

I Margaret Watson will say as follows:

1. I make this statement further to my statement dated 2 November 2011 and also in my capacity as founder for Justice for Victims. This statement is made in response to the notion advanced by certain Core Participants "that you can always go to law." This is it misleading and does not apply to families of homicide victims.
2. While we fully accept that defamation of the deceased is not in Lord Justice Leveson's terms of reference to take into account the current UK and Scottish defamation legislation, which excluded families of murdered victims from having any legal right of redress or to formally challenge malicious falsehoods published about deceased victims of violent crime. That said, I do have grave concerns at the assertion made by some Core Participants who gave evidence to the Judicial Inquiry, who stated that those grievously affected by misreporting or misrepresentation of the facts of particular case or situation can always take civil defamation action.
3. I feel that misrepresentation of the true position has to be addressed by the inquiry team otherwise the general public will continue to be under the misapprehension that every UK citizen has legal standing under the current UK and Scottish defamation legislation, when they do not.
4. The fact is, no matter how overwhelming the prima-facie evidence is families of homicide victim are denied the right to formally challenge malicious falsehoods disseminated in the mass media about a murdered victim at the hands of campaigning journalist, who abuse their position of great power and influence to campaign for more human rights for those convicted of serious violent crime by misrepresenting the true fact of a murder case to gain public support for their campaign.
5. While I am not asking Lord Justice Leveson's Legal Team to highlight the lack of human rights families of homicide victims are forced to endure under the current defamation legislation, I feel that those who have stated "that you can always go to law if you are not satisfied with an adjudication of the PCC" be reminded that law of defamation does not apply when the victim of defamation is deceased.
6. I have attached as exhibit MW1 a letter from Tessa Jowell, former Minister for Culture, Media and Sport dated 03 July 2006, which may be of interest to the Inquiry. I draw to the attention of the Inquiry page 1 of the attached letter which states, "it is undoubtedly the case that politicians and other public figures have a much better chance of securing media coverage when they disagree with published statements about themselves. But I don't think that should automatically lead to the conclusion that everyone should have an automatic, statutory right of reply when the press publish something about us, with which we disagree. It is the nature of politics that the activities and Reputations of Government Ministers are considered to be off general public interest, especially as, on occasions, such issues can have consequences for the governance of the country." As the mother of an innocent murdered victim, I am outraged by the assertion that politicians right to defend their

good name and reputation must take priority over that of ordinary members of the general public and families of murdered victims.

7. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight how the rich and famous use their power and influence to defend the good name and reputation of a much loved and sorely missed deceased member of their family. "Sir Michael Parkinson Accepts Libel Damages" for defamation of his deceased father.
8. Sir Christopher Meyer's statement 31 January 2012. Sir Christopher highlighted the disparity that exists within the PCC between the ordinary members of the general public and those of a higher status. After the 2003 Scottish Sunday Mail article "Child Victims Turn into Criminals" I naively requested a meeting with the PCC regarding repeated malicious falsehoods which were disseminated in various newspapers about the events leading up to the murder of our dear daughter Diane Watson, my request was reject on the grounds that the PCC does not meet with complainants. Why then did Sir Christopher invite Doctors Kate and Gerry McCann to his home to discuss their justifiable complaints?
9. PCC Pre-notification: Sadly I had good reason to submitted a complaint to the PCC as I was not notified of the publication of Kenneth Roy's Guardian article dated 13 March 2012 which is one of 7 articles condemning Lord Justice Leveson for allowing my husband and I to highlight the injustices we as the parents of a murdered victim have had to endure at the hands of irresponsible sections of the press. I realise by highlighting this complaint my complaint will be dismissed by the PCC, but I feel this issue has to be brought to the attention of Lord Justice Leveson. The Guardian Newspaper has refused to publish an article written by Jackie Kemp the daughter of Arnold Kemp the former editor of the Glasgow Herald Newspaper "My Father, and the Leveson Inquiry" in response to Kenneth Roy's Guardian article. Direct quote from Jack Kemp article dated 21 March 2012, "Those who live by the sword must die by the sword. He (Arnold Kemp) would no doubt admit that mistakes were made in this case and that they were in all probability his mistakes. His protégée Jack McLean was not a trained reporter but an ex-teacher and observer of Glasgow life turned columnist and Arnold was aware of the need for careful handling of his copy."
10. The contents of this statement are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed:

Margaret Watson

Dated 06 July 2012