



# Political Affairs Digest

A daily summary of political events affecting the Jewish Community

## Contents

Home Affairs

Relevant Legislation

Consultations

## Home Affairs

### House of Commons Home Affairs Committee

#### Counter-extremism and counter-terrorism

**Q2 Sara Khan (Lead Commissioner, Commission for Countering Extremism):** In the report [“Challenging Hateful Extremism”], we ... identified a distinct type of extremist activity in this country, which we are calling hateful extremism. It is extremist organisations, individuals and groups who are inciting hatred against other people and making the moral case for violence, which is based on hateful, hostile supremacist beliefs and is causing harm. I am very happy to talk about the report.

Since the publication of that report, we have also been looking at covid, and at how hateful extremists have been exploiting the pandemic. We published a report about that in July. ...

**Q3 Sara Khan:** The Government’s definition of extremism is around the issue of British values. There has been a lot of discussion about that definition. ... There is no doubt that there is consensus among the public about terrorism ... there were overarching themes ... beliefs, behaviours and harms—which we describe as being the key pillars of hateful extremism.

We found that what we are seeing are the types of things that we identified in our report, such as behaviours that incite hatred against other people, where there is persistent hatred against individuals who belong to particular groups—often particular groups of people with protected characteristics. We also saw people who make the moral case for violence against other people. We have seen, for example, people celebrating the acts of suicide bombers, glorifying people like Brenton Tarrant or celebrating people like Thomas Mair, who murdered Jo Cox. ... That type of activity is interesting, because it is not caught by the threshold of terrorism legislation. It sits beyond hate crime and is a distinct type of activity that has not been dealt with effectively ...

**Q4 Sara Khan:** ... Some of this behaviour is happening online and some is offline. We are seeing examples of people inciting hatred against Jews as a whole. If you look at organisations like the British Nationalist Socialist Movement, a neo-Nazi white supremacist organisation, it is not a proscribed terrorist organisation in this country. It meets the definition for hateful extremism. You can see some of the language and things they have been engaging in. For example, on Telegram, they have been encouraging users to deliberately infect Jews and Muslims. Again, it is this idea of targeting groups of people

because of their race and their religious identity, whereas hate crime, for example, will very much look at attacking victims as individuals.

So there is a gap if we look at individuals. ... When it comes to people engaging in this behaviour against groups of people as a whole, the law is not dealing with this effectively. ... Behaviour which is probably currently described as being legal should probably be made illegal. ...

**Q5 Sara Khan:** ... Every day, around 6,000 images and memes of extremist material and content are uploaded on 4chan. ...

Look at platforms like BitChute ... on just this one platform, there are videos that have supported National Action; videos supporting Brenton Tarrant; videos supporting Combat 18; material celebrating incels and promoting the idea of incels; conspiracy theories from QAnon, to the great replacement theory to George Soros; antisemitic material; and white supremacist material. In April this year, BitChute tweeted that it had about 20 million unique visitors alone in that month. Has there been a single penalty received by this platform? Not a single one.

As a country and a society we have to ask ourselves, “Is this acceptable?” because if people behaved like this offline, it would be completely unacceptable. The fact that this is allowed to happen and there is no punishment and no prosecution at this moment in time, or that it is not being dealt with effectively ... is completely unacceptable as a society. ...

**Q6 Sara Khan:** ... as a commission, we feel that the threat of extremism has increased over the past decade. The face of modern-day extremism has changed substantially. The ecosystem of hateful extremism has changed beyond recognition, despite the fact that we have a Prevent strategy and despite the fact that we have a counter-extremism strategy. The current approach is not working or responding to this challenge, and part of the reason is that extremists have professionalised. ... they have intellectualised their hate, and they are now operating locally, nationally and transnationally. ...

**Q9 Diane Abbott (Labour):** ... people’s idea of what constitutes extremism, both in the popular press and even among politicians, can vary quite drastically. The groups singled out as extremists can vary quite drastically. Can you understand that some people might have a problem with the concept of hateful extremism, partly because it suggests two tiers of extremism, but also because it is an essentially subjective thing ...

**Sara Khan:** ... yes, that type of behaviour happens, but that does not take away from the fact that there is a problem with the type of hateful extremist activity that we are seeking to address, which is harming our democracy and the rights of minorities, and creating a climate of censorship. ...

