



House of Lords
House of Commons
Joint Committee on
Human Rights

**Government Response to
the Committee's Fourteenth
Report of Session 2007–08:
Data Protection and Human
Rights**

**Twenty–Second Report of
Session 2007–08**

*Report, together with formal minutes, and an
appendix*

*Ordered by the House of Lords to be printed
17 June 2008*

*Ordered by The House of Commons to be printed
17 June 2008*

**HL Paper 125
HC 754**

Published on 23 June 2008
by authority of 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 Stern

HOUSE OF COMMONS

John Austin MP (Labour, *Erith & Thamesmead*)
Mr Douglas Carswell MP (Conservative, *Harwich*)
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*)

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 (Committee Specialists), James Clarke (Committee Assistant), and Karen Barrett (Committee Secretary) and John Porter (Chief Office Clerk).

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>
1 Report	3
Letter from Michael Wills MP, Minister of State, Ministry of Justice dated 23 May 2008	5
Formal Minutes	4
Appendix	5
Reports from the Joint Committee on Human Rights in this Parliament	13

1 Report

Under cover of a letter of 23 May 2008 from Michael Wills MP, Minister of State, Ministry of Justice, we have received the Government's Response to our Fourteenth Report of this Session, *Data Protection and Human Rights* (HL Paper 72, HC 132). We publish this Response as an Appendix to this Report.

Formal Minutes

Tuesday 17 June 2008

Members present:

Mr Andrew Dismore MP, in the Chair

Lord Bowness

Dr Evan Harris MP

Lord Dubs

Mr Richard Shepherd MP

Lord Lester of Herne Hill

The Earl of Onslow

Lord Morris of Handsworth

Baroness Stern

Draft Report (*Government Response to the Committee's Fourteenth Report of Session 2007-08: Data Protection and Human Rights*), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read the first and second time, and agreed to.

A Paper was ordered to be appended to the Report.

Resolved, That the Report be the Twenty-second Report of the Committee to each House.

Ordered, That the Chairman make the Report to the House of Commons and that Baroness Stern make the Report to the House of Lords.

[Adjourned till Tuesday 24 June at 1.30pm.]

Appendix

Letter from Michael Wills MP, Minister of State, Ministry of Justice dated 23 May 2008

I am writing to respond to the Committee's conclusions and recommendations in the above report. The Government thanks the Committee for its report on Data Protection and Human Rights. I have adopted the Committee's numbering as in the summary at page 21 of the report.

1. Government must show that any proposal for data sharing is both justifiable and proportionate, and that appropriate safeguards are in place to ensure that personal data is not disclosed arbitrarily but only in circumstances where it is proportionate to do so. (Paragraph 14)

The Government takes data protection and human rights seriously and agrees that data sharing should be justifiable, proportionate and only undertaken when proper safeguards are in place. Sharing information within government can promote the well being of society and help deliver public services more efficiently. Such information sharing can deliver significant benefits for the citizen, from protecting society as a whole from harm to facilitating the delivery of more efficient and tailored public services. Information sharing and proper respect for an individual's right to private life are compatible. We agree that there is a need to ensure that data sharing is proportionate.

It was for this reason, in October 2007, that the Prime Minister set up the independent review chaired by Dr Mark Walport of the Wellcome Trust and the Information Commissioner, Richard Thomas, to look at how personal information is used and protected in both the public and private sector.

2. Where there is a demonstrable need to legislate to permit data sharing between public sector bodies, or between public and private sector bodies, the Government's intentions should be set out clearly in primary legislation. This would enable Parliament to scrutinise the government's proposals more effectively and, bearing in mind that secondary legislation cannot usually be amended, would increase the opportunity for Parliament to hold the executive to account. (Paragraph 20)

3. Setting out the purposes of data sharing and the limitations on data sharing powers in primary legislation would give a clear indication to the staff utilising such powers of the significance of data protection. (Paragraph 21)

Data protection safeguards are enshrined in the Data Protection Act 1998. Where it is necessary to legislate in order to empower bodies to share data, the exercise of those powers will usually be governed by the provisions of the Data Protection Act and the Human Rights Act. In many cases it is therefore unnecessary to duplicate those safeguards in the data sharing provisions of the enabling legislation.

