

## News story: Hayling Island people smuggler guilty

Vladyslav Kurtoglu, 50, was convicted of assisting unlawful immigration at Portsmouth Crown Court. His co-conspirator, Dmytro Kruik, 29, had earlier pleaded guilty to the same offence.

The men, both Ukrainian nationals of no fixed UK address, were caught when their yacht 'The Tazik' was intercepted by a Border Force Coastal Patrol Vessel (CPV) near Hayling Island on 20 May 2017.

The yacht was sailing towards the UK from Barfleur, France, when the CPV hailed the vessel and escorted it into Sparkes Marina. Kurtoglu was confirmed as the captain with Kruik as his deck hand. Kruik told officers that they had come to the UK on what he said was "just a trip". Border Force officers carried out a search of the vessel which revealed that there were 6 additional Ukrainian men on board.

Kurtoglu and Kruik were arrested by Border Force officers and the case was passed to Immigration Enforcement's Criminal and Financial Investigation (CFI) team. The 6 other Ukrainian men on the yacht were arrested and later removed from the UK.

When officers examined Kruik's phone they discovered a video he had filmed of a reconnaissance route from a harbour side in Barneville-Carteret to a nearby car park. Investigators believe that the car park was where the illegal entrants were dropped off, under the cover of night, before boarding the yacht. In the clip, Kruik can be heard commenting on the fact that there are no security cameras covering the area. The video was dated 21 April 2017, a month before the men were arrested. Officers also discovered paperwork on board the yacht which showed that it had been registered and insured using false details.

Kurtoglu claimed in his defence that after he purchased the yacht, he planned to hold his 50th birthday party on board. He wanted to employ the Ukrainians as crew for the event, so had sailed from Barfleur to the middle of the channel to assess their seafaring abilities. He then claimed that a huge storm had moved in and the yacht had also developed engine problems. Becoming frightened, he said the Ukrainian crew turned on him and threatened to throw him overboard unless he brought them to the UK.

This story was disproved by evidence from a marine engineer who examined the engine of the Tazik yacht and concluded that it was running smoothly. The Met Office provided a marine weather report for the day in question which showed that conditions at the time were calm.

Lyn Sari, from CFI, said:

The video on Kruik's phone is indicative of the planning and

organisation that went into this attempt. I cannot think of a reason why you would record such a film and comment approvingly on the lack of security cameras unless your intentions were criminal.

Kurtoglu's unlikely defence was readily undermined by mechanical and meteorological evidence. The reality was that these men were engaged in a quite deliberate attempt to undermine the UK's immigration laws.

My officers work closely with other law enforcement partners, such as the National Crime Agency who provided valuable assistance with this investigation, to bring people smugglers like Kurtoglu and Kruik to justice. Anyone involved in this kind of offending should understand that the consequences are considerable.

The judge also ordered the forfeiture of the yacht, which will now be sold and the proceeds returned to the public purse.

Border Force works closely with the marine community to gather intelligence about threats to the UK's coastline.

Where people witness suspicious activity near the coastline and require immediate assistance, they should call 999. If an emergency response is not required, the activity should be reported to local police on 101, or anonymously to Crimestoppers on 0800 555 111.

---

## **Press release: Government announces support for Lebanon in fight against terror**

Through a long-standing project, worth £63 million since 2012, the UK is helping the Lebanese Armed Forces to contain internal threats and secure Lebanon's border with Syria.

The UK is helping to build 75 border watchtowers and forward operating bases along the border, and training and equipping thousands of troops.

Today the Government has announced to Parliament that, as part of the project, it has placed a further order for £320,000 worth of communications equipment for the border watchtowers.

Minister for the Middle East Alistair Burt said:

The UK is committed to working with Lebanon and our partners around

the world to tackle head on the global threat from terrorism and violent extremism.

We are steadfast in our support to the brave men and women of the Lebanese army who have successfully repelled Daesh from Lebanese territory.

We firmly believe that Lebanon's security and stability are in the interests of all across the region and beyond, including the UK. I am proud of the impact our contribution is making.

---

## [Press release: Government outlines next steps to make the UK the safest place to be online](#)

- New review launched into online laws
- Code of practice will set new standards for online platforms
- [New guide for teachers](#) to develop children's online safety skills

The Prime Minister has announced plans to review laws and make sure that what is illegal offline is illegal online as the Government marks Safer Internet Day.

