

A REPORT BY **JUSTICE**

*Legal
Penalties*

The Need for Revaluation

CHAIRMAN
SIR DAVID CAIRNS, Q.C.



3s. 6d. net

JUSTICE

British Section of the International Commission of Jurists

JUSTICE was founded in the spring of 1957, following a joint effort of lawyers of the three main political parties to secure fair trials for those accused of treason in Hungary and South Africa. From this co-operation emerged the desire to found a permanent society, and a Council was formed of barristers, solicitors and teachers of law, a fair representation of the three parties being observed and enjoined in a preamble to the constitution.

The primary object of JUSTICE is, "to uphold and strengthen the principle of the Rule of Law in the territories for which the British Parliament is directly or ultimately responsible; in particular to assist in the maintenance of the highest standards of the administration of justice and in the preservation of the fundamental liberties of the individual."

At home, JUSTICE has undertaken studies of matters in which the principles of the Rule of Law may be endangered, and this is the second of a series of reports it is publishing. Among other matters under review by sub-committees are the need for a revaluation of existing legal penalties, the protection of the individual against arbitrary acts of administration, and the right of asylum. The Council has been pressing for compensation to be paid to victims of crimes of violence.

In our overseas territories, JUSTICE is studying the recruitment and status of colonial judges and magistrates, the provisions for training and admission of the legal profession, the availability of legal aid, and the working of native courts. In the course of other travels, members have made investigations in Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Kenya and Tanganyika.

The International Commission of Jurists, to which JUSTICE is affiliated, is a voluntary body of lawyers dedicated to the strengthening of the Rule of Law throughout the world, and JUSTICE co-operates with it when requested to do so. In the past two years, members of JUSTICE have gone as observers to trials in South Africa (twice), Hungary, Portugal and Spain. It sent a strong delegation to a recent World Congress of Jurists in New Delhi, organised by the International Commission, at which the essential safeguards for the protection of the rights of the individual were discussed and agreed by lawyers from fifty-three countries.

JUSTICE invites support for its work not only from lawyers, but from all who are concerned with its objects.

A REPORT BY **JUSTICE**

*Legal
Penalties*

The Need for Revaluation

CHAIRMAN
SIR DAVID CAIRNS, Q.C.

LONDON
STEVENS & SONS LIMITED
1959

*First published in 1959 by
Stevens & Sons Limited
of 119 & 120 Chancery Lane
London — Low Publishers
and printed in Great Britain
by The Eastern Press Ltd.
of London and Reading*

©

Justice

1959

THE COMMITTEE

Chairman

SIR DAVID CAIRNS, Q.C.

H. GRAHAM BARROW

PATRICK FITZGERALD

G. E. GARRETT

DR. ALBERT KIRALFY

BRIAN SIMPSON

J. E. HALL WILLIAMS

Secretary

TOM SARGANT

CONTENTS

SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY	1
DISCUSSION	3
Are some of the maxima too low?	3
Are some of them too high, and if so does it matter?	4
Should an effort be made to remove the many existing anomalies?	5
Should some general rules be laid down as to matters that may be taken into account by way of aggravation or mitigation?	8
Is there a case for having fixed minimum penalties?	10
CONCLUSION	10
NOTE ON CLASSIFIED TABLES	11
MAXIMUM PENALTIES CLASSIFIED IN SOCIAL CATEGORIES	11
MAXIMUM PENALTIES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SEVERITY	14

Legal Penalties: The Need for Revaluation

The Report of a Committee appointed by JUSTICE

SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY

In this report we treat the word "penalty" as meaning any type of punishment authorised by law to be inflicted by a criminal court and we assume that the purpose of our inquiry is to form an opinion as to whether some general review is needed of penalties laid down by statute or available under the common law. What the law provides is, of course, almost always, a *maximum* penalty.

It must always be remembered that English law allows a much wider discretion as to the penalty to be imposed than is common under other systems of law. In practice, especially in the case of offences dealt with on indictment, the punishment awarded by an English court is usually far below the maximum, and full use is made by the courts of the powers to make orders for probation or for conditional or absolute discharge, even in cases where the statutory maximum is a very long term of imprisonment. The breadth of the discretion granted to the courts makes it possible for considerable discrepancies to exist between the ways in which different courts deal with similar offences. On the other hand, it is only by allowing a wide discretion that the court can be enabled to take account of the innumerable factors, affecting the nature and circumstances of the crime and the history and personality of the defendant, which ought to be taken into account in assessing punishment.

We are conscious that when any criticism is made of penalties actually inflicted such criticism is much more often directed against the way in which a court has exercised its discretion in fixing the penalty than against the legal limitations to that discretion. After considerable discussion we decided that any useful investigation of possible injustices involved in sentences which have been passed, or of the apparent discrepancies in sentencing practice between one court and another, would necessitate the collection of a vast amount of material which would be quite beyond the scope of this committee. We understand that two pieces of research are being carried out in the universities on the sentencing policy of the courts, which will cover certain aspects of these matters.

