

Dear Sir,

I have the experienced personally the impact of press intrusion following a family tragedy. I also experienced the failings of the then PCC which agreed that the press behaviour breached its code, but did next to nothing about it. This means a great deal to me and I seek to protect others from the possibility of similar behaviour. I want to live in a civilised society and I, like Lord Leveson, conclude that the press must not be allowed to opt out of the full regulation that he recommends. I don't suspect; I know that an unregulated media will behave in an uncivilised way.

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, 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 sincerely

David Wilkinson