through the Commons, we have not had the opportunity to correspond with the Government about the human rights implications of the Bill as we usually would on a Bill of this significance. In this Report we therefore confine ourselves to identifying what we consider to be the most significant human rights issue raised by the Bill, suggesting some of the main questions which the Government needs to answer on that issue, and suggesting a probing amendment in an effort to ensure that the issue is debated at Report Stage in the Commons and thereafter in the Lords.

Significant human rights issue: the right to a fair hearing

The issue

1.4 The significant human rights issue raised by the Bill is whether it provides sufficient safeguards to be compatible with the right of Members to a fair hearing under Article 6(1) ECHR and the common law of procedural fairness, which has been recognised as providing no less protection than Article 6 ECHR. This is an issue which has already been the subject of much consideration and debate by other Committees, such as the Committee on Standards in Public Life¹ and the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege which

¹ See e.g. Eighth Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, *Standards of Conduct in the House of Commons* (Cm 5663, November 2002).

reported in 1999.² We draw on the evidence submitted to those Committees, and the conclusions of the Committees themselves, in this Report.

The effect of the Bill

1.5 The main purpose of the Bill is, in the words of the Prime Minister in his statement to the House of Commons on 10 June 2009, to enable the House of Commons to “move from the old system of self-regulation to independent, statutory regulation.” To this end the Bill establishes a new Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority (“IPSA”), which is to have functions in relation to MPs’ salaries, allowances and financial interests. The Bill also establishes a separate Commissioner for Parliamentary investigations to investigate breaches of the rules on allowances and financial interests.

1.6 IPSA will be responsible for drawing up the MPs’ allowances scheme, and also for authorising and making payments under the allowances scheme. It will also be responsible for preparing financial interests rules. It will have the power to request the Commissioner for Parliamentary Investigations to conduct an investigation into overpayments under the allowances scheme or breaches of the financial interests rules. IPSA will determine the procedures for the Commissioner to follow, which must include safeguards for the MP, including that the MP have an opportunity to make representations to the Commissioner during the investigation and to IPSA in light of the Commissioner’s report.³

1.7 In addition to the above range of functions, IPSA is also given a role in enforcement following the Commissioner’s investigation, and has a range of sanctions available to it in response to a Commissioner’s report. It is given powers to direct a member of the House of Commons to repay amounts under the allowances scheme that should not have been paid, and to correct omissions or inaccuracies in the register of financial interests.⁴ It may also recommend to the House of Commons Committee on Standards and Privileges that the House should exercise any of its disciplinary powers in relation to a member of the House,⁵ including withholding a member’s salary for a specified period, or suspending or expelling them from the House.⁶ If IPSA proposes to exercise its enforcement powers of giving a direction or making a recommendation, it must first give the member concerned an opportunity to make further representations to IPSA.⁷

The Government’s position on the right to a fair hearing

1.8 The Explanatory Notes to the Bill acknowledge that the provisions of the Bill which relate to the functions of the IPSA in making directions or recommendations may engage the right to a fair hearing in Article 6 ECHR.⁸ However, the Government’s view is that there is no incompatibility with Article 6(1), for two reasons.

² Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, *Parliamentary Privilege – First Report*, HL 43-I/HC 214-I (April 1999).

³ Clause 7(6).

⁴ Clause 8(1).

⁵ Clause 8(2).

⁶ Clause 8(10).

⁷ Clause 8(3).

⁸ Bill 121-EN para. 128.

1.9 First, the Explanatory Notes state that “there are arguments” that the direction or recommendation functions of the IPSA do not involve the determination of civil rights or obligations. In particular, it is said, “conduct and discipline concerning a member of the legislature is often regarded for the purposes of the ECHR as a matter of ‘public law’ rather than private law rights.” On this view, Article 6(1) ECHR simply does not apply because there are no “civil rights” in play within the meaning of that term as interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights

1.10 Second, the Explanatory Notes state that, even if IPSA’s functions of giving directions or making recommendations determined a member’s civil rights, so that Article 6(1) applied, there is no incompatibility with that Article because there is a range of safeguards in place to ensure the fairness of the procedures of IPSA. Two examples are given. First, it is said that both the members of IPSA and the Commissioner are independent, because they are appointed by a process involving the Speaker and the House of Commons and are removable only on an address of both Houses. Second, before any sanction can be applied, a Member has the opportunity to make representations at all stages of the process: during the investigation, in light of the Commissioner’s findings and before IPSA issues a direction or makes a recommendation.