Further, we have not attempted to deal with any question whether new types of penalty should be introduced or whether any of the present methods of punishment should be superseded. We do not regard "revaluation" of penalties as including the examination of such matters as the desirability or otherwise of corporal punishment or the finding of suitable substitutes for ordinary imprisonment. We assume that, broadly speaking, punishment will continue to be by death, deprivation of liberty or fine, and that what are to be revalued are the terms of imprisonment and the fines that are provided for different crimes.

We have not found it easy to isolate the problem of revaluation of penalties from the general question of reform of the criminal law. The first thing that must strike anybody who looks at a list of maximum penalties such as that contained in Archbold's *Criminal Pleading and Practice* is the immense variety of maxima provided for crimes which are not inherently very different from each other.

There may well have been valid historical reasons for such apparent anomalies, though in many cases such reasons are now undiscoverable and in many more they have ceased to have any practical significance. The obvious solution in most cases would be to reduce the number of separate categories of crime rather than merely to bring the maxima into line. Thus, for instance, the normal maximum penalty for malicious damage is two years' imprisonment; but for malicious damage to buoys it is seven years; and for malicious damage to hopbinds it is fourteen. On the face of it, damaging buoys would seem to be a more serious offence than damaging hopbinds, but damaging an aircraft or a piece of delicate machinery would be likely to be more serious still. The truth is, however, that the mere question of what type of article is damaged is only one, and not the most important, of the elements that go to make a particular act of malicious damage grave or trivial. There seems to be no point in having these different maximum penalties, but for that matter there seems to be no point in having this series of different crimes, and the logical course would be to bring all types of malicious damage under one head—or else to provide different categories on some basis more in accordance with contemporary ideas. But at this stage we come to a general problem of reform of the substantive criminal law.

Confining ourselves, then, to the matter of prescribed penalties, these questions seem to arise:

- (1) Are some of the maxima too low?
- (2) Are some of them too high, and if so does it matter?

- (3) Should an effort be made to remove the many existing anomalies?
- (4) Should some general rules be laid down as to matters that may be taken into account by way of aggravation or mitigation?
- (5) Is there a case for having fixed or minimum penalties for some crimes?

We consider these questions in turn.¹

DISCUSSION OF THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED

(1) *Are some of the maxima too low?* A penalty is too low if it forms no real deterrent to the commission of the offence. It is in our view wrong in principle that a penalty should be so limited that a large proportion of the people who are inclined to commit the offence in question will consider it worth while to do so continually and to pay the penalty exacted by the law, regarding it merely as a tiresome expense incidental to their activities. Prostitution and street betting are two obvious examples. If any form of behaviour is constituted a crime it seems clear that the maximum penalty should be sufficient to act as a real deterrent.

(We recognise that there are some offences, *e.g.*, some of those connected with Sunday observance, which are themselves archaisms. While those remain on the Statute-book, we should not suggest increasing the penalties. In such cases it is the substantive law and not the penalty provision which needs revision.)

If the maximum penalty is frequently imposed for some offence the reasonable inference is that the maximum is too low. The maximum should be high enough to be adequate punishment for the worst cases in the category covered. A conspicuous example, until recently, of a penalty that was too low was the maximum fine of £2 for fraudulent travelling on the railways. That maximum must have been imposed in many thousands of cases before it was raised in 1950 to £5. We express no opinion as to whether the new limit is high enough.

We have, indeed, no means of carrying out the elaborate investigation that would be needed to form any definite opinion as to whether any particular maximum penalty is too low; but we are satisfied that there must be many that could be raised with advantage. Possible candidates would include indecent assault on females (2 years); simple drunkenness (10s. to 40s.); and being drunk and disorderly (40s. or one month). We consider that this is a matter that should be looked into by some properly equipped

¹ See also classified tables at pp. 11 *et seq.*, *post.*

body, with a view to preparing legislation raising the maxima in all cases where there is a serious doubt as to the adequacy of the existing penalty.

(2) *Are some of them too high, and if so does it matter?* There must be many crimes for which the maximum punishment has not in fact been imposed for generations. It is inconceivable today that a life sentence should be imposed for "personating an owner of stock" or for destruction of a baptismal register; that fourteen years' imprisonment should be awarded for poaching by three armed persons, or five years for cheating at games. These are oddities and archaisms which are not of great practical importance but two points of much wider significance may be mentioned. The first is that there is normally no definable limit to the amount of a fine that may be imposed on conviction on indictment (see *R. v. Morris*,^{1a} where it was held that the only limit was that provided by Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights, *i.e.*, that the fine must not be "excessive"). The second is that there is no limit to the imprisonment that may be imposed on conviction on indictment for any common law offence, including, in general, any *attempt* to commit a felony or misdemeanour.² While the Court of Criminal Appeal has laid down that an attempt should not be punished with a heavier penalty than the maximum prescribed for the full offence,³ it remains true that, in theory at least, the maximum imprisonment for, say, forgery of documents not otherwise provided for is two years but there is no fixed maximum for an attempt to commit such a forgery. Similar considerations apply to a conspiracy to commit an offence.⁴

Does it matter? Everybody knows that the maximum sentence is hardly ever imposed for any crime except murder and some minor crimes where the penalty happens to be a very low one. Courts of assize and quarter sessions are dealing constantly with housebreakers who are liable to fourteen years' imprisonment but in practice, apart from the defendants put on probation, discharged, fined, or sent to Borstal, corrective training or preventive detention, the sentence will range from, say, nine months to five years according to the previous record and the number and gravity of the offences being dealt with. Does it then make any practical difference to anybody whether the maximum is seven, fourteen or twenty years?

