

Dear Sir/Madam,

I understand that the Press Recognition Panel (PRP) – set up to assess whether self-regulators meet Leveson's criteria – will have to report to Parliament on the state of the press regulatory system and are consulting with the public before doing so. I would like to make the following points:

1. Self-regulation has been tried over many years in different forms and has always failed the public and served the newspapers. It is self-evident that an industry cannot self-regulate, others are not allowed to, why should newspapers?
2. Following the phone hacking scandal which exposed criminal activity by some journalists the Leveson inquiry was set up and considered the matter of press regulation very thoroughly. 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.**"
3. 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,

Frank Turner