Assessment of compatibility with the right to a fair hearing

1.11 We have considered carefully the Government’s analysis of the Bill’s compatibility with the right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR, but we do not agree, for the reasons we now set out in summary form.

Applicability of Article 6(1) ECHR

1.12 The Government’s view that Article 6(1) ECHR does not apply to the disciplining of members is in our view not tenable in view of the very serious consequences that might result for the individual member concerned. The sanctions available include expulsion from the House, suspension, withholding of salary and ordering the repayment of money. Any of these will also have a serious impact on a Member’s reputation. This was expressly recognised by the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege in 1999:⁹

“Contempt is a serious matter. A finding of contempt of either House against a member may have adverse consequences of a high order, particularly where it relates to the member’s personal conduct. ... in a particularly serious case a member of the House of Commons faces the prospect of suspension and significant financial loss and, which may be more worrying for him, the destruction of his political career. Even when a member is not suspended, the electorate may react adversely to his conduct as revealed during investigation of a complaint made against him.”

1.13 The Committee on Standards in Public Life has also recognised the serious consequences for an accused member.¹⁰

1.14 In our view, Article 6(1) ECHR applies to the disciplining of members by the House of Commons. Sometimes the nature of the allegation will be such that its determination

⁹ Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, above, n. 2, at para. 280.

¹⁰ Eighth Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, above n.1, at para. 6.16.

amounts to the determination of a criminal charge, for example where the complaint is that the member has acted fraudulently. In such cases, the criminal limb of Article 6(1) will apply, complete with its higher procedural protections for the member against whom the allegations are made. This much is clear from the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, in particular the case of *Demicoli v Malta*, in which the criminal fair trial guarantee in Article 6(1) ECHR was held by the Court to apply to parliamentary contempt proceedings.¹¹ Although the Strasbourg case in question concerned contempt proceedings against a non-member, as opposed to a member, in our view the reasoning in that case applies equally to proceedings against a member where the criteria for whether the proceedings are “criminal” in nature apply, as they would, in our view, in cases where the allegation is sufficiently serious and involves conduct of a criminal nature. As the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege observed, “in that case the person charged with contempt was a non-member, but it would be unwise to assume the requirements of fairness would be significantly less for members.”¹²

1.15 In other cases where the allegations may be less serious we consider that the Member’s civil rights will be determined by the proceedings, in view in particular of the seriousness of the consequences for the Member concerned. Not only will this often have some financial consequence for the Member, which in today’s Strasbourg case-law is often seen as sufficient to qualify as a civil right, but it will always have serious reputational consequences and may affect the member’s ability to pursue their livelihood.

1.16 **We therefore conclude that Article 6(1) ECHR applies.** We note that the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege pointed out in its report that several witnesses drew its attention to the possible application of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights,¹³ including Lord Bingham, the recently retired Senior Law Lord who was then Lord Chief Justice.¹⁴

Procedural safeguards

1.17 The Government argues that, even if the right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR applies, the procedural safeguards in the Bill are sufficient to ensure that there is no breach of that right. The main procedural safeguard in the Bill is the right of a Member who is the subject of an investigation or complaint to make representations to the Commissioner about the investigation or complaint and to IPSA in light of the Commissioner’s report and before it exercises its power to give a direction or make a recommendation.

1.18 This is an important procedural safeguard, but it falls well short of the set of safeguards which the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege described as “the minimum requirements of fairness.”¹⁵ The Joint Committee concluded, in light of the seriousness of the consequences for a member, that it is important that the procedures

¹¹ *Demicoli v Malta* (1992) 14 EHRR 47 at paras 30-35 (held by the European Court of Human Rights that, in view of the seriousness of the penalties potentially available, the right to a fair trial in Article 6(1) ECHR applied to proceedings for contempt of parliament against the editor of a political satirical periodical who had published an article criticising the performance of two Members during a parliamentary debate).

¹² Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, above, n. 2, at para. 283.

¹³ *Ibid.* at para. 284.