In our opinion the amount of the maximum is of importance for the following reasons:

^{1a} [1951] 1 K.B. 394.

² *R. v. Pearce* (1942) 36 Cr.App.R. 146.

³ Archbold, 34th ed., § 4111.

⁴ See *R. v. Morris*, *supra*.

(a) The provisions of the law have an effect upon both judicial and lay attitudes to crimes, and if the maximum penalty is fixed high the crime tends to be regarded as more serious than if the maximum were low. This point is made with great force in the case of capital punishment by the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment.⁵ It is, we think, inevitable, and indeed right, that a judge or bench of magistrates in considering sentence should pay some regard to the statutory maximum (apart from the obligation not to exceed it). If the legislature considers that two years is a suitable maximum for indecent assault on a female and ten years is the proper maximum for indecent assault on a male, then a judge must and should regard the latter as an offence which demands heavier punishment than the former, circumstances being as nearly as possible equal. Moreover the public, in so far as they are aware of the difference, are likely to be affected by it in the degree of repugnance that they feel for the crime. So far as the potential criminal is concerned, if he knows of the maximum at all and pays any heed to it, a maximum which bears some relation to the punishment he is likely to receive may be more effective than one which is so high that he does not regard it as a serious risk.

(b) The purpose of fixing maxima is to put some limit on judicial discretion and if there is to be such a limit for some crimes there should be a limit for all and it should be chosen rationally. The whole notion of legality, to which JUSTICE is dedicated, involves a distrust of excessively wide discretionary powers and seeks to impose such limitations as are consistent with the public interest.

(3) *Should an effort be made to remove the many existing anomalies?* The removal of anomalies may be said to consist in the raising of maxima which are too low and the lowering of those which are too high, and therefore to be covered by the discussion in the last two sections. The points we wish to emphasise in this section are: (i) that while for any crime considered in isolation all that matters is that the maximum penalty should be sufficient to deal with any case likely to arise and not so great that it cannot conceivably be necessary to impose it, it is desirable that in a rational legal system the *relationship* between the maxima for different crimes should be a logical one; and (ii) that the law should aim at being as simple, intelligible and consistent as possible.

As an example we take Larceny. Larceny of dogs after a previous conviction is punishable by eighteen months' imprisonment; for larceny of deer (after a previous conviction), of fish, of

⁵ 1953, Cmd. 8932, para. 59.

hares or rabbits by night, of ore, or any larceny of up to £5 in value by a tenant or lodger, the maximum is two years' imprisonment: for simple larceny and also for larceny of documents of title, electricity, fixtures, plants or trees it is five years; for larceny of postal packets by an officer of the post office, or for larceny over the value of £5 by a tenant or lodger it is seven years; for larceny by a clerk or servant, larceny from the person or from ships, docks, etc., larceny in a dwelling-house, larceny of cattle or of certain goods in process of manufacture, it is fourteen years; and for larceny of postal packets from mail bags or of wills or for larceny by an officer of the post office of a packet containing a valuable security, it is life imprisonment. (This list is far from including all the varieties of larceny known to the law.)

The maximum penalty for obtaining goods, money or a valuable security by false pretences is five years' imprisonment.

Clearly the theft of a valuable greyhound may be a graver offence than the theft of half a crown in a dwelling-house. He who obtains an enormous sum by a cleverly devised scheme of false pretences may deserve heavier punishment than he who, on the spur of the moment, steals a letter containing a postal order.

We draw attention to the extraordinary jumble of criteria which govern the maximum: sometimes it depends on value; sometimes on the type of goods stolen; sometimes on the status or occupation of the thief; sometimes on the place of theft; sometimes on whether it is a first or subsequent offence. For rabbits and hares, but for nothing else, the maximum depends on whether it is a day or a night offence; the gravity of a lodger's theft depends on the value but for a clerk or servant it does not; and so forth.

In our opinion the criminal law would be greatly improved by a simplification of the provisions as to the punishment for larcenies and by the making of some more realistic assessment of the comparative gravity of larceny and false pretences. For larceny the defect is one of over-elaboration, for false pretences it is rather one of excessive uniformity.

We recognise that different types of larceny may require different maxima. For instance, any circumstances which permit a special opportunity for theft (*e.g.*, in the postal service) may necessitate a high penalty to act as a sufficient deterrent. The same may be so in the case of thefts of a type which of their nature are difficult to detect. Again, it may be right to maintain the broad differentiation between larceny, which involves a direct violation of proprietary rights, and obtaining by false pretences; but we consider that the same considerations which justify the

retention of several categories of larceny would also make appropriate the introduction of several categories of false pretences with different maxima.