Whether those data sharing provisions are best set out in primary or secondary legislation will depend on the context of the legislation and the data sharing involved. Primary legislation will not always be the best vehicle to be used. For example where comprehensive

lists of types of information, organisations or specific cases which may require amendment are set out in the legislation. Using secondary legislation in these cases allows for flexibility, particularly where future reviews and changes to such lists are likely, and in response to operational requirements, as it can more easily be amended than primary legislation.

The Government notes the Committee's view that the outlining of data sharing in primary legislation allows greater opportunity for scrutiny

Detailing the purposes and limitations on powers in primary legislation would not necessarily increase the significance to those responsible for sharing data, nor necessarily instill a culture of respect. The efficient use of codes of practice may provide a more pragmatic and effective approach in the form of practical and detailed guidance to front line staff who manage and handle information than can be offered solely in the form of provisions set out in primary legislation.

4. We recommend that the role of data protection minister should be enhanced. In addition to overseeing the data protection legislation, the data protection minister should have a high-profile role within Government, championing best practice in data protection and ensuring that lessons are learnt from breaches of data protection. (Paragraph 26)

In my oral evidence to the Committee I outlined my responsibilities in relation to data protection. The Ministry of Justice is responsible for the construction and maintenance of the Data Protection Act.

Management of information is part and parcel of the delivery of public services. Individual Departments and their agencies are best placed to manage their own key framework and information because they understand best what information they hold and how best to deliver the services for which they are responsible.

They exercise that responsibility within a co-ordinated framework of:

- the Data Protection Act 1998; Human Rights Act and the Freedom of Information Act 2000, for which the Ministry of Justice is responsible;
- a strategic information assurance and security framework defined by Cabinet Office, which houses the Government's Central Sponsor for Information Assurance (CSIA); and
- corporate governance and accountability requirements, promulgated by HM Treasury.

As the Committee has stated, there should be inter-departmental co-ordination to share best practice and help deal with the fall-out from significant breaches of data protection. The Government agrees with this and I refer you to the Cabinet Office Interim Progress Report: Data Handling Procedures in Government¹, published in December 2007.

1

http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/reports/~/_media/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/publications/reports/data/data_handling%20pdf.ashx

Paragraphs 7 to 12 of the report outline exactly how Government has, and does, strive to protect information in a co-ordinated way.

The final Cabinet Office report, due in Spring 2008, will seek to consolidate this joint approach to protect Government data, and define how Ministerial overview of progress will be provided.

6. Recent breaches in data protection appear mostly to have resulted from human error and procedural lapses rather than technological problems. However, it would be wrong to see these errors and lapses as unfortunate “one-off” events. In our view they are symptomatic of the Government’s persistent failure to take data protection safeguards sufficiently seriously by defining data sharing powers more tightly in primary legislation and including detailed safeguards against arbitrary or unjustified disclosure. The rapid increase in the amount of data sharing has not been accompanied by a sufficiently strong commitment to the need for safeguards. The fundamental problem is a cultural one: there is insufficient respect for the right to respect for personal data in the public sector. (Paragraph 27)

7. We are surprised, and disappointed, to find that senior public officials need to be reminded of the main principles of the Data Protection Act. (Paragraph 28)

Defining powers and safeguards in primary legislation would not necessarily lead to increased levels of respect for personal data. The Committee is certainly right to highlight the issues of culture and respect, and I made the same points when I appeared before the Committee last year. High levels of data security must be underpinned by a culture that values, protects and uses information. This culture is important when services are being planned and when they are being delivered.

Government is embarking on a sustained and determined effort to ensure that the right culture is in place. This will have to be led from the top of Departments, but will cover all those involved in the management of and access to personal data. All Departments must have strategies to nurture the right culture.

Government will always regard any data loss as a cause for concern. Where problems do occur the culture has to be one in which they are identified and learned from.

The Committee has stated its surprise and disappointment that senior officials need to be reminded of the main principles of the Data Protection Act. Staff at all levels of departments were reminded of their responsibilities under the Data Protection Act as part of the Cabinet Office review of “Data Handling Procedures in Government”. This is part of a continuing process to deliver the cultural change that both we and the Committee believe is necessary. Such cultural change depends, among other things, on continuing to remind all staff of procedures. The Review instigated a re-examination of all areas where sensitive data is stored to ensure that proper processes are in place to protect personal data.