¹⁴ Memorandum of evidence (Volume 2 of Joint Committee Report on Parliamentary Privilege, above n. 2) and oral evidence Qs 391-409, 17 February 1998 (Volume 3 of Joint Committee Report on Parliamentary Privilege).

¹⁵ Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, above, n. 2, at para. 281.

followed in the investigation and adjudication of complaints should match contemporary standards of fairness:

“While fairness is fundamental to any disciplinary procedure, the more serious the consequences, the more extensive must be the safeguards if the procedure is to be fair. Some allegations of contempt are more serious than others. In dealing with specially serious cases, we consider it is essential that committees of both Houses should follow procedures providing safeguards at least as rigorous as those applied in the courts and professional disciplinary bodies. At this level the minimum requirements of fairness are for the member who is accused to be given:

- a prompt and clear statement of the precise allegations against the Member;
- adequate opportunity to take legal advice and have legal assistance throughout;
- the opportunity to be heard in person;
- the opportunity to call relevant witnesses at the relevant time;
- the opportunity to examine other witnesses;
- the opportunity to attend meetings at which evidence is given, and to receive transcripts of evidence.

In determining a member’s guilt or innocence, the criterion applied at all stages should be at least that the allegation is proved on the balance of probabilities. In the case of more serious charges, a higher standard of proof may be appropriate.”

1.19 The Committee on Standards in Public Life subsequently endorsed the Joint Committee’s view.¹⁶

1.20 In our view, the procedural safeguards in the Bill fall well short of the minimum requirements for fairness identified by the Joint Committee and the Committee on Standards in Public Life, and are insufficient to prevent breaches of the right to a fair hearing occurring in practice. We recommend below that the Bill be amended to bolster the procedural safeguards to at least the level recommended by these two Committees.

Independence

1.21 The Government argues that the Bill is compatible with the right to a fair hearing because the IPSA is independent. We assume that this is an argument that IPSA itself satisfies the right in Article 6(1) of access to an independent and impartial tribunal in the determination of civil rights and obligations.

1.22 We do not find this argument persuasive. The claim rests primarily on the manner of appointment of IPSA, by the Speaker’s Committee. **In our view IPSA is not capable of constituting the sort of independent and impartial tribunal to which an individual member is entitled under Article 6(1). Its functions, described in detail above, include devising the rules, designing the procedural safeguards, referring for investigation, and**

¹⁶ Eighth Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, above n.1, at para. 6.20.

various enforcement powers. Such a body is not in our view capable of providing the independent and impartial tribunal required by Article 6(1) ECHR.

1.23 In his evidence to the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, Lord Bingham expressed his unease about the lack of access to any independent body from disciplinary decisions of the Houses of Parliament. He said:¹⁷

I have an inherent unease at a situation in which anyone can be held to have committed what I think you might call a quasi-criminal offence and perhaps subjected to some penalty where there is no means of challenge at all. Of course one does get this position in the courts. A judge may find that there is a contempt of court that has been committed and impose some penalty. But there is always an appeal as of right so that anybody who says, "This simply is not a contempt" or somebody who says, "Well, even if it is, this penalty is quite disproportionate", can challenge that decision. I am always rather uneasy if any decision by anybody, however wise and authoritative, is final and immune from any challenge, and therefore the reason why I think it would be desirable to have a route of challenge available is simply to eliminate that situation. I would not expect the right to be exercised at all often, and I would be surprised if the primary decision-maker, namely either House, were disturbed at all frequently; it certainly would not be disturbed at all readily. I just think it is better to enable people to challenge an adverse ruling, in anything other than a domestic context of course.

1.24 In his written evidence to the Committee, he said:¹⁸

It seems to me right that both Houses should have the primary responsibility for regulating their members, and also members of the public, in relation to the conduct of parliamentary business. But I can, again, see force in the argument that the Houses should not be the sole and final arbiter in such matters. There would be scope for undesirable conflict if those aggrieved could resort to the ordinary courts. But if an issue arose (taking one of your examples) whether conduct amounted to a contempt, or whether the punishment imposed was unreasonable, the Judicial Committee would be a very suitable body to rule. Article 6 of the European Convention might have some bearing here.