One reason why many penalties now seem anomalous is that changes have occurred in the social and moral climate since they were laid down by Parliament. The legal penalties imposed in any society reflect the social and moral values of the period, and the view taken by lawmakers of the potential harmfulness of various crimes to the existing social order. When the social climate changes, the law is changed only after a certain delay during which the law may fall into disrepute and not be enforced. An obvious example from the past is the refusal of many juries to convict for theft during a considerable period before the abolition of the death penalty for this offence.

In the last thirty years, there has probably been a bigger revolution in social values than in any previous hundred years, but our scales of punishment have remained largely unchanged. For example, many existing penalties still reflect the extreme fear with which attacks on the existing order and the sanctity of established institutions were formerly regarded. Thus we find life imprisonment still prescribed for such offences as arson of public buildings, stations and churches; trading with pirates; riot after proclamation; unlawful oaths; malicious damage to river banks, bridges, and railways; destruction of registers; fraudulent cancellation of wills; false entry of stock at the Bank of England (14 years only at the L.C.C.); counterfeiting gold and silver; forgery of wills and deeds; and sacrilege.

Another similar tendency in our system of penalties is for offences against property to command heavier punishment than physical offences against persons, particularly where sexual offences against women and girls are concerned. The long list of property offences (larceny, forgery, arson, etc.), for which sentences of from seven years to life can be imposed, often dating from a time when the defence of property was the main concern of the law, now looks out of keeping with the maximum of two years for a whole range of sexual offences such as procuration by threats, fraud or drugs; detention in a brothel; living on the earnings of prostitution; indecent assault on any woman or girl; and sexual intercourse with a girl of between thirteen and sixteen years of age. A striking example of this anomaly is that the abduction of a woman with intent on her fortune involves a maximum of fourteen years, but the abduction of a girl of fourteen with intent on her virtue only two years. Again, the maximum for cruelty to children is only two years—unless the accused was interested in

money accruing on the death of the child, in which case it is five years.

We are not here concerned to say whether the maxima for offences against property are too high, or those against the bodily and moral welfare of persons are too low; we desire only to call attention to the disparity of concern evinced by the present law.

As we indicated at the beginning of this report, any attempt to remove anomalies such as we have referred to, which run right through our criminal law, might well involve reforms which do not come under the heading of revaluation of penalties, but affect the substantive law, and it is obvious that very full inquiry would be needed before any legislation could be prepared.

We would, however, suggest that in a modern system of law any differentiation as to maximum penalty between one crime and another within the same broad category should be based on the motive and intention with which the act is done and on other circumstances (e.g., whether a breach of trust is involved), rather than on the actual loss or damage inflicted by it.

(4) *Should some general rules be laid down as to matters that may be taken into account by way of aggravation or mitigation?* Aggravating circumstances are dealt with in a very haphazard way by English law. Thus the fact that a crime is committed by night is in general immaterial, though a judge could of course take it into account if he thought fit in fixing a penalty within the maximum. We have, however, already mentioned one example of a case where commission of the offence during the night is regarded as an aggravation requiring a higher maximum penalty. A still more striking example is that of breaking into a dwelling-house with intent to steal therein, which is the crime of housebreaking, punishable by seven years' imprisonment, if done by day, but is elevated into the separate crime of burglary and made punishable with life imprisonment if done by night. The fact that the defendant has been convicted of a similar offence on a previous occasion, or on a number of previous occasions, has normally no bearing on the maximum available sentence, though it is one of the principal matters ordinarily considered in fixing the actual sentence and is the basis for the special sentences of Corrective Training and Preventive Detention. For a comparatively small proportion of crimes, however, a higher maximum is fixed for a second or subsequent offence (mainly in the case of some less serious crimes such as betting and driving offences). There are some quite absurd anomalies, e.g., that for the theft of dogs or deer (but not of fish, hares or cattle) the maximum is higher after a previous conviction.

Mitigating circumstances are hardly ever provided for by law, except in the sense that certain statutes require regard to be paid to the youth of the offender or to the fact that he had not been previously convicted. Murder may be "reduced" to manslaughter by certain mitigating circumstances, *e.g.*, provocation, but in general it is left entirely to the judge's discretion to take into account by way of mitigation anything which seems to him to lessen the gravity of the offence.

It appears to us that certain matters to be taken into account by way of aggravation might with advantage be laid down by law so as to apply to criminal offences generally. Thus, in connection with previous offences, the present haphazard provisions for certain crimes to be more heavily punishable after a previous conviction might be swept away and some general rules laid down for higher maxima for persons previously convicted. One advantage of dealing in this way with this and other matters of aggravation would be to enable the ordinary maximum to be reduced so as to be more closely related to what should represent a fitting punishment for the crime in question. At present most maxima are fixed high simply because provision has to be made for the case which may arise only once in many years where the aggravating circumstances are such as to demand a very heavy punishment. It would, we consider, be more satisfactory that the matters which will justify an unusually severe sentence should be laid down by the law than that they should be left entirely to the discretion of the judge.