There also has to be a recognition—I don’t think this has been acknowledged enough—of how extremism itself threatens human rights and equality norms in this country. ... It is always about balance. It is about the balance of one group of people or the individual against another. ...

**Q10 Sara Khan:** ... the issue of free speech is critical. We made that clear in the report and outlined the distinction between free speech and the behaviours that we are looking at. Free speech is a qualified right. It can be legitimately restricted, as we know, in our country, but we have made it clear that the right to offend, to critical views or to dissent—all those things—we must protect in a democracy. ...

When you look at people and platforms such as BitChute and particularly the far right, they have weaponised free speech in a way where they are acting as if there are no boundaries to free speech and you cannot restrict free speech. They are engaging in speech and language that are directly undermining the rights of other people and of other minority communities. ...

**Q11 Sara Khan:** ... Disinformation conspiracy theories are fundamentally a key tactic for extremist groups. ...

It is a tactic used by extremists to spread extremist narratives and extremist propaganda.

... One of the things that we want to propose in terms of the online harms Bill is to classify and devise a classification system when it comes to extremist material and conspiracy theories. No one is going to have a problem with harmless conspiracy theories about whether Neil Armstrong walked on the moon, for example, but there is a type of hateful extremist propaganda where, say, people on social media platforms are saying, “We must deliberately infect Jews and Muslims. It was Jews who created the virus.” ...

**Q14 Andrew Gwynne (Labour):** ... I want to follow up on what you have already said about pinning down a definition—a working definition—of extremism, because, as you have said, the E word is regularly misused. Is it misused by public authorities? Are Government, the police service, local authorities, clear on what extremism is?

**Sara Khan:** ... it is clearly a subjective term. It always has been; but it doesn't dissuade and doesn't take away from the fact that there is a genuine extremist problem that exists in our country and when we gathered all the evidence we found that many people have described those experiences—how they are being targeted by extremist organisations, from journalists to Jews, Muslims to a whole range of different groups of people. ... People will continue to use the E word in whatever shape or form they want to, but in an institutionalised way this is where the counter-extremism policy really matters, because to deal with this in a much more operational sense that is where we need to go, and we just don't have that at the moment. ...

**Q17 Sara Khan:** ... [Government] need to be focusing on tackling what I have identified as the beliefs, behaviours and harms of hateful extremism, such as challenging the narratives of far-right groups. If far-right organisations are spreading conspiracy theories or antisemitic or anti-Muslim narratives, we need to challenge those beliefs, challenge the behaviours, and do more to support victims.

The issues around harm were really important. What we found was that victims of extremism and their experiences are not even acknowledged ...

**Q18 Sara Khan:** ... I would just make a point about the experiences of counter-extremists. This is a shocking statistic, which we do not acknowledge enough: one thing that came out of our report was that 78% of the people who do this work experience abuse, intimidation, threats. People have told me they have experienced rape threats or death threats. A third of the people who have said that have been shunned by their family or their local community. ... for example, being labelled as Islamophobic because they are challenging Islamist extremism ...

**Q26 Stuart C McDonald (SNP):** ... there have been increasing reports of children and young people who have engaged with and been recruited into far-right groups. What is the scale of that, as far as you are aware? How do we go about tackling that and stopping it happening?

**Sara Khan:** ... this issue of young people espousing extremist and racist views has been quite alarming. I repeatedly hear that. Again, a lot of this information is anecdotal, but there is clearly a problem felt among many teachers that more and more young people are promoting and holding racist, extremist and anti-women views. ...

**Q28 Tim Loughton (Conservative):** ... the Public Order Act 1986 criminalised conduct that was “intended” or “likely to” lead to an offence—it did not actually have to do it—and there have been very few prosecutions. The highest number was 13, in 2018-19, so it was tiny. ... We have these rules, but, for some reason, they have not actually been applied, so will changing laws change anything?

**Sara Khan:** ... I have appointed Sir Mark Rowley to look at this to understand whether there are gaps in the law or whether the application of the current legislation is not adequate and not dealing with this growing problem. You are right to highlight the fact that, last year, there were around 11 cases for incitement offences. If you look at that and at the regular incitement that I see on a day-to-day basis and at what extremists are doing, there

seems to be a bit of a mismatch. ...

**Q30 Sara Khan:** ... There is no doubt that we lack research—academic research—about far-left extremism in this country. There are probably a whole load of reasons why that is, and I am not going to go into them now.