The Law Commission will launch a review of current legislation on offensive online communications to ensure that laws are up to date with technology.

As set out in the [Internet Safety Strategy Green Paper](#), the Government is clear that abusive and threatening behaviour online is totally unacceptable. This work will determine whether laws are effective enough in ensuring parity between the treatment of offensive behaviour that happens offline and online.

The Prime Minister has also announced:

- That the Government will introduce a comprehensive new social media code of practice this year, setting out clearly the minimum expectations on social media companies
- The introduction of an annual internet safety transparency report – providing UK data on offensive online content and what action is being taken to remove it.

Other announcements made today by Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Matt Hancock include:

- A new [online safety guide](#) for those working with children, including school leaders and teachers, to prepare young people for digital life

- A commitment from major online platforms including Google, Facebook and Twitter to put in place specific support during election campaigns to ensure abusive content can be dealt with quickly – and that they will provide advice and guidance to Parliamentary candidates on how to remain safe and secure online

DCMS Secretary of State Matt Hancock said:

We want to make the UK the safest place in the world to be online and having listened to the views of parents, communities and industry, we are delivering on the ambitions set out in our Internet Safety Strategy.

Not only are we seeing if the law needs updating to better tackle online harms, we are moving forward with our plans for online platforms to have tailored protections in place – giving the UK public standards of internet safety unparalleled anywhere else in the world.

Law Commissioner Professor David Ormerod QC said:

There are laws in place to stop abuse but we've moved on from the age of green ink and poison pens. The digital world throws up new questions and we need to make sure that the law is robust and flexible enough to answer them.

If we are to be safe both on and off line, the criminal law must offer appropriate protection in both spaces. By studying the law and identifying any problems we can give government the full picture as it works to make the UK the safest place to be online.

The latest announcements follow the publication of the [Government's Internet Safety Strategy Green Paper](#) last year which outlined plans for a social media code of practice. The aim is to prevent abusive behaviour online, introduce more effective reporting mechanisms to tackle bullying or harmful content, and give better guidance for users to identify and report illegal content. The Government will be outlining further steps on the strategy, including more detail on the code of practice and transparency reports, in the spring.

To support this work, people working with children including teachers and school leaders will be given a new guide for online safety, to help educate young people in safe internet use. Developed by the UK Council for Child Internet Safety ([UKCCIS](#)), the toolkit describes the knowledge and skills for staying safe online that children and young people should have at different stages of their lives.

Major online platforms including Google, Facebook and Twitter have also agreed to take forward a recommendation from the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) to provide specific support for Parliamentary candidates so that they can remain safe and secure while on these sites. during election campaigns. These are important steps in safeguarding the free and open elections which are a key part of our democracy.

## **ENDS**

### **Note to editors:**

Included in the Law Commission's scope for their review will be the Malicious Communications Act and the Communications Act. It will consider whether difficult concepts need to be reconsidered in the light of technological change – for example, whether the definition of who a 'sender' is needs to be updated.

The Government will bring forward an Annual Internet Safety Transparency report, as proposed in our Internet Safety Strategy green paper. The reporting will show:

- the amount of harmful content reported to companies
- the volume and proportion of this material that is taken down
- how social media companies are handling and responding to complaints
- how each online platform moderates harmful and abusive behaviour and the policies they have in place to tackle it.

Annual reporting will help to set baselines against which to benchmark companies' progress, and encourage the sharing of best practice between companies.

The new social media code of practice will outline standards and norms expected from online platforms. It will cover:

- The development, enforcement and review of robust community guidelines for the content uploaded by users and their conduct online
- The prevention of abusive behaviour online and the misuse of social media platforms – including action to identify and stop users who are persistently abusing services
- The reporting mechanisms that companies have in place for inappropriate, bullying and harmful content, and ensuring they have clear policies and performance metrics for taking this content down
- The guidance social media companies offer to help users identify illegal content and contact online, and advise them on how to report it to the authorities, to ensure this is as clear as possible
- The policies and practices companies apply around privacy issues.

Education for a Connected World: A framework to equip children and young people for digital life is available on the [UKCCIS page of GOV.UK](#).