Similarly there might be a general provision for a reduced maximum penalty in the case of offenders who had no previous convictions, of any kind or of a similar kind.

We consider that some codification of grounds for aggravation or mitigation, and of the degree to which these should affect the penalty, would be of assistance in co-ordinating the sentencing practice of different courts; though we are far from suggesting that any attempt should be made to lay down such precise regulations that the sentence could be arrived at by mere rule of thumb. Whatever guidance is given to the courts by statute, we consider it essential that they should not be deprived of the power to take account of circumstances for which the legislature has made no provision, and to give such weight to them as they think fit, within reasonable limits. A valuable check on any tendency for a particular court to exercise its discretion in a way that is out of line with current practice is provided by the decisions and observations on sentences made by the Court of Criminal Appeal and the Divisional Court.

(5) *Is there a case for having fixed or minimum penalties for some crimes?* Except for the death penalty and the penalty of life imprisonment for non-capital murder, there are practically no fixed or minimum penalties laid down by English law. Under war-time legislation it was provided that for certain offences a fine should be imposed not less than sufficient to ensure that the defendant made no profit from his offence. But the rule is practically universal that the court can impose any fine from a nominal sum up to the maximum (if any) fixed by statute, or any term of imprisonment (or detention) from one day up to the maximum.⁶ Many Continental systems of law do fix minima as well as maxima, and fixed penalties are not unknown.

We do not feel called upon to express any opinion on the question of whether sentence of death or of life imprisonment should be the automatic sequel to conviction for the gravest crimes. As to penalties generally, we do not consider that the introduction of minimum or fixed penalties would be advantageous. So long as the court has it in its power to make an order for probation or for absolute or conditional discharge (and we see no reason to think that any limitation is likely to be or ought to be imposed on the discretion to make such orders), it would be illogical to compel the court, if it punishes at all, to impose some fixed or minimum penalty. Moreover, the definition of almost every kind of crime is necessarily so worded as to include some acts which are little more than technical offences; and the possible circumstances of mitigation are so many and various that we consider it should always be open to a court to reduce the penalty to any extent it thinks fit.

CONCLUSION

It has not been practicable for this sub-committee to do more than make a brief survey of the subject of revaluation of penalties, but this has been sufficient to satisfy us that there is a strong case for the setting up of an official committee or commission of inquiry into the matter, either as a separate subject for investigation or, perhaps more profitably, as part of a wider examination directed to finding ways of simplifying, strengthening and rationalising the criminal law of this country.

⁶ On certain convictions for driving offences, however, disqualification must be imposed in the absence of special reasons for ordering otherwise; and for driving while disqualified the punishment is imprisonment unless the court, having regard to special circumstances, considers a fine an adequate punishment.

NOTE ON CLASSIFIED TABLES

The tables which follow are intended to give a general picture of the present range of maximum penalties for indictable offences. They have been condensed from fuller tables prepared by the Committee when it undertook this study. They are not designed as comprehensive lists for legal reference.

No attempt has been made to survey the wide range of minor offences punishable summarily in Magistrates' Courts.

MAXIMUM PENALTIES CLASSIFIED IN SOCIAL CATEGORIES

Offences against the State—Security

Treason	Death
Treason felony, inciting to mutiny	Life
Spying	14 years
Illegal training and drilling	7 years
Shooting at naval vessel or aircraft	5 years
Inciting to disaffection, disclosure of information, harbouring spies	2 years

Offences against the State—Public Order

Arson of ships, piracy with violence	Death
Arson of public buildings, stations, mines, churches, stacks	Life
Malicious damage to river and sea banks, bridges, railways, ships, machinery and certain goods	Life
Riot, riot after proclamation, unlawful assembly, endangering safety of railways	Life
Causing explosions	20 years
Attempted arson of public buildings, etc.	14 years
Possessing firearms to endanger life	14 years
Assault on officer saving wreck	7 years
Malicious damage to electric lines, telegraphs, trees in parks (over £1), trees not in parks (over £5)	5 years
Assault on police officer in execution of duty	2 years
Causing disaffection among police	2 years
Signalling to smugglers	1 year

Offences against the State—Coinage and Currency

Counterfeiting gold and silver coins, possessing counterfeiting tools	Life
Impairing gold and silver coins, possessing forged banknotes	14 years
Counterfeiting copper coins, making paper for banknotes	7 years
Possessing 3 or more counterfeit gold or silver coins	5 years
Uttering counterfeit coin twice in 10 days	2 years
Defacing coin, uttering counterfeit coin	1 year

Offences against the State—Financial

Embezzlement by Post Office or Bank of England officials, false entry of Bank of England stock	Life
Forgery of wills, bonds, deeds or banknotes	Life
Larceny and receiving of postal packets	Life
Bribery of public officials	Life
False entry of L.C.C. stock	14 years
Compounding by corruptly taking reward, forgery of official documents	7 years
Personation of Inland Revenue officer, smuggling	2 years
Corruption of members or servants of public bodies	2 years