However, I think that we have seen, and I am very aware that there is, for example, hateful extremism emanating from the far left against Jews—the kind of incitement against Jewish MPs and against Jewish organisations, for example. It is very clear and very obvious, and I do not think we have a very good discussion about that, and there are some of the examples you have given.

To be very clear, extremism is not confined to one particular ideology. It cuts across all different types of groups of people, including faith communities. We looked at issues around Sikh extremism. There are aspects of hate in Hindu extremism that we are concerned about. We looked at the issues around animal rights extremism and far-left extremism. I think the only way you can deal with the issue of extremism is to take a consistent approach and be prepared to call it all out, wherever it comes from. ...

**Q32 Assistant Commissioner Neil Basu (National Lead for Counter Terrorism Policing, Metropolitan Police Service):** ... In 2016, I would have talked about 6% of my casework being right-wing terrorism and somewhere in the region of 75% to 80% being Islamist. It is still 75% to 80% Islamist, but actually it is now 10% right-wing terrorism. ...

... a near doubling of that threat since 2016 does worry me, and the ability of the messaging and the way that people are incited, groomed and effectively brought to the fore is largely what Sara has just been talking about. I came to listen, and I was joking with Sara outside, saying, “I would be incredibly surprised if I disagree with a single word you say.” I am not surprised, and I do not disagree with it. If you wanted me to, I would adopt her evidence tomorrow. ... The amplification of extremism and its ability to incite a vulnerable section of the population towards terrorism, which is where myself and MI5 set in, is probably my greatest single fear. ...

**Q34 Assistant Commissioner Basu:** ... Social media has such an influence over every single one of us in our daily lives, but when you have been locked down, you are able to sit there and take that in permanently with no other form of distraction or protective factor around you—I am thinking of schooling, employment, other friends, family members who are not influenced or potentially extremists themselves. That is a concern. That is definitely an effect of covid-19 that we are worried about. ...

**Q36 Assistant Commissioner Basu:** There are very few gaps in terrorist legislation in this country. This country has had very robust terrorist legislation because of its history, certainly with Northern Ireland and dissident republican terrorism ... There is no point having powers ... because if we ask for lots of legislation that we never use, it comes into disrepute. ...

**Q44 Tim Loughton:** On the subject of proscribing terrorist organisations, what impact does that have on police operational activity, and what impact do you think it has on recruitment to the organisation as well?

**Assistant Commissioner Basu:** ... it is a double-edged sword. Proscription is a rare and difficult thing to get. Prior to National Action in 2016, the British Union of Fascists in 1940 was the only other proscribed right-wing organisation. ... What proscription allows us to do in counter-terrorism policing is this. It brings them into the ambit of law enforcement and allows us to use tools, techniques and the law against members of those proscribed organisations.

At a relatively low level, simple membership, if we can prove it, would allow us to prosecute somebody, rather than waiting for them to actually spin up into terrorist behaviour. ... The proscription process, however, is quite bureaucratic; we have found with other proscribed organisations that by the time they are proscribed we have already disrupted and dismantled them. That is a problem, because their proscription ... could glorify them, and

could make them a subject of interest. But then so does talking about them. ... they don't care that I am talking about them in a way that means I want to arrest, prosecute and put them behind bars. To them any publicity is good publicity, and proscription is any publicity. ...

**To read the full transcript see**

<https://committees.parliament.uk/oralevidence/901/html/>

*“Challenging Hateful Extremism”, referred to above can be read at*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/874101/200320\\_Challenging\\_Hateful\\_Extremism.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/874101/200320_Challenging_Hateful_Extremism.pdf)

*“COVID-19 How hateful extremists are exploiting the pandemic”, referred to above, can be read at*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/906724/CCE\\_Briefing\\_Note\\_001.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/906724/CCE_Briefing_Note_001.pdf)

## House of Commons Written Answers

### Religious Hatred: Internet

**Jonathan Gullis (Conservative):** To ask the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, what steps his Department is taking to tackle (a) anti-semitism and (b) islamophobia online.

**Caroline Dinenage:** The Government is absolutely clear that there is no place for hateful content online. In April 2019 the Government published the Online Harms White Paper setting out our plans for world-leading legislation to make the UK the safest place to be online. In February 2020 the Initial Government Response to the consultation was published indicating the direction of travel for the legislation. The Full Government Response detailing proposals for the legislation will be published later this year.

