

Good Evening

My understanding is that the press 'industry' is currently avoiding the issue of independent regulation.

The Leveson Report says (I've paragraphed for emphasis):

*"if some or all of the industry are not willing to participate in effective independent regulation, my own concluded view is to reject the notion that they should escape regulation altogether.*

*I cannot, and will not, recommend another last chance saloon for the press. With some measure of regret, therefore, I am driven to conclude that the Government should be ready to consider the need for a statutory backstop regulator being established, to ensure, at the least, that the press are subject to regulation that would require the fullest compliance with the criminal and civil law, if not also to ensure consequences equivalent to those that would flow from an independent self-regulatory system."*

Why please, should the press escape the 'equivalent consequences' of any INDEPENDENT oversight. This to me indicates that the press and its supporters feel that media – which demonstrably alter public opinion – can act on a simple purchaser-to-reader basis.

I acknowledge that person-to-corporate obligations, devoid of independent oversight, are supported by more extreme groups in the United States, lobbying relaxations and the disproportionate weight of big corporate-versus-individual - but that should not be a model for this country.

That faulty argument of "corporate-know-best" also neatly sums up the previous ineffective system, which perhaps resulted in the Inquiry in the first place. Please ask, what precisely did the Levenson Inquiry seek to CHANGE ?

Time to reject the latest dilution of independent regulation, which would serve the public well.

Thank you

Regards

Chris Jones