8. It is clear to us from a great deal of our work, and in particular recently our inquiries into human rights of older people in healthcare and adults with learning disabilities, as well as from this inquiry, that human rights are far from being a mainstream consideration in Government departments. The Minister has identified the cultural barrier to ensuring that personal data is adequately protected by the staff who handle it,

but much more needs to be done to tackle this problem successfully. We have so far seen no evidence that the human rights champions in departments have made any impact, particularly in relation to front line staff. We will continue to scrutinise their work carefully. (Paragraph 34)

While acknowledging that more can and should be done to mainstream human rights amongst public authorities, and while respecting the Committee's views, the Government disagrees with the Committee's conclusion that "*there is no evidence that the human rights champions in Departments have made any impact, particularly in relation to front line staff*". Senior human rights champions across Departments regularly meet to discuss current human rights initiatives as well as tackling ways to improve information on human rights amongst public authorities. One such initiative, recently rolled out to Government Departments, is the access to a free online awareness course on human rights sponsored by the National School of Government and the Ministry of Justice. The National School of Government monitors the completion of the package by users. Departmental human rights practitioners, the next level in the human rights champions network, closely liaise with each other and the Ministry of Justice in order to raise awareness amongst policy officials to consider human rights implications when working on new and current policies. The evidence of the success of the human rights champions network is not easily measurable since public scrutiny and the media are usually focused (and rightly so) on the rare occasions when things go wrong rather than when Government policies are human rights compliant, which is the vast majority of cases. The test should not be on the basis of a month-by-month assessment but rather by regular long-term assessments of whether and how the necessary cultural change is taking place. We intend to carry out such long-term assessment.

We would also like to remind the Committee that the Government successfully carried out the human rights programme giving effect to the recommendations of the July 2006 *Review of the Implementation of the Human Rights Act*². The programme focused on various areas including improved guidance on human rights (with specific guidance for public authorities including front line staff), further human rights training for legal advisers to Departments, and the establishment of human rights "action plans" by individual Departments. The evaluation of the programme conducted by the Ministry of Justice Assurance Team found that the programme had delivered all of its main objectives as defined in the programme definition document. A copy of the evaluation report was sent to the Committee on 1 November 2007.

The Committee may also wish to note that the wide distribution of the Ministry of Justice human rights guidance (*Human Rights: Human Lives* handbook³ and the summary booklet and DVD) amongst Government Departments and their sponsored bodies focused on a range of sectors: health, local Government, education and the Criminal Justice System. In addition, the Department of Health currently has a human rights work programme with the overall aim of championing human rights in health and social care. The programme includes development and policy work within the Department of Health itself and externally facing work to support NHS Trusts to develop and apply human rights based approaches in their work. Phase I of the Human Rights in Healthcare project focused on

² http://www.dca.gov.uk/peoples-rights/human-rights/pdf/full_review.pdf

³ <http://www.dca.gov.uk/peoples-rights/human-rights/pdf/hr-handbook-public-authorities.pdf>

the production of the framework *Human Rights in Healthcare – A Framework for Local Action*⁴ to assist NHS Trusts to develop and use a human rights based approach to support their core business of planning and delivering high quality and accessible health services for all. Phase 2 will involve further development of the framework into a “road tested” version with a more developed business case and indicators. This phase will also devise a range of linked strategic tools that meet the needs identified by NHS trusts to work within the framework and to provide a greater evidence base of the impact of using a human rights based approach in supporting trusts objectives.

The human rights programme has provided a solid foundation for mainstreaming human rights into policy and service delivery. The Ministry of Justice will continue to monitor the implementation of Departments’ Action Plans and cross-Government human rights initiatives to sustain these efforts.

In relation to data protection, recent months have seen a wide range of activity taking place across Departments and in delivery bodies reporting to them. All Departments have started a broader process of culture change, for example working with staff to ensure that sensitive data is handled responsibly and securely. Much of the work will require ongoing and sustained attention. Sir Gus O’Donnell wrote to all Permanent Secretaries on 6 March 2008 attaching mandatory standards for data handling, and including measures to foster a culture of respect for personal data throughout Government.