Government recognises that incidents of online hate crime are becoming more prevalent and we are taking action to tackle the issue. We allocated £200,000 for a new national police hub to tackle the emerging threat of online hate crimes which went live in January 2018. We have been supporting initiatives specific to tackling islamophobia and anti-semitism. We have committed £100,000 for the Antisemitism Policy Trust to support their work to tackle online antisemitism, and acknowledge this as a growing area of concern. We have also supported Tell MAMA (Measuring Anti-Muslim Attacks) with just over £2.8m between 2016 and 2020 to monitor and combat anti-Muslim hatred (including online).

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-09-14/89876>

*The White Paper referred to above can be read at*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/online-harms-white-paper/online-harms-white-paper>

*The initial Government response referred to above can be read at*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/online-harms-white-paper/public-feedback/online-harms-white-paper-initial-consultation-response>

### Marriage: Coronavirus

**Jane Hunt (Conservative) [90293]** To ask the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, whether his Department has made an assessment of the feasibility of increasing the number of people allowed to attend weddings at licensed venues where the event is (a) seated and (b) social distancing measures can be adhered to.

**Paul Scully:** Wedding receptions can only take place in a COVID-19 secure

environment which adheres to the appropriate guidelines which can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-small-marriages-and-civil-partnerships>.

The limit of 15 people at a wedding reception from 28 September will remain one of the few occasions when people are legally permitted to gather in groups of more than 6 people.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-09-15/90293>

### **Funerals: Coronavirus**

**Julian Sturdy (Conservative)** [88307] To ask the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, whether funeral receptions and wakes will be exempt from the covid-19 lockdown restrictions announced on 9 September 2020.

This answer is the replacement for a previous holding answer.

**Nadine Dorries:** Up to 30 people can attend funerals. This does not include wakes. Wakes are included in the revised guidelines of up to six people only.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-09-10/88307>

## **Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government**

**COVID-19: Updated guidance for the safe use of places of worship and special religious services and gatherings during the pandemic**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-places-of-worship-during-the-pandemic-from-4-july/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-places-of-worship-during-the-pandemic-from-4-july>

**COVID-19: Updated guidance for small marriages and civil partnerships**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-small-marriages-and-civil-partnerships/covid-19-guidance-for-small-marriages-and-civil-partnerships>

## **Scottish Parliament Ministerial Statement and Q&A**

### **Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill**

**The Cabinet Secretary for Justice (Humza Yousaf):** Two weeks ago, I promised that I would return to the chamber to outline changes that I look to make to the Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill. Those changes are in response to the very genuine concerns that I have heard from a number of stakeholders and members over the past few months. ...

We cannot let down victims of hate crime. We must take forward our plans to legislate in order that we ensure that our hate crime legislation is fit for the 21st century and, most important, that it affords sufficient protection to those who need it.

I highlighted in Parliament two weeks ago how hate crime remains a significant issue that we must tackle. More than 5,600 hate crimes were reported to the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service last year, but they are only the tip of the iceberg, because we know that much hate crime is not reported at all. We cannot afford to be complacent. Effective hate crime legislation makes it clear to victims, perpetrators, communities and wider society that offences that are motivated by prejudice will be treated seriously.

I have listened to the voices that have expressed concerns about the bill ...

The operation of the new stirring up hatred offences has raised concerns that the offences can be committed where behaviour is "likely" to stir up hatred, whether or not the accused intended to stir up hatred. Stirring up hatred offences are not new and have, in relation to race, existed across the countries of the United Kingdom for decades. The bill introduces

new offences of stirring up hatred that cover the characteristics of age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, transgender identity and variations in sex characteristics. ...

Behaviour that stirs up hatred is corrosive. It can incite people to commit offences against individuals in the targeted group, and it can contribute to an atmosphere in which prejudice and discrimination are accepted as normal. It can leave entire communities feeling isolated, scared and vulnerable to attack. In the most serious cases, it can directly encourage activity that threatens or endangers life. ...

People are concerned that the offence could be committed by people who are expressing controversial views but have no intention of stirring up hatred against any group.

The bill contains some protections against that, and the offences themselves set a significant threshold for criminal sanctions. Behaviour must be threatening or abusive and must be likely to stir up hatred, and not merely dislike, disapproval or disrespect. There is also a defence that the accused's behaviour was, in the particular circumstances, reasonable.

