

CROSS

**The
ENGLISH
SENTENCING
SYSTEM**

Third Edition

Butterworths

THE ENGLISH SENTENCING SYSTEM

By

SIR RUPERT CROSS, D.C.L., F.B.A.

*Solicitor; Vinerian Professor of English
Law in the University of Oxford and
Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford*

AND

ANDREW ASHWORTH, LL.B., B.C.L., Ph.D.

Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford

THIRD EDITION

LONDON
BUTTERWORTHS
1981

ENGLAND: BUTTERWORTH & CO. (PUBLISHERS) LTD.
LONDON: 88 KINGSWAY, WC2B 6AB

AUSTRALIA: BUTTERWORTHS PTY. LTD.
SYDNEY: 271-273 LANE COVE ROAD, NORTH RYDE,
NSW 2113
ALSO AT MELBOURNE, BRISBANE
ADELAIDE AND PERTH

CANADA: BUTTERWORTH & CO. (CANADA) LTD.
TORONTO: 2265 MIDLAND AVENUE, SCARBOROUGH
M1P 4S1

NEW ZEALAND: BUTTERWORTHS OF NEW ZEALAND LTD.
WELLINGTON: 33-35 CUMBERLAND PLACE

SOUTH AFRICA: BUTTERWORTH & CO. (SOUTH AFRICA) (PTY.) LTD.
DURBAN: 152-154 GALE STREET

U.S.A. BUTTERWORTH & CO. (PUBLISHERS) INC.
BOSTON: 10 TOWER OFFICE PARK, WOBURN, MASS. 01801

First Edition June 1971
Second Edition March 1975
Reprinted August 1976
Third Edition July 1981

©
Butterworth & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.
1981

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying and recording, without the written permission of the copyright holder. Such permission must also be obtained before any part of this publication is stored in a retrieval system of any nature. This book is sold subject to the Standard Conditions of Sale of Net Books and may not be re-sold in the U.K. below the net price fixed by Butterworths in our current catalogue.

ISBN — Casebound: 0 406 57014 0
Limp: 0 406 57015 9

*Reproduced from copy supplied
printed and bound in Great Britain
by Billing and Sons Limited
Guildford, London, Oxford, Worcester*

PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION

It is with deep sadness that I find myself writing this Preface alone. By the time of Sir Rupert's death in September 1980, we had completed the revision of Chapter III and part of Chapter I. My hope is that the remainder of the revision succeeds in reflecting the tremendous benefit (and pleasure) which I derived from working beside one of the most accomplished lawyers and textwriters of our time. We had discussed in broad terms the changes which were to be made to these other parts of the book. I have attempted to effect those changes.

The six years since the appearance of the Second Edition have seen a wide range of developments. Although the legislature has not, apart from the Criminal Law Act 1977, been particularly active on sentencing matters, the activities of the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) have more than compensated for this. The tide of appellate decisions on sentencing rises each year, and there have been three noteworthy landmarks in the form of the publication of the second edition of David Thomas's *Principles of Sentencing* in 1979, the introduction of a new series of law reports devoted exclusively to sentencing cases (the Criminal Appeal Reports (Sentencing)), and the judgments of Lord LANE, C.J., in *Upton* and in *Bibi*. The reform bodies have also been active in this sphere: recent reports of the Law Commission and of the Criminal Law Revision Committee have sentencing implications, and two reports of the now defunct Advisory Council on the Penal System, on *The Length of Prison Sentences* and *Sentences of Imprisonment: a Review of Maximum Penalties*, have made significant and provocative contributions to debate about the sentencing system.

Both the structure of the book and its aims remain essentially the same as for previous editions. The main task has been one of bringing the text up to date, and it is hoped that the book reflects the

sentencing system at 1st October 1980. The form of Chapters I, II and IV has been little altered in the process of up-dating; the opening section of Chapter III remains unchanged, but there has been considerable re-writing in the remainder of Chapter III and in Chapter V.

ANDREW ASHWORTH

Worcester College,
Oxford,
March, 1981

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION

This book is based on lectures given in the University of Oxford and primarily designed for candidates for a law degree who had opted, or were thinking of opting, for a paper on criminal law and penology; but it is hoped that the book may appeal to all those concerned with the penal system and indeed to all who are interested in the problems of punishment and sentencing. For this reason I have been deliberately "elementary" at certain points in my account of the law. The book is not a textbook, although the first two chapters contain about as much information concerning the law of sentencing as most students are likely to require; my aim has been to provoke thought and further reading. This accounts for the note on further reading in the appendices. I have deliberately made it brief and it has accordingly been necessary to be highly selective.