9. We await the outcomes of the various reviews of data protection with interest. We expect the Government to keep us informed about its proposals for reform in this area. We recommend that, in its responses to the reviews, the Government should acknowledge the close connection between data protection and human rights; and explain how it proposes to ensure that a culture of respect for personal data is fostered throughout Government. (Paragraph 35)

The reports from the various reviews will help the Government to take a considered view of the range of measures necessary to strengthen the protection of personal data.

It is clear that more can be done to improve trust and confidence about the arrangements in place to protect information in Government. Transparency is a powerful tool in this respect. Departments will cover information assurance issues in their annual reports.

We will ensure that recommendations of the reviews are used to strengthen the security of personal information.

We will keep the Committee informed, as they request.

10. We see the Information Commissioner as an important defender of human rights in relation to data protection and freedom of information. His office should be regarded as an important part of the national human rights machinery. We support proposals to enhance the Commissioner’s powers and the resources at his disposal to ensure that he can discharge his responsibilities more effectively. (Paragraph 39)

4

http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_073473?IdcService=GET_FILE&dID=137175&Rendition=Web

We agree with the Committee's comments about the important role played by the Information Commissioner and his office.

We believe it is essential that the Information Commissioner has the powers to effectively encourage and compel compliance with the Data Protection Act. This was reflected in the Prime Minister's invitation to the Information Commissioner in late 2007 to conduct spot checks on Central Government Department's compliance with the Data Protection Act. This does not involve any legislative change. These spot checks will begin over the coming months.

The Data Protection Act has recently been amended to confer, on the Information Commissioner, a power to impose a monetary penalty on a data controller where the ICO is satisfied that the data controller has committed a serious contravention of the data protection principles.

The Information Commissioner's powers are also being considered by the Thomas/Walport review. The review will make recommendations on the powers and sanctions available to the regulator and courts. A report is expected in mid 2008. The Government will take a considered view on what measures to take to strengthen the Information Commissioner's powers in light of these and the recommendations of the Cabinet Office review.

The Commissioner's data protection work is funded by notification fees paid by data controllers under section 26 of the Data Protection Act which his office retains with the agreement of HM Treasury. In 2006-07 this was £10,200,000. Government is currently considering the Commissioner's case for increased resources, including the recommendation of the House of Common's Justice Committee report '*Protection of Private Data*' (January 2008)⁵ that a graduated fee scale be introduced to replace the current flat fee that applies to all data controllers.

11. We support initiatives to ensure that data protection issues are dealt with at an early stage in the planning of Government projects, including legislative proposals. We intend to scrutinise how privacy impact assessments are used in practice. (Paragraph 40)

The Information Commissioner has made a powerful case for Privacy Impact Assessments (PIAs) to be carried out at an early stage in the development of policy and service delivery. In December 2007, the Information Commissioner launched the PIA handbook⁶ developed for the Information Commissioner by an international team of experts co-ordinated by the University of Loughborough.

The Government is looking at how best to introduce PIAs and working with the ICO on the best way to do this. The National Police Improvement Agency, for example, have started a PIA for the Police National Database (PND) closely following the Information Commissioner's handbook and working with staff from the Commissioner's office. It aims to complete the PIA for the first phase of the PND by the end of this year. The results will be published.

⁵ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmjust/154/154.pdf>

⁶ http://www.ico.gov.uk/upload/documents/pia_handbook.html/html/foreword.html

12. Recent breaches in data protection by Government departments do not encourage us to feel confident about the security of data collected as part of the National Identity Register project. We intend to take a close interest in the Government's detailed proposals for the National Identity Register as and when they emerge. (Paragraph 47)

The Home Office/Borders and Immigration Agency issued its consultative 'National Identity Scheme Delivery Plan 2008'⁷ on 5 March 2008. The purpose of the consultation is to help Government to proceed with the implementation of the National identity Scheme including the introduction of identity cards linked to a National Identity Register (NIR). The delivery plan set out the proposed benefits of the scheme and how the security of data will be maintained. Para 20 of delivery plan states: 'In terms of security, the Government's goal for the National Identity Scheme is that it will provide the most secure basis for identity assurance of any system currently operating in the public or private sector. Its approach to the design of the Scheme aims to balance customer service, privacy, security and usability. In doing so, Government recognises the need to respond to public concerns about data security and it will use technology and other non technical safeguards to provide the highest levels of protection for an individual's personal data'.

