

Hello

I am writing concerning your public consultation on the present situation with press regulation and your forthcoming report to Parliament.

It is very disappointing that the press have chosen to disregard the huge level of public and parliamentary support for Leveson and have chosen not to co-operate with the Leveson Report. In my view Parliament should be reminded by the PRP what the Leveson Report said should happen if the industry tried to veto his recommendations and refused to comply.

The Leveson Report says: "***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.***"

In the meantime, regardless of whether IMPRESS is recognised by the PRP, I consider that the PRP should 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 had intended.

With best wishes

John Tasker