I lay no claim to originality of thought or research. So far as the thought is concerned, all that I have done which others have not done in works of a similar nature is to link the theories of punishment with sentencing practice, and to say something of the whys and wherefores of the latter. So far as research is concerned, the only out of the ordinary information on which the book is based is the response of a number of Queen's Bench Judges, Recorders, Chairmen of Sessions and Magistrates to a variety of oral and written questions. I wish to express my deep gratitude for this cooperation so willingly given by such busy men.

RUPERT CROSS

All Souls College
Oxford,
March, 1971.

TABLE OF CASES

Abbott, [1964] 1 Q.B. 489, C.C.A.	79
Ambler, [1976] Crim. L.R. 266, C.A.	43
Ames, [1938] 1 All E.R. 515, C.C.A.	88
Ankers (1975), 61 Cr. App. Rep. 170, C.A.	57
Ashdown (1973), 58 Cr. App. Rep. 399, C.A.	49
Ashworth, [1980] Crim. L.R. 556	159
Aston, [1948] W.N. 252, C.C.A.	192, 193
Atkinson, [1978] 2 All E.R. 460, C.A.	115, 116
Bainbridge (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 36	19
Baker (1971), 55 Cr. App. Rep. 182, C.A.	57
Ball (1951), 35 Cr. App. Rep. 164, C.C.A.	191
Battams (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 15	178
Beacock (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 198	58
Bentham, [1973] 1 Q.B. 357, C.A.	101
Bibi (1980), 71 Cr. App. Rep. 360	135, 174, 177, 178
Bingham, [1973] Q.B. 870, C.A.	196
Black, [1971] Crim. L.R. 109, C.A.	100
Blackburn (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 205	50
Blake, [1962] 2 Q.B. 377, C.C.A.	94, 101
Bosomworth (1973), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 708, C.A.	80
Bottomley (1922), 16 Cr. App. Rep. 184	189
Bowler (1972), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 275, C.A.	24
Bradburn (1973), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 948, C.A.	65
Brandon (1969), 53 Cr. App. Rep. 466, C.A.	89
Brighton, [1963] Crim. L.R. 64, C.C.A.	193
Broad (1978), 68 Cr. App. Rep. 281, C.A.	118
Bruce (1977), 65 Cr. App. Rep. 148, C.A.	137
Buchanan, [1980] Crim. L.R. 317	131
Burton (1941), 28 Cr. App. Rep. 89, C.A.	92
Bushell, [1980] Crim. L.R. 444	118
Byrne (1975), 62 Cr. App. Rep. 159, C.A.	43
Caird (1970), 54 Cr. App. Rep. 499, C.A.	82, 184
Campbell (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 12	188
Campbell, [1980] Crim. L.R. 248	91
Cardwell (1973), 58 Cr. App. Rep. 241	16
Cargill, [1913] 2 K.B. 271, C.C.A.	25, 189
Carmichael (1930), 22 Cr. App. Rep. 142, C.C.A.	152

