

Royal Charter and the need for recognised self-regulation, not IPSO style

Date	Whittingdale original position	Link
27/04/2011	When the Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport, which I have the honour to chair, examined press standards, we certainly looked at the issue of due prominence. I share the hon. Gentleman's view that, when an adverse ruling is reached by the PCC, it is vital that it appear with the same due prominence as the original article.	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2011-04-27/debates/11042792000002/PressSelf-Regulation
03/12/2012	There is no question but that all of us in this Chamber are of one mind that the system of self-regulation administered by the Press Complaints Commission has failed.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121203/debtext/121203-0001.htm#1212039000774
03/12/2012	We are all agreed that we cannot continue with a system of self-regulation. The idea of the press marking its own homework, as Lord Leveson rightly put it, does not work and cannot continue.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121203/debtext/121203-0001.htm#1212039000774
03/12/2012	The Hunt-Black proposals are no longer on the table. I agree with Lord Leveson that they were not sufficiently independent. It is clear that the new body has to be completely independent of the press , and it has to have a board that does not have serving editors on it.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121203/debtext/121203-0001.htm#1212039000774
13/02/2013	Does my right hon. Friend agree that there is considerable public impatience to have a new, strong independent regulator in place as soon as possible? Will she re-emphasise to the industry the need to reach agreement very swiftly, and will she confirm that her approach will both ensure that the new body conforms with all Lord Justice Leveson's recommendations and allow it to start its work without waiting for legislation?	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-02-13/debates/13021368000004/PressRegulation
18/03/2013	I join those who have already congratulated the leadership and members of all three parties on achieving at the eleventh hour an agreement on a way forward. we are now on the point of getting what was needed for at least that six years or, arguably, for far longer—a tough independent regulator of the press with real powers, able to carry out investigations. That is necessary to avoid any repetition of the abuses we have seen.	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-03-18/debates/13031811000002/RoyalCharterOnPressConduct
18/03/2013	We do need a new tough regulator, and the appointments to it will be conducted under the processes now contained in the royal charter. There is a recognition body to be established that will make sure that those appointments are compliant with the requirements of the Leveson report.	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-03-18/debates/13031811000002/RoyalCharterOnPressConduct

31/10/2013	I endorse the view of my colleague on the Select Committee, the hon. Member for Newcastle-under-Lyme (Paul Farrelly), that there is no serious justification for saying that the royal charter marks the end of press freedom.	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-10-31/debates/13103165000019/PressRegulation
Whittingdale after he learns the newspapers have a story on him		
22/10/2015	It has always been made clear that it is a matter for the press as to whether it chooses to seek recognition, or for a regulator as to whether it chooses to seek recognition. I want to consider this matter carefully before reaching a final decision, but I am keenly aware that the priority for most people is that we have in place a strong, tough and independent regulator. Certainly the Independent Press Standards Organisation, which has now been set up, is a considerable improvement on the previous regulatory body, the Press Complaints Commission.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmhansrd/cm151022/debtext/151022-0001.htm

Section 40 of Crime and Courts Act

Date	Whittingdale original position	Link
03/12/2012	It is our job in this House to persuade the victims that what is now in prospect is a different regime that would have the necessary teeth to prevent the kind of abuses they suffered.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121203/debtext/121203-0001.htm#1212039000774
03/12/2012	Lord Hunt himself suggested that there should be some statutory recognition of the body in the context of, for instance, defamation cases, so that it can be taken into account when damages are awarded.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121203/debtext/121203-0001.htm#1212039000774
18/03/2013	The safeguard in the charter—the requirement for a two-thirds majority in both Houses—is welcome because it will send the message that politicians will tamper with the royal charter at their peril. It is, of course, somewhat cosmetic, as any future Government with a majority in Parliament could overturn it and legislate if they chose to do so. It does, however, send the additional, powerful message that this is something in which politicians should not become involved. That issue has always underlain all my misgivings—and, I think, those of my hon. Friends—about the original recommendations in Lord Justice Leveson’s report. I greatly welcome the fact that we have now achieved this agreement. I hope that it will deliver what we all want: a free press, protected from interference or pressure from	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-03-18/debates/13031811000002/RoyalCharterOnPressConduct

	politicians , but at the same time subject to clear rules enforced by a tough and independent regulator. If that is the outcome, the House will have done a good job.	
18/03/2013	Votes for <i>cross-party amendments to the Crime and Courts Bill which include s40 on costs shifting.</i>	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-03-18/division/1303197000632/CrimeAndCourtsBill(Lords)?outputType=Names
Whittingdale after he learns the newspapers have a story on him		
19/10/2015	<p>There is a second matter that needs looking at for the future: the question of when is the right time to introduce the additional incentive identified by the Leveson Inquiry, namely that relating to costs. The costs provisions in the Crime and Courts Act, when brought into force, will have the effect that publishers who are not members of a recognised self-regulator will normally lose the ability to claim back their own costs in libel and privacy cases – whether they lose or win. This will be a serious and significant change for the industry. I know that it is a matter of particular concern to many small publishers who had absolutely no involvement in the abuses the Leveson Inquiry was set up to tackle.</p> <p>I have to say that at the moment, I am not convinced the time is right for the introduction of these costs provisions. Given the changes under way within the industry, the introduction of the new exemplary damages provisions, and the pressures on the industry, I question whether this additional step, now, will be positive and will lead to the changes I want to see.</p>	https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/culture-secretary-keynote-to-society-of-editors

Leveson Pt 2

Date	Whittingdale original position	Link
22/05/2012	I hope that the full facts will continue to emerge, not just through the work of the Committee but through that of Lord Justice Leveson and the police investigation and the possible charges to follow.	https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2012-05-22/debates/12052232000003/Privilege
25/10/2012	My real regret – one of the key things I wanted Lord Justice Leveson to look into – was how it was that the News of the World newsroom appeared to allow this to go on... but also how the police sat around for four years and did nothing.	http://www.theguardian.com/media/greenslade/2012/oct/21/press-freedom-sundaytimes

03/12/2012	I very much hope that we will see the establishment of part 2 of the Leveson inquiry.	http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121203/debtext/121203-0001.htm#1212039000774
12/02/2013	Does my right hon. Friend agree that one of the great unanswered questions in the sorry saga of phone hacking is how although the police had evidence taken from Glenn Mulcaire in 2006 that suggested widespread lawbreaking was taking place, not only was nothing done about it, but it was denied that such evidence existed? That matter was intended to be examined by Lord Justice Leveson in part 2 of his inquiry. Will the Home Secretary confirm that an investigation will still take place to answer those questions?	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2013-02-12/debates/13021255000004/PoliceIntegrity
Whittingdale after he learns the newspapers have a story on him		
04/02/2016	It was always said that we needed to get to the end of all the criminal proceedings. They're not there yet. The end could be in sight, in that the Crown Prosecution Service decided not to investigate some of the cases, but there are still some investigations going on. The question about whether there should be a further inquiry is something we will need to examine , particularly in light of the findings of the courts. There have been some convictions but then there have been a lot of people who have been acquitted and have not therefore been involved.	https://www.politicshome.com/news/uk/social-affairs/politics/news/58930/culture-secretary-john-whittingdale-hints-brexit-backing
03/03/2016	We have always said that any decisions about whether or not Leveson 2 should take place will be taken once all the criminal proceedings have been completed. We are not at that stage; further criminal proceedings are under way. Once those are completed, we will come back to look at this question.	https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-03-03/debates/16030337000028/TopicalQuestions