

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

I wish to offer two suggestions in response to your consultation of the public's views of the current situation regarding developments subsequent to Lord Levinson's report and its recommendations concerning the press regulatory system.

Given that the corporate press industry is clearly refusing to establish a system of independent self-regulation meeting Leveson's criteria, as also the government's blocking of a relevant law passed by Parliament in 2013, I would wish to see the following occur:

- 1 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."*
- 2 In the meantime, regardless of whether IMPRESS is recognised by the PRP, 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.

Yours,

Peter Tomlinson