Carnwell (1978), 68 Cr. App. Rep. 58, C.A.	26
Cash (1969), 53 Cr. App. Rep. 483, C.A.	100
Castro v. R. (1880), 6 App. Cas. 229, H.L.	100
Clarke (1975), 61 Cr. App. Rep. 320, C.A.	135, 191
Coe, [1969] 1 All E.R. 65, C.A.	191
Coleman (1967), 51 Cr. App. Rep. 244, C.A.	189
Coleman (1976), 64 Cr. App. Rep. 124, C.A.	82
Collins (1969), 53 Cr. App. Rep. 385, C.A.	34
Copley (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 55	65
Coplin, [1964] Crim. L.R. 483, C.A.	88
Cox, [1968] 1 All E.R. 386, C.A.	72, 125
Creamer, [1966] 1 Q.B. 72, C.C.A.	157
Crosby (1974), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 234, C.A.	33
Curbishley, [1964] Crim. L.R. 555, C.A.	197
Cuthbertson, [1980] 2 All E.R. 401, H.L.	68, 188
Daher (1969), 53 Cr. App. Rep. 490, C.A.	137, 138
Davies, [1965] Crim. L.R. 56	194
Davies, [1980] Crim. L.R. 598	117, 184
Davies and Gorman (1978), 68 Cr. App. Rep. 319, C.A.	195
Davis, [1979] Crim. L.R. 327, C.A.	117
Depledge, [1979] Crim. L.R. 733, C.A.	91
Director of Public Prosecutions v. Anderson, [1978] 2 All E.R. 512, C.A.	67, 87, 91
Director of Public Prosecutions v. Majewski, [1977] A.C. 443, H.L. ...	159
Director of Public Prosecutions v. Ottewell, [1970] A.C. 642	51, 190
de Haan, [1968] 2 Q.B. 108, C.A.	117
Disbrey, [1967] Crim. L.R. 431, C.A.	134
Doherty (1887), 16 Cox C.C. 306	90
Eaton (1969), 53 Cr. App. Rep. 118, C.A.	100
Elvin, [1976] Crim. L.R. 204, C.A.	142, 188
Evans, [1977] 1 All E.R. 228, C.A.	32
Faulkener (1972), 56 Cr. App. Rep. 594, C.A.	102
Fell, [1963] Crim. L.R. 207, C.C.A.	189
Ferguson, [1970] 2 All E.R. 820, C.A.	64
Flemming, [1973] 2 All E.R. 401, C.A.	48
Ford, [1969] 3 All E.R. 782, n., C.A.	141
Ford (1976), 62 Cr. App. Rep. 303, C.A.	80
Forsythe, [1980] Crim. L.R. 313	26
Fraser, [1967] 3 All E.R. 544, C.A.	161
Fuat (Mustafa), [1973] 3 All E.R. 562, C.A.	80
Gardiner, [1967] 1 All E.R. 895, C.A.	71
Genese (1976), 63 Cr. App. Rep. 152, C.A.	27, 57
Goodlad, [1973] 2 All E.R. 1200, C.A.	59
Gordon, [1970] 2 All E.R. 385	52
Grafton (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 305	65
Gravell, [1978] Crim. L.R. 438, C.A.	91
Gumbs (1926), 19 Cr. App. Rep. 74, C.C.A.	113
Hair and Singh, [1978] Crim. L.R. 698, C.A.	192
Hampton, [1965] Crim. L.R. 564, C.C.A.	131

TABLE OF CASES

xv

Hargreaves, [1964] Crim. L.R. 236, C.C.A.	193
Harper, [1968] 1 Q.B. 108, C.A.	117
Harris (1970), 55 Cr. App. Rep. 290, C.A.	185
Harrison, [1979] Crim. L.R. 262, C.A.	54
Hayes (1974), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 234, C.A.	33
Headley (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 158	50
Heather (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 139	161
Hercules, [1980] Crim. L.R. 596	50
Hodgson (1967), 52 Cr. App. Rep. 113, C.A.	49, 50, 51
Hollyman, [1980] Crim. L.R. 60	118
Huchison, [1972] 1 All E.R. 936, C.A.	91
Hudson (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 130	90
Hume, [1973] Crim. L.R. 320, C.A.	156
Hunt (1958), <i>Times</i> , November 16th	187
Hunt, [1978] Crim. L.R. 697, C.A.	7
Hyam v. Director of Public Prosecutions, [1974] 2 All E.R. 41	147
Inwood (1974), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 70, C.A.	65
Ithell, [1969] 2 All E.R. 449, C.A.	58
Jagger, [1967] 3 All E.R. 545, n., C.A.	12
James (1913), 9 Cr. App. Rep. 142, C.C.A.	194
Jamieson (1975), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 318, C.A.	118
Jones (1971), 56 Cr. App. Rep. 212, C.A.	196
Jones (1976), 62 Cr. App. Rep. 291, C.A.	142
Jones, [1976] Crim. L.R. 203, C.A.	177
Kastercum (1972), 56 Cr. App. Rep. 298, C.A.	102
Kemp (1979), 69 Cr. App. Rep. 330, C.A.	188
Kerr, [1980] Crim. L.R. 389	92
Kilroy (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 179	58
Larkin, [1943] K.B. 174, C.A.	90
Lemon, [1979] 1 All E.R. 898	147
Lester (1975), 63 Cr. App. Rep. 144, C.A.	90, 91
Lewis, [1965] Crim. L.R. 121	23
Lewis, [1975] Crim. L.R. 353, C.A.	64
Llewellyn Jones, [1968] 1 Q.B. 429, C.A.	129, 140
Long, [1980] Crim. L.R. 315	92
Lott-Carter (1978), 67 Cr. App. Rep. 404, C.A.	26
Lowe, [1964] 2 All E.R. 116, C.C.A.	82
Lowe (1977), 66 Cr. App. Rep. 122, C.A.	195
McCann, [1980] Crim. L.R. 734	110, 173
McClelland, [1951] 1 All E.R. 557, C.C.A.	12
McFarlane (1975), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 320, C.A.	73
McGowan, [1975] Crim. L.R. 113, C.A.	13, 24
Maguire (1956), 40 Cr. App. Rep. 92, C.C.A.	99
Mallett, [1972] Crim. L.R. 260, C.A.	158
Markwick (1953), 37 Cr. App. Rep. 125, C.C.A.	24
Marquis, [1974] 2 All E.R. 1216	18
Matheson, [1958] 2 All E.R. 87, C.C.A.	90
Menocal, [1979] 2 All E.R. 510, C.A.	192
Mills (1979), 68 Cr. App. Rep. 154	91