1.25 We agree with Lord Bingham's analysis that both the minimum requirements of procedural fairness, and Article 6(1) ECHR, require there to be access to a truly independent and impartial tribunal, in the form of a limited degree of judicial supervision. Lord Bingham suggested that either House would make its own decision in the first instance and that any party who did not accept that decision would have a right to petition the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by way of challenge. Such a right of appeal could be similar to that which existed for many years against disciplinary decisions of professional regulatory bodies such as the relevant professional standards committees of the General Medical Council and the General Dental Council. Although for the most part appeals against professional regulatory bodies have been transferred to the Administrative Court, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council developed considerable expertise in ensuring that the right of appeal in professional disciplinary cases is only used sparingly.

¹⁷ Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, above, n. 2, Vol. 3, Q396.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, Written Memorandum of the Lord Chief Justice, Q2.

The Judicial Committee also already has a role in determining whether a member of the House of Commons is subject to a statutory disqualification: under s. 7 of the House of Commons Disqualification Act 1975 a member of the public may apply to the Judicial Committee for a declaration to that effect. We make a recommendation below that the Bill be amended to this effect.

Parliamentary Privilege

1.26 In this Report we have merely sought to analyse the compatibility of the Bill with the right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR. We acknowledge that under our current law UK courts have no jurisdiction to entertain complaints of breaches of Convention rights by either House of Parliament or a person exercising functions in connection with proceedings in Parliament. This is the effect of the provision in s. 6(3) of the Human Rights Act 1998 that Parliament is not a public authority for the purposes of domestic claims under the HRA, which was intended to preserve the existing law relating to parliamentary privilege and contempt of Parliament.

1.27 However, as the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege pointed out, although proceedings for breach of Article 6(1) are excluded by the Human Rights Act from the jurisdiction of the UK courts, they remain within the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights.¹⁹ In this Report, we have sought to point out that **if the current Bill is enacted in its present form, it is only a matter of time before Strasbourg makes a finding of a violation of a member's right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR.** We suggest below the amendments which in our view would be necessary to avoid this inevitability. As the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege concluded, "it is in the interests of Parliament, as well as justice, that Parliament should adopt at least the minimum requirement of fairness."²⁰

Conclusion and recommendation

1.28 We welcome the move from the old system of self-regulation to independent, statutory regulation as a move which, in principle, is likely not only to enhance public confidence in Parliament, but has the potential to improve the fairness of the treatment of individual members. However, for the reasons we have summarised above, **we conclude that the Bill, as currently drafted, is incompatible with the right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR.**

1.29 **To render it compatible, it needs to be amended in two ways. First, to insert at the very least the minimum requirements of fairness identified by the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege in its 1999 Report and endorsed by the Committee on Standards in Public Life in 2002. Second, by extending the Bill's acceptance of independent regulation by providing a right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council against decisions of both the IPSA and the House of Commons which amount either to the determination of a criminal charge or which determine a member's civil rights.** We set out below some probing amendments designed to ensure

¹⁹ Report of the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege, above, n. 2, at para. 284, citing the European Court of Human Rights decision in *Demicoli v Malta* (above, n. 9).

²⁰ *Ibid.*

that this important issue is debated before the Bill completes its passage through the Commons.

Clause 7, Page 5, Line 6, leave out sub-clause (6) and insert New Clause:

Minimum requirements for fairness

The procedures referred to in sub-section (5) of section 7 must, in particular, provide a member who is the subject of an investigation or complaint with –

- (a) a prompt and clear statement of the precise allegations against the Member;
- (b) adequate opportunity to take legal advice and have legal assistance throughout;
- (c) the opportunity to be heard in person;
- (d) the opportunity to call relevant witnesses at the relevant time;
- (e) the opportunity to examine other witnesses;
- (f) the opportunity to attend meetings at which evidence is given, and to receive transcripts of evidence
- (g) the benefit of a standard of proof of beyond reasonable doubt where the allegation amounts to a criminal charge, and of the balance of probabilities in all other cases.

Page 6, Line 17, insert New Clause:

Right of appeal

A Member of the House of Commons has a right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council against any determination by IPSA or the House of Commons which amounts to a determination of a criminal charge against the Member or a determination of the Member's civil rights and obligations within the meaning of Article 6(1) ECHR.