Offences against the State—General Social Order

Destruction of registers of births, deaths, etc.	Life
Obscene, seditious or blasphemous libel	Life
Sacrilege, blasphemy, gaming, public mischief, inciting to commit crime, conspiracy generally	Life
Offences against Marriage Act, time, place, banns, Holy Orders, etc.	14 years
Contravention of Dangerous Drugs Act	10 years
Bigamy, perjury, personation of bail	7 years
False entries of birth	5 years
Concealment of birth, forgery of passports, perjury in statutory declaration	2 years
Bribery at elections, keeping common gaming house	1 year
Street betting (3rd offence)	6 months (or £50)

Offences against Private Property

Burglary, robbery (aggravated)	Life
Housebreaking and committing felony	14 years
Larceny, by clerk or servant; larceny in house or of cattle	14 years
Damage to cattle, certain goods, and machinery	14 years
Possession of housebreaking implements (2nd offence)	10 years
Housebreaking with intent	7 years
Larceny by tenant or lodger	7 years
Larceny of documents, electricity, plants, trees; and simple larceny	5 years
Larceny of fish, and of hares and rabbits by night	2 years
Larceny of dogs	18 months
Taking motor-vehicle without owner's consent	1 year

Financial Offences against Persons or Firms

Demanding money with menaces	Life
Larceny of wills, conspiracy to defraud	Life
Personation of heir, or of owner of stock	Life
Embezzlement by clerk or servant, forgery of documents	14 years
Falsification of accounts by clerk or servant	7 years
Fraudulent conversion, frauds by directors, sharepushing	7 years
Bankruptcy (non-disclosure of property)	5 years

Financial Offences against Persons or Firms—continued

Cheating at games, false pretences (re securities), demanding money with intent to steal	5 years
Fraudulent mediums	2 years
Bankruptcy: absconding, gambling, etc.	2 years
Corruptly taking money for recovery of stolen dog	18 months
Obtaining credit by false pretences	1 year

Physical Offences against Adult Persons (not Sexual)

Capital or repeated murder	Death
Non-capital murder, manslaughter, attempted murder	Life
Abortion, by use of drugs, poison or instrument	Life
Armed robbery, aggravated assault, attempt to maim, false imprisonment	Life
Abduction of woman for financial gain	14 years
Conspiracy or threat to murder	10 years
Assault occasioning actual bodily harm	5 years
Supplying means for abortion	5 years
Causing bodily harm by wanton or furious driving	2 years
Common assault	1 year

Offences against Children (not Sexual)

Child destruction, infanticide	Life
Abduction of child with intent to steal	7 years
Abandonment and exposure of children under 2	5 years
Cruelty to children with financial interest on death	5 years
Cruelty, generally; abduction of girl under 16	2 years
Allowing child to live in or frequent brothel	6 months (&/or fine)

*Sexual Offences against Children and Young Persons**Under 13*

Sexual intercourse, incest, permitting defilement	Life
Attempt at sexual intercourse	2 years

13-16

Sexual intercourse or attempt, encouraging seduction, permitting defilement, encouraging prostitution	2 years
---	---------

Under 18

Abduction of girl for sexual intercourse	2 years
--	---------

Under 21

Attempt to procure for sexual intercourse	2 years
---	---------

Sexual Offences against Women

Rape	Life
Attempted Rape, Incest	7 years
Attempt to cause prostitution, procuring by threat, woman exercising control of prostitute	2 years
Indecent assault, administering drugs with intent	2 years
Living on immoral earnings	2 years
Attempt to procure defective, attempting intercourse with idiot or imbecile	2 years

Sexual Offences against Males

Buggery	Life
Assault with intent to commit buggery	10 years
Indecent assault on males	10 years
Incest	7 years
Attempted incest	2 years
Gross indecency with male person	2 years

MAXIMUM PENALTIES CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SEVERITY

Under Two Years

Assault, common	Common Law	1 year
Bankruptcy, obtaining credit, etc.	Bankruptcy Act, 1914, s. 156	1 year
Bawdy house, allowing child of 4-16 to frequent or reside in	Children and Young Persons Act, 1933, s. 3	6 months (&/or fine)
Betting (various offences after first conviction)	Betting and Lotteries Act, 1934, ss. 1, 2, 3, 11	1 year (&/or £750)
Brothel keeping (after previous conviction)	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 33, 37	6 months (or £250)
Counterfeiting coin—uttering	Coinage Offences Act, 1936, s. 5	1 year
Dredging for oysters	Larceny Act, 1861, s. 26	3 months
Larceny of dogs	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 5	18 months
Libel, publishing	Libel Act, 1843, s. 5	1 year
Malicious damage to Post Office letter box	Post Office Act, 1953, s. 60	1 year
Motor-vehicles, driving when under influence of drink or drugs	Road Traffic Act, 1930, s. 15	6 months (or fine)
Obtaining credit by false pretences	Debtors Act, 1869, s. 13	1 year
Signalling to smugglers	Customs and Excise Act, 1952, s. 71	1 year (&/or fine)

