

Submission to the Leveson Inquiry

1. I, Peter Bradley, confirm that I have provided to the Inquiry the following documents which I have submitted in a personal capacity:
 - A. *Right of Reply & Press Standards Bill* (of 2005); and
 - B. *Press Standards & Citizens' Rights* (text of a contemporaneous article for *The Guardian* on the provisions of the Bill).
2. I promoted in February 2005 the *Right of Reply & Press Standards Private Members Bill* (which was supported by the Campaign for Press & Broadcasting Freedom, MediaWise and the NUJ); the article I wrote at the time for *The Guardian* provides a succinct account of what I was trying to achieve and why.
3. In brief, the Bill proposed to:
 - require publications to respond within three days to complaints and, where agreement with the complainant is reached, publish at the first opportunity a prominent correction in its news or editorial pages and if applicable on its website as well as amending its archive material
 - establish an independent Press Standards Adjudicator who would arbitrate between a publication and a complainant when they fail to reach agreement; the Adjudicator would have powers, through the High Court, to require a publication to carry a correction
 - set up an independent Press Standards Board to which either party can appeal the Adjudicator's decision: the Board's decisions would also be enforceable through the courts
 - require the Press Standards Board to maintain a database of all corrections which journalists would be expected to consult
 - require the Board to report periodically on its activities and allow it to undertake or commission research on trends in journalism
 - give the Board powers to require compliance from publications responsible for a disproportionate number of upheld complaints
 - require the Board to develop, in consultation with the press, codes of practice designed to raise and maintain press standards.
4. The Bill's focus was narrower than that of the Leveson Inquiry though, while it sought primarily to deal with inaccuracy, it did also propose broader provisions on standards which may be of interest. In brief, its intention was to create a regulatory climate in which journalists policed themselves and standards were driven up.

Statement of Truth

I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed ..

Date 15 February 2012