Clause 10, Page 7, Line 9, insert:

- (d) a Member from exercising the right to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in section [].

Conclusions and recommendations

1. In our view, the procedural safeguards in the Bill fall well short of the minimum requirements for fairness identified by the Joint Committee and the Committee on Standards in Public Life, and are insufficient to prevent breaches of the right to a fair hearing occurring in practice. We recommend below that the Bill be amended to bolster the procedural safeguards to at least the level recommended by these two Committees. (Paragraph 1.20)
2. In our view IPSA is not capable of constituting the sort of independent and impartial tribunal to which an individual member is entitled under Article 6(1). Its functions, described in detail above, include devising the rules, designing the procedural safeguards, referring for investigation, and various enforcement powers. Such a body is not in our view capable of providing the independent and impartial tribunal required by Article 6(1) ECHR. (Paragraph 1.22)
3. We agree with Lord Bingham's analysis that both the minimum requirements of procedural fairness, and Article 6(1) ECHR, require there to be access to a truly independent and impartial tribunal, in the form of a limited degree of judicial supervision. (Paragraph 1.25)
4. if the current Bill is enacted in its present form, it is only a matter of time before Strasbourg makes a finding of a violation of a member's right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR. (Paragraph 1.27)
5. we conclude that the Bill, as currently drafted, is incompatible with the right to a fair hearing in Article 6(1) ECHR. (Paragraph 1.28)
6. To render it compatible, it needs to be amended in two ways. First, to insert at the very least the minimum requirements of fairness identified by the Joint Committee on Parliamentary Privilege in its 1999 Report and endorsed by the Committee on Standards in Public Life in 2002. Second, by extending the Bill's acceptance of independent regulation by providing a right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council against decisions of both the IPSA and the House of Commons which amount either to the determination of a criminal charge or which determine a member's civil rights. (Paragraph 1.29)

Formal Minutes

Tuesday 30 June 2009

Members present:

Mr Andrew Dismore MP, in the Chair

Lord Dubs	John Austin MP
Earl of Onslow	Dr Evan Harris MP
Baroness Prashar	Virendra Sharma MP
	Richard Shepherd MP
	Edward Timpson MP

Draft Report (*Legislative Scrutiny: Parliamentary Standards Bill*), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1.1 to 1.29 read and agreed to.

Summary read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Nineteenth Report of the Committee to each House.

Ordered, That the Chairman make the Report to the House of Commons and that Lord Dubs make the Report to the House of Lords.

[Adjourned till tomorrow at 1.30pm.]

Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

First Report	The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	HL Paper 9/HC 93
Second Report	The Work of the Committee in 2007-08	HL Paper 10/HC 92
Third Report	A Bill of Rights for the UK? Government Response to the Committee's Twenty-ninth Report of Session 2007-08	HL Paper 15/ HC 145
Fourth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Political Parties and Elections Bill	HL Paper 23/ HC 204
Fifth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Annual Renewal of Control Orders Legislation 2009	HL Paper 37/HC 282
Sixth Report	UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Government Response to the Committee's First Report of Session 2008-09	HL Paper 46/HC 315
Seventh Report	Demonstrating respect for rights? A human rights approach to policing protest	HL Paper 47/HC 320
Eighth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Coroners and Justice Bill	HL Paper 57/HC 362
Ninth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Borders, Citizenship and Immigration	HL Paper 62/HC 375
Tenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Policing and Crime Bill	HL Paper 68/HC 395
Eleventh Report	Legislative Scrutiny: 1) Health Bill and 2) Marine and Coastal Access Bill	HL Paper 69/HC 396
Twelfth Report	Disability Rights Convention	HL Paper 70/HC 397
Thirteenth Report	Prisoner Transfer Treaty with Libya	HL Paper 71/HC 398
Fourteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Welfare Reform Bill; Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Bill; Health Bill	HL Paper 78/HC 414
Fifteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Policing and Crime Bill (gangs injunctions)	HL Paper 81/HC 441
Sixteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Coroners and Justice Bill (certified inquests)	HL Paper 94/HC 524
Seventeenth Report	Government Replies to the 2 nd , 4 th , 8 th , 9 th and 12 th reports of Session 2008-09	HL Paper /HC 592
Eighteenth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Fifteenth Report): Annual Renewal of 28 Days 2009	HL Paper 119/HC 726