- Guidance is given on eight different aspects of online education: self-image and identity, online relationships, online reputation, online

bullying, managing online information, health, wellbeing and lifestyle, privacy and security, and copyright and ownership.

- The Framework has been developed by members of the UKCCIS Education Working Group.
- UKCCIS is a group of more than 200 organisations drawn from across government, industry, law, academia and charity sectors working in partnership to help keep children safe online.
- The UKCCIS Education Working Group brings together ten leading organisations in online safety in education: Barnardo's, CEOP (the child protection command of the National Crime Agency), Childnet, Department for Education, Kent County Council, the NSPCC, Parent Zone, the PSHE Association, South West Grid for Learning and the UK Safer Internet Centre. It focuses on how education settings in the UK are responding to the challenges of keeping their pupils safe online.

Supportive statements:

Jonathan Baggaley, CEO of the PSHE Association said:

We're delighted to have supported the development of the UKCCIS framework. Education plays a critical role in preparing young people for the opportunities and challenges of this rapidly changing digital world. The UKCCIS framework provides an invaluable tool for teachers, supporting them to plan a developmental curriculum which will help children to thrive online.'

Ken Corish, Online Safety Director at South West Grid for Learning said:

Children and young people use technology in empowering and sophisticated ways in online environments that have become increasingly complex. Our approach to educating in this area requires a sophistication to match; it should resonate; be relevant and prompt the outcomes that affect cultural change.

This UKCCIS framework has been designed to identify those opportunities for anyone shaping their teaching in this area from very young children right through to young adults. It brings the current online technology landscape into one document and maps those opportunities against age/developmental stage.

We think it is both challenging and relevant and hope it assists in creating online technology education that makes a difference.

Barnardo's Chief Executive, Javed Khan said:

Barnardo's welcomes this framework for educators to help children and young people of all ages stay safe and have a positive experience online.

The fast-moving digital world puts increasing pressures on children which can affect their self-image and make them vulnerable to potential bullying and grooming online.

This UKCISS framework should be used by the tech industry to incorporate age appropriate safeguards into their apps and platforms to help prevent abuse happening.

---

## [Press release: New review launched of press sustainability in the UK](#)

The UK has always benefited from a strong, well established and diverse press sector. However over the past decade the way in which people consume news has been transformed.

Many UK newspapers have a strong online presence but falling print circulations and changes to advertising trends have caused the press sector to experience declining revenues. Latest figures show that around two thirds of local authority areas don't have a daily local newspaper.

The review will investigate the overall health of the news media, looking at the range of news available and how the press is adapting to the new digital market – including the role and impact of online platforms such as Facebook and Google, and the digital advertising supply chain.

DCMS Secretary of State Matt Hancock said:

Robust high quality journalism is important for public debate and scrutiny – but as print circulations decline and more readers move online, the press faces an uncertain future.

This review will look at the sustainability of the national, regional and local press, how content creators are appropriately rewarded for their online creations, and ensure that the UK has a vibrant, independent and plural free press as one of the cornerstones of our public debate.

A key focus of the review will be the local and regional press, who face an uncertain future. The review will also assess the operation of the digital advertising supply chain including funding flows and its role in creating or reducing value for publishers. It will also look at 'clickbait' and low quality news and if there is more that can be done to tackle this issue and undermine any commercial incentives associated with it.

Also within the review's remit will be an examination of how data created or owned by news publications is collected and distributed by online platforms.

A panel of experts will be appointed in the coming months to lead the review.

As well as identifying challenges, the review will make recommendations on what industry and government action can be taken, with a final report expected in early 2019.

David Dinsmore, News Media Association chairman, said:

The NMA welcomes this announcement today on behalf of the national, regional and local news media industry. This review acknowledges the importance of journalism in a democratic society, the vital role that the press takes in holding the powerful to account and producing verified news which informs the public.

Viable business models must be found that ensure a wide variety of media are able to have a long and healthy future. Through digital platforms, news content is more widely consumed than ever before but the revenues to sustain the investment in that quality content are challenged. This review on a sustainable future is very welcome.

