

Dear Sir/Madam,

In response to your consultation, I would like to make the following points:

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." It is clear that we have arrived at a point where the need for a statutory backstop regulator has been demonstrated, since there is absolutely no evidence that the press intend ever to participate in effective independent regulation. They don't even participate in the current ineffective regulation.

In the meantime, whether or not you intend to recognise IMPRESS, I believe you 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 intended.

Many thanks in advance for your consideration of these points.

Regards,

Eric Norton