

I understand that the PRP will soon have to report to Parliament on the state of the press regulatory system

I am contacting you as an 'ordinary member of the public' (I am a recently retired Macmillan Clinical Lead Nurse) because I am concerned about regulation of the press in Great Britain. For sometime I have been concerned that the relationship between the owners of our media and establishment/senior figures, in all walks of life, may hinder what 'ordinary citizens' are able to learn from media. What we now know about reporting at the time of and subsequent to the Hillsborough Disaster has increased my concern. I have previously contacted my MP Jeff Smith regarding my concerns. Specifically I request that:-

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.

Your Sincerely

Mrs Joanne (Jo) O'Neill