## Notes for Editors

1. Recent estimates suggest that current average annual revenue per digital media user is only c.£15, compared to c.£124 per print media user: ["UK News Media: an engine of original news content and democracy – A study on the economic contribution of the UK news media industry"](#), Deloitte, December 2016
2. An estimated two thirds of Local Authority Districts in the UK now not served by a local daily newspaper: ["Monopolising local news: Is there an emerging local democratic deficit in the UK due to the decline of local newspapers?"](#), Gordon Ramsay and Martin Moore Centre for the Study of Media, Communication and Power, May 2016
3. Panel members are yet to be decided and will be made up of individuals with experience in some of the core sectors under review, bringing a range of voices and expertise to the process.
4. The review will not address politically motivated disinformation and propaganda.

---

## [Speech: PM speech on standards in](#)



## public life: 6 February 2018

One hundred years ago today British democracy was transformed. With the passage of the Representation of the People Act on 6 February 1918, most women aged over 30 and the 40% of men who did not own property gained the right to vote in Parliamentary elections for the first time, and with it, a say in making the laws of the land.

It was a great expansion of democratic participation – tripling the size of the electorate and empowering voices and perspectives which for centuries had been excluded.

Gender equality at the ballot box was not achieved for another ten years, and I am proud to say under a Conservative government.

But with the 1918 Act, the die was cast.

And it is wonderful to be here in Manchester to mark its anniversary. This great city was one of the centres of activism for women's suffrage. It was the birthplace and home of one of the icons of the movement, Emmeline Pankhurst. I heard about the campaign for women's votes from my godmother, whose parents were active in the cause and knew the Pankhursts.

So I am delighted that this year, with funding from the government, a statue of Mrs Pankhurst will be erected in this city as a lasting monument to her courage and vision.

And as Leader of the Conservative Party, and the co-founder of Women2Win, which works to encourage more women to stand for public office, I am proud that Emmeline Pankhurst was one of our pioneers, being selected as the Conservative candidate for the Whitechapel and St Georges constituency in east London in 1928. And the simple fact is that we don't have nearly enough monuments to the great women of our country's past – and I am pleased that we are now starting to set that right.

Today we celebrate a huge and irreversible step towards creating a truly universal democracy, and the beginning of a representative public debate.

But I also want to take this opportunity to reflect on the nature of our public life today.

As we remember the heroic campaigners of the past, who fought to include the voices of all citizens in our public debate we should consider the values and principles that guide our conduct today, and how we can maintain a healthy public debate for the future.

For while there is much to celebrate, I worry that our public debate today is coarsening.

That for some it is becoming harder to disagree, without also demeaning opposing viewpoints in the process. I believe that all of us – individuals,

governments, and media old and new – must accept our responsibility to help sustain a genuinely pluralistic public debate.

### **Freedom of speech in a democracy**

In that task we build on the finest of traditions and the firmest of foundations. Britain's liberal democracy has long been respected around the world for its tolerance and decency. It is defined by values which have a universal appeal. Freedom of thought and expression within laws which are democratically made. The competition of ideas leading to collective progress and improvement. Respect for those with different viewpoints.

These principles have been at the heart of the British tradition of liberty for generations. From John Milton at the height of the English Civil War arguing against censorship and in favour of the 'free and open encounter' of different opinions, to John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century, advocating 'searching for and discovering the truth' by way of free speech and debate, a philosophy of freedom of expression in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance has been one of this country's great intellectual gifts to the world.

In an open market-place of ideas in which different viewpoints can coexist and people are free to make the case for their own beliefs opinions can be changed, arguments won and progress achieved.

### **Votes for Women**

Mill, working in collaboration with his wife Harriet Taylor, was a leading advocate of women's rights. But the cause of women's suffrage had to overcome entrenched opposition, just to be heard. As an early campaigner, Margaret Wynne Nevinson, wrote:

Sometimes, the hostility of the people was so great that the police were alarmed. Occasionally, we were taken to the police station and kept there for safety till far into the night.

Those who fought to establish their right – my right, every woman's right – to vote in elections, to stand for office and to take their full and rightful place in public life did so in the face of fierce opposition.

They persevered in spite of all danger and discouragement because they knew their cause was right.

Eventually, through a free and open encounter with the opposing view, the truth of their arguments won the day. And we are all in their debt.