However, having heard the views that have been expressed in Parliament and by a range of key stakeholders, I recognise that even with the protections that I have just outlined, there is a real risk that if the offences do not require intent to stir up hatred, there could be uncertainty and a perception that operation of that aspect of the offences might be used to prosecute entirely legitimate acts of expression, which might lead to an element of self-censorship.

That is not the aim of the legislation. The bill does not seek to stifle robust debate, public discourse or artistic freedoms. ...

I can advise that the Scottish Government will lodge stage 2 amendments to the bill to make the new offences of stirring up hatred based on intent only. I hope that that fundamental change will provide the necessary reassurance that the new offences of stirring up hatred strike an appropriate balance between respecting freedom of expression and protecting people who are affected by those who set out to stir up hatred.

In making the change, I will maintain the distinct approach of the bill to the stirring up racial hatred offences, which will continue to apply as they do at the moment, and as they have done for the past 34 years. Stirring up racial hatred offences in the form that they take in the bill have existed across the United Kingdom, including in England and Wales, for decades. I see no reason to fundamentally adjust a long-standing approach and protection that has worked well in practice. I would be concerned about community cohesion were there to be any weakening of the existing protections in respect of race. ...

I know that hate crime is an emotive subject; I know all too well that it is a deeply personal one, too. I want to give this criminal law legislation the best chance of affording protection to those who need it. ...

**Liam Kerr (Conservative):** ... The amendments that the Cabinet Secretary for Justice proposes do not begin to go far enough and respondents will note that the cabinet secretary has not admitted that the first draft of the bill is a threat to free speech. He makes no mention of the threshold for criminality, with regard to "threatening or abusive" behaviour or communication, which represents a significant difference to the legislation south of the border. There is still no protection in the bill for anything that is said in the privacy of one's own home and the bill's vague clauses on "inflammatory material" are not mentioned. ...

**Humza Yousaf:** Dealing effectively with the new stirring-up offences by changing them to intent-only offences will mitigate and ameliorate the vast majority of concerns that a number of stakeholders have expressed. ...

... simply scrapping the stirring-up offences is not an option, because those offences are corrosive to society. ... we should not shy away from that vital protection. ...

**Patrick Harvie (Green):** ... Why has the cabinet secretary not chosen to take a similar

approach to that taken in the Public Order Act 1986 in relation to stirring up racial hatred, where intent or likelihood are both covered? Where intent is not proved, it is a defence that the accused was not aware that their behaviour might be threatening or abusive. Surely, if we do not take that approach, we will risk a situation in which very extreme actions that clearly stir up hatred will be legitimised on the basis that an accused can merely argue that their intention was something else.

**Humza Yousaf:** ... I tested that proposition with the Faculty of Advocates, the Law Society of Scotland and some lawyers and solicitors that I know. They provided me with a significant degree of reassurance that it is not simply a case of the accused saying that they did not intend to do something and that therefore a judge, jury or sheriff would accept that as the word of the accused. The judge, jury or sheriff would look at all the contextual factors surrounding an incident and determine whether there was an intent to stir up hatred or not. It is not simply the case that an accused could say, "I did not intend to do that." ...

**Liam McArthur (Liberal Democrat):** ... the proposed stirring-up offence in the bill has led to serious widespread and legitimate concerns about the consequences for freedom of expression, and the "intent to" safeguard is a welcome step in the right direction. However, Lord Bracadale said: "almost every case which could be prosecuted as a stirring up offence could also be prosecuted using a baseline offence and an aggravation"

Can the cabinet secretary offer examples of behaviour that would be caught by a stirring-up offence but would not be caught by the bill's aggravation provisions?

**Humza Yousaf:** ... The reason why a stirring-up offence is needed is because it does not require an individual to be on the receiving end of it; it could be an entire community, such as the Muslim community, the gay community or people who have disabilities, that is affected by a stirring-up offence, whereas the statute of aggravators in part 1 of the bill ... generally involve offences that are attached to an individual. ...

**Alex Rowley (Labour):** ... the Faculty of Advocates has suggested that some of the definitions in the bill—for example, those that concern perceived religious affiliation—are too broad and too vague. To avoid a repeat of the problems of the Offensive Behaviour at Football and Threatening Communications (Scotland) Act 2012, is the cabinet secretary considering amendments that would tighten the definitions in the bill?