13. We regret that it has taken the loss of personal data affecting 25 million people – a “train crash”, in the words of the Information Commissioner – for the Government to take data protection seriously. Data protection is a human rights issue and should not be treated as a fringe concern, a matter for rarely consulted policy documents and procedures which are all too easily ignored. The recent data protection breaches have revealed the complacency of the Government's repeated refusal to accept our recommendations that more detailed limits and safeguards be included in Government bills which authorise the sharing of personal data. The problem is symptomatic of a deeper problem to which we have drawn attention in recent reports and on which we recently commented in our annual Report on our work for 2007: the failure to root human rights in the mainstream of departmental decision making. (Paragraph 49)

We take data protection seriously and had already established the Thomas/Walport Review prior to the HMRC data loss incident.

We are committed to ensuring information sharing is undertaken in a transparent and controlled manner with legal and process controls in place to ensure that information is shared appropriately and proportionately. Personal data must be protected in line with the data protection principles enshrined in the Data Protection Act and information sharing can only take place when not incompatible with the purpose for which it was obtained.

Because no information handling system provides total protection, performance needs to be monitored and lessons learned. The Government is putting in place mechanisms to ensure that both are done.

The handling and protection of data is a global concern and both the public and private sectors have been faced with tackling information security breaches. Sharing data is essential and commonplace as our society becomes more interconnected. The Government is clear that it must constantly reassess its mechanisms for protecting information in this rapidly changing technological and globalised world.

⁷ <http://www.ips.gov.uk/identity/downloads/national-identity-scheme-delivery-2008.pdf>

For the reasons already stated in the response to point 8 of the Committee's Report, the Government respectfully disagrees with the Committee's conclusion about the alleged Government's "*failure to root human rights in the mainstream of departmental decision making*". I would also like to refer the Committee to my letter of 11 April 2008 with the Government's response to the Committee's Sixth Report on "*The Work of the Committee in 2007 and the State of Human Rights in the UK*".

14. We note that the Government has launched a number of reviews of data protection legislation and practice. Once those reviews have been completed, we expect the Government to take action to foster a positive culture for the protection of personal data by public sector bodies. This will enable the Government to reap the benefits of data sharing, where it is considered desirable, without calling into question the right of ordinary people for respect for their personal lives.

We are taking action now to foster a positive culture which values and protects personal data and we will continue to do so. In addition, and as the Committee has anticipated, the Government will take a considered view on what further measures we need to take to strengthen the protection for personal data in light of the recommendations of the Thomas/Walport, Poynter and Cabinet Office reviews.

Reports from the Joint Committee on Human Rights in this Parliament

The following reports have been produced

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

Session 2006-07

First Report	The Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism	HL Paper 26/HC 247
Second Report	Legislative Scrutiny: First Progress Report	HL Paper 34/HC 263
Third Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Second Progress Report	HL Paper 39/HC 287
Fourth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Mental Health Bill	HL Paper 40/HC 288
Fifth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Third Progress Report	HL Paper 46/HC 303
Sixth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Sexual Orientation Regulations	HL Paper 58/HC 350
Seventh Report	Deaths in Custody: Further Developments	HL Paper 59/HC 364
Eighth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Draft Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005	HL Paper 60/HC 365
Ninth Report	The Meaning of Public Authority Under the Human Rights Act	HL Paper 77/HC 410
Tenth Report	The Treatment of Asylum Seekers: Volume I Report and Formal Minutes	HL Paper 81-I/HC 60-I
Tenth Report	The Treatment of Asylum Seekers: Volume II Oral and Written Evidence	HL Paper 81-II/HC 60-II
Eleventh Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Fourth Progress Report	HL Paper 83/HC 424
Twelfth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Fifth Progress Report	HL Paper 91/HC 490
Thirteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Sixth Progress Report	HL Paper 105/HC 538
Fourteenth Report	Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of this Session: Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Draft Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 (Continuance in force of sections 1 to 9 order 2007)	HL Paper 106/HC 539
Fifteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Seventh Progress Report	HL Paper 112/HC 555
Sixteenth Report	Monitoring the Government's Response to Court Judgments Finding Breaches of Human Rights	HL Paper 128/HC 728
Seventeenth Report	Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report of this Session: The Treatment of Asylum Seekers	HL Paper 134/HC 790