Session 2007-08

First Report	Government Response to the Committee's Eighteenth Report of Session 2006-07: The Human Rights of Older People in Healthcare	HL Paper 5/HC 72
Second Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: 42 days	HL Paper 23/HC 156
Third Report	Legislative Scrutiny: 1) Child Maintenance and Other Payments Bill; 2) Other Bills	HL Paper 28/ HC 198
Fourth Report	Government Response to the Committee's Twenty-First Report of Session 2006-07: Human Trafficking: Update	HL Paper 31/ HC 220
Fifth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Criminal Justice and Immigration Bill	HL Paper 37/HC 269
Sixth Report	The Work of the Committee in 2007 and the State of Human Rights in the UK	HL Paper 38/HC 270
Seventh Report	A Life Like Any Other? Human Rights of Adults with Learning Disabilities: Volume I Report and Formal Minutes	HL Paper 40-I/HC 73-I
Seventh Report	A Life Like Any Other? Human Rights of Adults with Learning Disabilities: Volume II Oral and Written Evidence	HL Paper 40-II/HC 73-II
Eighth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Health and Social Care Bill	HL Paper 46/HC 303
Ninth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Eighth Report): Counter-Terrorism Bill	HL Paper 50/HC 199
Tenth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Ninth report): Annual Renewal of Control Orders Legislation 2008	HL Paper 57/HC 356
Eleventh Report	The Use of Restraint in Secure Training Centres	HL Paper 65/HC 378
Twelfth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: 1) Health and Social Care Bill 2) Child Maintenance and Other Payments Bill: Government Response	HL Paper 66/HC 379
Thirteenth Report	Government Response to the Committee's First Report of Session 2006-07: The Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism	HL Paper 67/HC 380
Fourteenth Report	Data Protection and Human Rights	HL Paper 72/HC 132
Fifteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny	HL Paper 81/HC 440
Sixteenth Report	Scrutiny of Mental Health Legislation: Follow Up	HL Paper 86/HC 455
Seventeenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: 1) Employment Bill; 2) Housing and Regeneration Bill; 3) Other Bills	HL Paper 95/HC 501
Eighteenth Report	Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2007-08: The Work of the Committee in 2007 and the State of Human Rights in the UK	HL Paper 103/HC 526
Nineteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Education and Skills Bill	HL Paper 107/HC 553
Twentieth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Tenth Report): Counter-Terrorism Bill	HL Paper 108/HC 554
Twenty-First Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Eleventh Report): 42 days and Public Emergencies	HL Paper 116/HC 635

Twenty-Second Report	Government Response to the Committee's Fourteenth Report of Session 2007-08: Data Protection and Human Rights	HL Paper 125/HC 754
Twenty-Third Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Government Replies	HL Paper 126/HC 755
Twenty-Fourth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Government Responses to the Committee's Twentieth and Twenty-first Reports of Session 2007-08 and other correspondence	HL Paper 127/HC 756
Twenty-fifth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Twelfth Report): Annual Renewal of 28 Days 2008	HL Paper 132/HC 825
Twenty-sixth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Criminal Evidence (Witness Anonymity) Bill	HL Paper 153/HC 950
Twenty-seventh Report	The Use of Restraint in Secure Training Centres: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report	HL Paper 154/HC 979
Twenty-eighth Report	UN Convention against Torture: Discrepancies in Evidence given to the Committee About the Use of Prohibited Interrogation Techniques in Iraq	HL Paper 157/HC 527
Twenty-ninth Report	A Bill of Rights for the UK?: Volume I Report and Formal Minutes	HL Paper 165-I/HC 150-I
Twenty-ninth Report	A Bill of Rights for the UK?: Volume II Oral and Written Evidence	HL Paper 165-II/HC 150-II
Thirtieth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights (Thirteenth Report): Counter-Terrorism Bill	HL Paper 172/HC 1077
Thirty-first Report	Monitoring the Government's Response to Human Rights Judgments: Annual Report 2008	HL Paper 173/HC 1078
Thirty-second Report	Scrutiny of Mental Health Legislation: Government Response to the Committee's Sixteenth Report of Session 2007-08	HL Paper/ HC 1079