### **Progress to be proud of**

A century on from the first votes for women, we can look back with pride on the enormous strides which we have taken as a society.

A century ago women were forbidden the franchise, could not sit on a jury or

be admitted into the professions. Today, I am proud to serve as Britain's second female prime minister in a Parliament with more female MPs than ever before.

In 2018, the United Kingdom's most senior judge is a woman. The Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police is a woman. The Director of the National Crime Agency is a woman. Women serve as England's Chief Fire Officer and Chief Medical Officer. The CBI and the TUC are both headed by women. At Holyrood, a female First Minister debates against a female opposition leader. In the National Assembly for Wales, a woman leads the third party. The two largest parties in Northern Ireland are led by women. And at Westminster, where suffragettes chained themselves to statues and hid in a broom cupboard on census night, the Leaders of the House of Commons and the House of Lords are women. Black Rod, whose predecessor ejected suffragettes from the palace precincts, is a woman. A century ago the Home Secretary and Director of Public Prosecutions were grappling with the direct action of suffragettes. Today, both those offices are held by women. And just like the movement for women's votes, many other causes began as marginal and unpopular campaigns. They sent down their first roots into the stony ground of indifference and hostility.

They were championed by courageous people from all parties and none who braved abuse and ridicule, violence and persecution in a tireless quest for justice.

Sixty years ago, being gay was a crime and it was legal to discriminate on the basis of race.

Fifty years ago firms could advertise the same jobs with different salaries for men and women.

Thirty years ago, there was no legal compulsion to provide facilities for disabled people.

Today there are more openly gay people in prominent positions in public life than ever before.

More people from black, Asian, and minority ethnic backgrounds are in Parliament, in the media and business.

And disabled people play a more active role in our society than they ever have.

Real injustices still remain for women, for LGBT people, for black and minority ethnic Britons, for people from poorer families and for people with disabilities.

But if we cast our eyes back to well within living memory, we can see just how far we have come.

These improvements have been achieved through free and open debate leading to progressive, democratic change.

Collectively, they have helped to create an ideal as yet still not fully realised, but closer today than it has ever been of a public sphere where wealth, gender, sexuality, race, and disability present no barrier to full and active participation on a basis of equality.

A society where every voice counts. And when everyone has a say in the laws and policies of our country, everyone benefits. I have seen it in during my years in Parliament. As it has become a more diverse and representative place, it has better reflected the concerns of all sections of society. And in my experience, women often bring a different approach to politics than do men. For women, politics can be as much about listening and learning from others as it is about broadcasting your own views and opinions. And that is all to the good. Because when there isn't just one way of doing things or one perspective on an issue, our understanding is enriched and we can achieve better outcomes.

### **The threat to our public debate**

But today, the ideal of a truly plural and open public sphere where everyone can take part is in danger. A tone of bitterness and aggression has entered into our public debate. In public life, and increasingly in private conversations too, it is becoming harder and harder to conduct any political discussion, on any issue, without it descending into tribalism and rancour.

Participants in local and national public life – from candidates and elected representatives to campaigners, journalists and commentators – have to contend with regular and sustained abuse.

Often this takes the form of overt intimidation. Social media and digital communication – which in themselves can and should be forces for good in our democracy – are being exploited and abused, often anonymously.

British democracy has always been robust and oppositional. But a line is crossed when disagreement mutates into intimidation. When putting across your point of view becomes trying to exclude and intimidate those with whom you disagree.

Women in the nineteenth century had to contend with open hostility and abuse to win their right to vote in the twenty-first century it cannot be acceptable for any woman – or any person – to have to face threats and intimidation simply because she or he has dared to express a political opinion.

Sadly, that has all too often become the case.

A hundred years after bringing all voices – male and female, rich and poor – within our Parliamentary democracy we now face the prospect of our country's public debate becoming oppressively hostile and participation in it a risk which many are unprepared to run.

We can all see this change happening and I know that many share my concern about it.

Just last week, the Leader of Haringey council resigned, citing, 'sexism,

bullying, undemocratic behaviour and outright personal attacks' which had left her 'disappointed and disillusioned.'