**Humza Yousaf:** ... In short, my answer is yes ...

**Donald Cameron (Conservative):** ... the references to freedom of expression in sections 11 and 12 are controversial, because they relate only to two protected characteristics: sexual orientation and religion. Why is that? ...

**Humza Yousaf:** ... the point that he made about the specific nature of the freedom of expression provisions was made to me by the Equality Network, the Faculty of Advocates, the Roman Catholic Church and the Scottish Council of Jewish Communities, and my answer was that I absolutely will look again at the provisions. ...

**John Mason (SNP):** ... Can the cabinet secretary reassure us that the bar will not be raised too high, such that it will become too difficult to get a conviction? Can he also reassure us that there will not be confusion if race is treated differently from other protected characteristics?

**Humza Yousaf:** ... I had exactly the same concern about a move to intent only; I did not want an offence that, frankly, could not be prosecuted or that would be extremely difficult to prosecute. ...

The assurances that I got from the Faculty of Advocates and the Law Society of Scotland, in particular, were extremely helpful in that regard. ...

**To read the full transcript see**

<http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=12839&i=116077#ScotParlOR>

## Scottish Government

### Hate Crime law reform:

#### Amendments to Bill proposed to safeguard freedom of speech

The Scottish Government is proposing to make changes to the Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill to balance protection of vulnerable groups affected by hate crime with people's rights to freedom of expression.

Ministers are proposing to amend the legislation which, if agreed by Parliament, would mean a conviction for new offences of 'stirring up' hatred would be possible only where it was shown that someone intended to stir up hatred through their actions or behaviour.

The alternative and lower threshold for an offence to be triggered which is currently in the draft legislation – namely if someone's behaviour was 'likely to' stir up hatred – is to be removed.

There will be no change to the threshold for the existing stirring up of hatred offences for racial hatred. These offences have been in Scots Law since 1986 and will remain in place.

Announcing his intention to bring amendments in Parliament, Justice Secretary Humza Yousaf said: "Confronting hate crime is central to building the safer, stronger and inclusive Scotland that we all want to see – free from hatred, prejudice, discrimination and bigotry. Our plans to legislate will ensure hate crime law is fit for the 21st Century, giving sufficient protection to those who need it.

"I have listened to and reflected carefully on concerns raised over the Bill, particularly over the operation of the new stirring up hatred offences and concerns that these offences do not require that the accused intended to stir up hatred.

"I recognise that there is a real risk that if the offences don't require intent to stir up hatred, people may self-censor their activities through a perception that the operation of this aspect of the offences may be used to prosecute what are entirely legitimate acts of expression.

"The Scottish Government will therefore lodge stage 2 amendments to the Bill to make the new stirring up hatred offences 'intent only'. I hope this fundamental change will provide necessary reassurance that the new stirring up hatred offences strike an appropriate balance between respecting freedom of expression while protecting those impacted by people who set out to stir up hatred in others. ...

**To read the full press release see**

<https://www.gov.scot/news/hate-crime-law-reform/>

## Welsh Government

**COVID-19 BAME Socio-economic Sub Group Report: Welsh Government response**

<https://gov.wales/covid-19-bame-socio-economic-subgroup-report-welsh-government-response-html>

TOP

## Relevant Legislation

\*\* new or updated today

### UK Parliament

**Assisted Dying Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2592>

## **Education (Assemblies) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2579>

## **Genocide Determination Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2621>

## **Marriage Act 1949 (Amendment) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2608>

## **Marriage and Civil Partnership (Minimum Age) Bill**

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2584>

## **Scottish Parliament**

### **Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill**

<https://beta.parliament.scot/bills/hate-crime-and-public-order-scotland-bill>

### **Post-mortem Examinations (Defence Time Limit) (Scotland) Bill**

<https://beta.parliament.scot/bills/post-mortem-examinations-defence-time-limit-scotland-bill>

TOP

## **Consultations**

\*\* new or updated today

### **Getting Married: A Consultation Paper on Weddings Law** (closing date 3 December 2020)

<https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/weddings/#weddings-consultation-paper>

### **\*\* Hate crime laws** (closing date 24 December 2020)

<https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/hate-crime/>

TOP

The Scottish Council of Jewish Communities (SCoJeC) is Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation SC029438