Two Years

Abduction, of girl under 16, of girl under 18 or of woman de- fective for sexual intercourse	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 20, 19, 21	
Assault on peace officer in execu- tion of his duty	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 38	
Assault with intent to commit felony	do.	
Attempted intercourse with girl under 13 or 13-16	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 4, 5, 37	
Attempts to procure a woman by threats, a defective or girl under 21	do.	s. 37
Cruelty to children	Children and Young Persons Act, 1933, s. 1	

Two Years—continued

Concealment of birth	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 60
Corruption by or of agents	Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906, s. 1
Drugs, administering to female with view to carnal knowledge	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 4, 37
Escape, assisting prisoners to	Prison Act, 1952, s. 39
Forgery of documents (generally)	Forgery Act, 1913, s. 4
Indecent assault on females	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, s. 14
Larceny of deer (after previous conviction), of fish, of hares and rabbits at night	Larceny Act, 1861, ss. 12, 24, 17
Larceny of ore, of up to £5 value by tenant or lodger	Larceny Act, 1916, ss. 11, 16A
Malicious damage (various offences)	Malicious Damage Act, 1861
Moneylenders, false statements by	Moneylenders Act, 1900, s. 4 (and /or fine £500)
Motor-vehicle, reckless or dangerous driving	Road Traffic Act, 1930, s. 11
Official secrets, harbouring spies or wrongful communication	Official Secrets Act, 1911, ss. 7, 2
Police, causing disaffection	Police Act, 1919, s. 3
Prostitution, living on earnings of	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 30, 37
Threatening to publish with intent to extort or induce favour	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 31
Sexual intercourse with girl 13-16	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 6, 37

Five Years

Abandonment or exposure of child under 2	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 27
Abortion, supplying poison or instruments for procuring	do. s. 59
Assault, actual bodily harm or with intent to rob	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 23 (3)
Cheating at games	Gaming Act, 1845, s. 17
Cruelty to children (where money interest on death)	Children and Young Persons Act, 1933, s. 1 (5)
Drugs or poison, administering with intent to injure	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 24
False pretences, obtaining chattels or money, etc.	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 32
Housebreaking implements, possession of by night	do. s. 28
Larceny of electricity, fixtures, plants, trees, documents of title; simple larceny	Larceny Act, 1916, ss. 10, 8, 7, 2
Malicious damage to works of art over £20 if committed by night	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, s. 51
Marriage, issue of illegal certificates	Marriage Act, 1949, s. 75 (3)

Five Years—continued

Menaces, demanding money with intent to steal	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 30
Smuggling, interfering with Revenue vessels or aircraft	Customs and Excise Act, 1952, s. 72 (2)
Spring guns, setting with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 31

Seven Years

Abduction of child under 14 with intent to steal	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 56
Assault on gamekeeper by poacher	Night Poaching Act, 1828, s. 2
Bigamy	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 57
Corruption when H.M. Government is concerned	Prevention of Corruption Act, 1916, s. 1
Falsification of accounts by clerks or servants	Falsification of Accounts Act, 1875, s. 1.
Frauds by directors, etc.	Larceny Act, 1861, ss. 82, 83, 84
Fraudulent conversion generally	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 20
Housebreaking with intent	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 27
Illegal training and drilling	Unlawful Drilling Act, 1819
Incest by males and by females over 16	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 10, 11, 37
Larceny by tenant or lodger (over £5), by postal officer of postal packet	Larceny Act, 1916, ss. 16 (a), 18 (b); Post Office Act, 1953, s. 57
Malicious damage to buoys, fish ponds, mines	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, ss. 48, 32, 29
Perjury as to births, deaths, marriages and judicial proceedings	Perjury Act, 1911, ss. 4, 3, 1
Receiving (where stealing is a misdemeanour)	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 33 (1)
Unlawful oaths, generally	Unlawful Oaths Act, 1797, s. 1

Ten Years

Assault with intent to commit buggery	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 62
Conspiracy to murder	do. s. 4
Indecent assault on males	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, s. 15
Poison, administering so as to endanger life, etc.	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 23
Threats to burn houses	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, s. 50
Threats to murder	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 16

Fourteen Years

Abduction of woman for her property	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, s. 17
Abduction of heiress	do. s. 18
Arson of buildings and crops	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, ss. 6, 16

Fourteen Years—continued

Explosives, making or possessing in suspicious circumstances	Explosive Substances Act, 1883, s. 4
Forgery of valuable securities, registers, seals and dies	Forgery Act, 1913, ss. 2 (2), 3 (2), 5
Housebreaking and committing felony	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 26
Larceny by clerk or servant, and from the person	Larceny Act, 1916, ss. 17, 14
Larceny from ships and docks, in dwelling-houses, of cattle, of goods in process of manufacture	do. ss. 15, 13, 3, 9
Malicious damage to cattle and hobbinds	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, ss. 40, 19
Official secrets, spying	Official Secrets Act, 1911, s. 1
Poaching by three or more armed persons	Night Poaching Act, 1828, s. 9
Receiving any property (if stealing a felony)	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 33 (1)
Robbery	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 23 (2)
Marriage, offences <i>re</i> time, banns, place and Holy Orders	Marriage Act, 1949, s. 75