It is a depressing coincidence that in the week we are celebrating the first inclusion of women in the democratic process, one of the most senior women in local government has in effect been hounded out of office. In our universities, which should be bastions of free thought and expression, we have seen the efforts of politicians and academics to engage in open debate frustrated by an aggressive and intolerant minority. It is time we asked ourselves seriously whether we really want it to be like this. Whether we are prepared to accept a permanent coarsening and toxifying of our public debate, or whether, together, we will take a stand for decency, tolerance and respect.

Whether we choose to be a society in which we define ourselves by our differences or whether we want to be members of a community of common interest.

Those of us – the vast majority of all political persuasions – who want a healthy and pluralist public debate, where civility and tolerance are the default setting and abuse and intimidation have no place where every voice counts and no one is bullied out of speaking their mind have a responsibility to stand up and help deliver it.

### **Action we will take**

Last year I commissioned the Committee on Standards in Public Life to conduct an investigation into intimidation following last year's general election.

Their report makes sobering reading.

In this centenary year of votes for women its finding that 'candidates who are female, black and minority ethnic or LGBT are disproportionately targeted in terms of scale, intensity and vitriol' is a cause of deep concern. Such abuse risks undermining the diverse democracy which we have built in this country over succeeding generations.

But the committee's report also points the way forward.

It presents a credible plan of action to help build a more civil public debate and I welcome its recommendations. All of us in public life have a responsibility to challenge and report intimidating behaviour wherever it occurs.

We must all seek to uphold the highest standards of conduct.

We must set a tone in public discourse which is neither dehumanising nor derogatory and which recognises the rights of others to participate.

In word and in deed we should never engender hatred or hostility towards individuals because of their personal characteristics.

And we must not allow disagreements about policy or questions of professional

competence to lead to vitriol and hostility.

These responsibilities fall on each of us as individuals, and collectively on the political parties.

My Party has already put in place a new code of conduct for all representatives which puts respect and decency at its core.

And we have proposed that the other political parties follow us in signing a respect pledge for all campaigning, and I hope that they will take us up on that suggestion.

For its part, the government will act on the Committee's recommendations.

We will take action to make our electoral process more robust and offer greater protections for people taking part in elections.

While intimidation is already a crime, we will consult on making it an offence in electoral law to intimidate candidates and campaigners.

And because some candidates and their families have been targeted for abuse in their own homes, we will extend to candidates for local government the same protection which parliamentary candidates have to keep their home addresses secret.

I can also confirm that the National Police Chiefs Council and the College of Policing will implement each of the recommendations in the report which refer to them.

This includes ensuring a clear standard is set for the police when dealing with intimidation and online activity during an election.

And it is online where some of the most troubling behaviour now occurs.

## **Social media**

Social media is one of the defining technologies of our age. For millions of people, particularly young people, it is the means by which they engage with the world, express opinions and communicate with family and friends. In many cases this is clearly a force for good. More voices can find clearer and wider expression. Campaigns can gain publicity and traction.

Through the 'Me Too' movement, victims of sexual harassment and assault have felt empowered to speak out using social media.

But as well as being places for empowering self-expression, online platforms can become places of intimidation and abuse.

This is true for children facing the daily misery of online bullying, where a smartphone allows their persecutors in effect to follow them home and continue to torment them even after school has finished. And it is also true for many adults. This squanders the opportunity new technology affords us to drive up political engagement, and can have the perverse effect of putting

off participation from those who are not prepared to tolerate the levels of abuse which exist. The Committee on Standards in Public Life makes a number of recommendations for action which social media companies can take to address this problem.

It sets them a clear challenge to do much more to 'prevent users of their platforms from being inundated with hostile messages on their platforms, and to support victims of this behaviour.' The social media companies themselves must now step up and set out how they will respond positively to those recommendations. So far, their response has been encouraging, and I hope they will continue in that spirit. For its part, the government will publish our Internet Safety Strategy in the spring. It will set out details of a comprehensive new social media code of practice. It will cover the full range of issues we considered in our green paper – from enforcing community guidelines, to preventing the misuse of services.

It will make it easier for people to report inappropriate, bullying and harmful content when they come across it and ensure that firms have clear policies for taking this content down.

We will also establish a new Annual Internet Safety Transparency Report, to provide UK-level data on what offensive online content is being reported, how social media companies are responding to complaints, and what material is removed.

