

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to contribute to your consultation by making two suggestions.

1. Parliament should be reminded by the Press Recognition Panel (PRP) that Leveson foresaw the possibility that the press might try to veto his recommendations and refuse to comply with them. Broadly speaking, this is what the press has done.

I think the PRP has a duty to emphasise forcefully that Parliament should take into account what the Leveson Report recommended under these circumstances. Here is the relevant part of the Report:

"... 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. Meanwhile, 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 faithfully,

*Joseph Marshall*