Twenty Years

Conspiracy to cause explosions, etc.	Explosive Substances Act, 1883, s. 3
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Life

Abortion, using poison, instrument or drugs to procure	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 58
Arson of churches, mines, public buildings, stacks	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, ss. 1, 26, 5, 17
Attempts to commit crime generally	Common law (and/or fine)
Blasphemy	Common law (and/or fine)
Breaking prison	do.
Bribery of public officials	do.
Buggery	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 12, 37
Burglary	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 25
Carnal knowledge of girl under 13	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 5, 37
Cheating generally	Common law (and/or fine)
Child destruction	Infant Life, Preservation Act, 1929
Coinage, gilding, counterfeiting gold and silver	Coinage Offences Act, 1936, ss. 2, 1
Compounding offences	Common law (and/or fine)
Conspiracy generally	do.
Corrosive throwing	Offences against the Person Act, 1861, s. 29
Destruction of registers of births, baptisms	Forgery Act, 1861, ss. 36, 37

Life—continued

Embezzlement by officer of Post Office	Post Office Act, 1953, s. 57
False imprisonment	Common law (and/or fine)
False entries of stock in books of Bank of England	Forgery Act, 1861, s. 5
Forgery of wills and deeds and banknotes	Forgery Act, 1913, s. 2 (1)
Fraudulent cancellation of wills	Larceny Act, 1861, s. 29
Inciting to commit crime	Common law (and/or fine)
Indecent prints, selling	do.
Infanticide	Infanticide Act, 1938
Larceny of wills	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 6
Larceny by postal officer (valuable security), or of packet from mailbag	Post Office Act, 1953, ss. 57, 52
Libel, obscene, blasphemous or seditious	Common law (and/or fine)
Malicious damage to bridges, river banks, and railways	Malicious Damage Act, 1861, ss. 33, 30, 35
Manslaughter	Common law (and/or fine)
Menaces, demanding money with intent to extort or injure	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 29
Non-capital murder	Homicide Act, 1957, s. 9
Nuisance	Common law (and/or fine)
Personation of heir	False Personation Act, 1874, s. 1
Personation of owner of Indian Stock	Indian Stock Certificate Act, 1863, s. 14
Pirates, trading with	Piracy Act, 1721, s. 1
Rape	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 1, 37
Riot after proclamation	Riot Act, 1714, s. 1
Robbery, armed or aggravated or with violence	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 23 (1) (a)
Sacrilege	(b)
Sexual intercourse with girl under 13	Larceny Act, 1916, s. 24
Suicide, attempted	Sexual Offences Act, 1956, ss. 5, 37
Unlawful oaths, to commit treason or murder	Common law (and/or fine)
Unlawful assembly	Unlawful Oaths Act, 1812, s. 1
	Common law (and/or fine)

Death

Arson of ships	Dockyards Protection Act, 1772, ss. 1, 42
Capital or repeated murder	Homicide Act, 1957, ss. 5, 6
Piracy with violence	Piracy Act, 1837, s. 2
Treason	Treason Act, 1351, and Forfeiture Act, 1870, s. 1

JUSTICE

British Section of the International Commission of Jurists

CHAIRMAN

The Right Hon. Lord Shawcross, P.C., Q.C.

VICE-CHAIRMAN

John Foster, Q.C., M.P.

HON. TREASURER

F. Elwyn Jones, Q.C., M.P.

COUNCIL

John L. Arnold, Q.C.	Prof. A. L. Goodhart, K.B.E., Q.C.
Peter Benenson	Prof. Charles J. Hamson
Michael Bryceson	Sir Edwin Herbert, K.B.E.
Sir David Scott Cairns, Q.C.	Prof. F. H. Lawson
Sir William Charles Crocker	A. P. Marshall, Q.C.
George Dobry	Norman S. Marsh
Charles Fletcher-Cooke, Q.C., M.P.	Rt. Hon. The Lord Nathan, P.C., T.D.
Gerald Gardiner, Q.C.	Prof. H. Street
John W. Gauntlett	Jeremy Thorpe
Peter E. Webster	

Minimum
Annual
Subscription

Individual Membership:

any person who is a barrister or bar student, a solicitor or
articled clerk, a teacher of law, or who has held or holds
any judicial position in the United Kingdom or Colonies . £1 0s. 0d.

Corporate Membership:

any firm, partnership or other association consisting ex-
clusively of persons thus eligible £2 0s. 0d.

Associate Individual Membership:

any person not eligible under the above description who
subscribes to the objects of the Society 10s. 0d.

Associate Corporate Membership:

any body, partnership or other association which fully sub-
scribes to the objects of the Society £5 5s. 0d.

Applications for membership and all communications to the Society should
be sent to: Tom Sargent, Secretary, JUSTICE, 1 Mitre Court Buildings,
Temple, E.C.4. Telephone: CENTral 9428.