

I understand that the corporate press industry has refused to establish a system of independent self-regulation that meets Leveson's criteria; and that the Government is now also blocking the coming into effect of the main incentive - a law passed by Parliament in 2013 that would guarantee access to justice for victims of libel and press intrusion. It was designed by Leveson to encourage the big newspapers to join a recognised self-regulator.

I also understand that the PRP is consulting the public on what we think about the current situation, and what we think the PRP should tell Parliament. I therefore make these recommendations:

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.

Thank you for your attention.

L Warren