Eighteenth Report	The Human Rights of Older People in Healthcare: Volume I- Report and Formal Minutes	HL Paper 156-I/HC 378-I
Eighteenth Report	The Human Rights of Older People in Healthcare: Volume II- Oral and Written Evidence	HL Paper 156-II/HC 378-II
Nineteenth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: 28 days, intercept and post-charge questioning	HL Paper 157/HC 394
Twentieth Report	Highly Skilled Migrants: Changes to the Immigration Rules	HL Paper 173/HC 993
Twenty-first Report	Human Trafficking: Update	HL Paper 179/HC 1056

Session 2005-06

First Report	Legislative Scrutiny: First Progress Report	HL Paper 48/HC 560
Second Report	Deaths in Custody: Further Government Response to the Third Report from the Committee, Session 2004-05	HL Paper 60/HC 651
Third Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Terrorism Bill and related matters Volume I Report and Formal Minutes	HL Paper 75-I/HC 561-I
Third Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Terrorism Bill and related matters Volume II Oral and Written Evidence	HL Paper 75-II/HC 561-II
Fourth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Equality Bill	HL Paper 89/HC 766
Fifth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Second Progress Report	HL Paper 90/HC 767
Sixth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Third Progress Report	HL Paper 96/HC 787
Seventh Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Fourth Progress Report	HL Paper 98/HC 829
Eighth Report	Government Responses to Reports from the Committee in the last Parliament	HL Paper 104/HC 850
Ninth Report	Schools White Paper	HL Paper 113/HC 887
Tenth Report	Government Response to the Committee's Third Report of this Session: Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Terrorism Bill and related matters	HL Paper 114/HC 888
Eleventh Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Fifth Progress Report	HL Paper 115/HC 899
Twelfth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Draft Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 (Continuance in force of sections 1 to 9) Order 2006	HL Paper 122/HC 915
Thirteenth Report	Implementation of Strasbourg Judgments: First Progress Report	HL Paper 133/HC 954
Fourteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Sixth Progress Report	HL Paper 134/HC 955
Fifteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Seventh Progress Report	HL Paper 144/HC 989
Sixteenth Report	Proposal for a Draft Marriage Act 1949 (Remedial) Order 2006	HL Paper 154/HC 1022
Seventeenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Eighth Progress Report	HL Paper 164/HC 1062
Eighteenth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Ninth Progress Report	HL Paper 177/HC 1098
Nineteenth Report	The UN Convention Against Torture (UNCAT) Volume I Report and Formal Minutes	HL Paper 185-I/HC 701-I
Twentieth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Tenth Progress Report	HL Paper 186/HC 1138

Twenty-first Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Eleventh Progress Report	HL Paper 201/HC 1216
Twenty-second Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Twelfth Progress Report	HL Paper 233/HC 1547
Twenty-third Report	The Committee's Future Working Practices	HL Paper 239/HC 1575
Twenty-fourth Report	Counter-Terrorism Policy and Human Rights: Prosecution and Pre-Charge Detention	HL Paper 240/HC 1576
Twenty-fifth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Thirteenth Progress Report	HL Paper 241/HC 1577
Twenty-sixth Report	Human trafficking	HL Paper 245-I/HC 1127-I
Twenty-seventh Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Bill	HL Paper 246/HC 1625
Twenty-eighth Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Fourteenth Progress Report	HL Paper 247/HC 1626
Twenty-ninth Report	Draft Marriage Act 1949 (Remedial) Order 2006	HL Paper 248/HC 1627
Thirtieth Report	Government Response to the Committee's Nineteenth Report of this Session: The UN Convention Against Torture (UNCAT)	HL Paper 276/HC 1714
Thirty-first Report	Legislative Scrutiny: Final Progress Report	HL Paper 277/HC 1715
Thirty-second Report	The Human Rights Act: the DCA and Home Office Reviews	HL Paper 278/HC 1716