And to ensure that the criminal law, which was drafted long before the creation of social media platforms, is appropriate to meet the challenges posed by this new technology, the Law Commission will conduct a review of the legislation relating to online offensive communications.

The Committee on Standards in Public Life also called for the government to legislate to shift the liability of illegal content online towards social media companies.

These platforms are clearly no longer just passive hosts of the opinions of others, so we will look at the legal liability that social media companies have for the content shared on their sites.

The issue is far from straightforward, so we will consider carefully what approach we should take.

We are already working closely with international partners and social media companies themselves, to understand how we can make the existing frameworks and definitions work better and assess whether there is a case for developing a new definition for these platforms.

### **Press sustainability**

Changes in technology are also having a profound impact on one of the cornerstones of our public debate – our free press. Good quality journalism provides us with the information and analysis we need to inform our viewpoints and conduct a genuine discussion. It is a huge force for good.

But in recent years, especially in local journalism, we have seen falling circulations, a hollowing-out of local newsrooms and fears for the future sustainability of high-quality journalism. Over 200 local papers have closed since 2005.

Here in Greater Manchester, several local newspapers have closed, including the Salford Advertiser, the Trafford Advertiser and the Wilmslow Express.

This is dangerous for our democracy.

When trusted and credible news sources decline, we can become vulnerable to news which is untrustworthy.

So to address this challenge to our public debate, we will launch a review to examine the sustainability of our national and local press.

It will look at the different business models for high-quality journalism. And because digital advertising is now one of the essential sources of revenue for newspapers, the review will analyse how that supply chain operates. It will consider whether the creators of content are getting their fair share of advertisement revenue. And it will recommend whether industry or government-led solutions can help improve the sustainability of the sector for the future. A free press is one of the foundations on which our democracy is built and it must be preserved.

### **Tolerance and decency**

But the action we need to take to secure our democracy goes far beyond rules and reviews. It goes to the heart of how we conceive of political differences and, more profoundly, how we treat each other. At its best, British public life is characterised by the values which we have traditionally been most proud of as a nation. Fierce rivalry, yes, but also common decency. A rejection of extremism and absolutism. We have seen that spirit most clearly at some of our darkest moments. We saw it during the Second World War, when Conservative and Labour politicians put their rivalries and political differences aside to unite in defence of our common values. And we saw that spirit again recently, when Tessa Jowell made her deeply moving speech in the House of Lords about her own experience of suffering from a brain tumour and what more we can do to help people live well with cancer. She held peers from all parties spellbound, and all responded to a speech of great courage with an acknowledgement of our shared humanity. Because while political differences may separate us, and while those differences may at times be profound, so much more unites us. When we forget that fact, when we harden our hearts against those with whom we disagree when we exaggerate differences, doubt motives, accuse others of bad faith we risk destroying genuine debate and we leave open the path to extremism and intolerance.

We were reminded of that truth so tragically in 2016, when a politically-motivated extremist murdered the MP Jo Cox. Following that outrage, some inspirational words from Jo's maiden speech rightly entered into our common political lexicon. Describing her experiences as a candidate, the new MP for Batley and Spen, said:



While we celebrate our diversity, what surprises me time and time again as I travel around the constituency is that we are far more united and have far more in common than that which divides us.

It is a lesson which we must never forget.

## **Conclusion**

That sentiment chimes much more closely with how the public feel about politics than do shrill and tribal insults. Most people don't view politics through an ideological prism. They want politicians to work together to improve their lives and our country. They expect disagreements and debate about the best way forward. But they also want practical solutions which will improve people's lives. As the famous suffragette battle cry put it – they want 'deeds not words'.

And each day in Downing Street when I pass the framed portraits of my 53 predecessors, 52 of whom were men I focus not on what I can say but on what I can do to make our country a better place.

Negotiating a Brexit deal that respects the vote of the people and delivers a prosperous future for everyone.

Improving our schools, our colleges, and our universities, so every young person in this country, male or female, from every background, has the greatest chance to get on and do well in life.

Tackling the injustices which still hold too many people back.

And as the woman at the head of our country's government, a century after my grandmothers were first given the right to vote, my mission is clear.

To build that better future for all our people, a country that works for everyone, and a democracy in which every voice is heard.