

Dear Panel,

re the failure of the Government and all of the press to fully meet and comply with the recommendations of the Leveson Report:

(i) I would ask you to consider reminding Parliament what the Leveson Report said should happen if the industry tried to bypass or veto his recommendations and refused to fully comply. The Report clearly states: *"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."*

(ii) You may conclude that either a recognised regulator exists (if you decide to recognise IMPRESS) but that most significant publishers remain outside the recognised system, or that no recognised regulator exists (if you do not recognise IMPRESS), and that all significant publishers remain outside it. Either way, it is surely an inescapable conclusion that the big newspaper publishers have rejected this system.

(iii) In the meantime, regardless of whether IMPRESS is recognised by the PRP, I urge the PRP to strongly recommend to Parliament that the key 'guaranteed access to justice incentive' (section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act) should be brought into effect as Parliament clearly had intended.

Yours Sincerely,

Alan Legge