Mohan, [1976] Q.B. 1, C.A.	146
Morris, [1951] 1 K.B. 394, C.C.A.	40
Morris, [1961] 2 Q.B. 237, C.C.A.	164
Motley (1978), 66 Cr. App. Rep. 274, C.A.	137, 138
Mottershead (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 45	50
Mowatt, [1968] 1 Q.B. 421, C.A.	182
Moylan, [1970] 1 Q.B. 143, C.A.	58, 141
Munday (1971), 56 Cr. App. Rep. 220, C.A.	58
Mustafa Fuat (1973). <i>See</i> Fuat (Mustafa).	
Nelson, [1967] 1 All E.R. 385,n., C.A.	201
Newbury (1976), 62 Cr. App. Rep. 291, C.A.	142
Nicholson, [1947] 2 All E.R. 535, C.C.A.	88
Officer, [1976] Crim. L.R. 698, C.A.	73
O'Grady (1978), 66 Cr. App. Rep. 279, C.A.	184
O'Keefe, [1969] 2 Q.B. 29, C.A.	56, 57
O'Neill (1967), 51 Cr. App. Rep. 241, C.A.	158
O'Toole (1971), 55 Cr. App. Rep. 206, C.A.	10
Parry, [1951] 1 K.B. 590, C.C.A.	19
Penniford and Naylor, [1974] Crim. L.R. 130, C.A.	155, 158
Pitson (1972), 56 Cr. App. Rep. 391, C.A.	191
Practice Direction, [1966] 2 All E.R. 929, C.C.A.	95
Pritchard (1973), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 492	131, 196
Reeves (1972), 56 Cr. App. Rep. 366, C.A.	24, 192
Riddle (1970), 114 Sol. Jo. 492, C.A.	134, 201
Roberts, [1977] 3 All E.R. 527, C.A.	176
Robinson (1969), 53 Cr. App. Rep. 314, C.A.	92
Robinson (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 108	50
Roscoe (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 24	188
Salmon (1973), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 953, C.A.	58
Sands (1976), 63 Cr. App. Rep. 297, C.A.	42
Sapiano (1968), 52 Cr. App. Rep. 674, C.A.	57
Sargeant (1974), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 74, C.A.	143, 161
Saunders (1969), 54 Cr. App. Rep. 247, C.A.	58
Savundranayagan, [1968] 3 All E.R. 439	26
Sheen, [1979] Crim. L.R. 189, C.A.	141
Shelton (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 202	158
Shenton (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 81	65
Sholanke (1977), 66 Cr. App. Rep. 127, C.A.	43
Simons, [1977] 3 All E.R. 527, C.A.	176
Smedleys Ltd. v. Breed, [1974] 2 All E.R. 21, H.L.	9
Smith (1967), 51 Cr. App. Rep. 376, C.A.	164
Smith, [1975] Crim. L.R. 468, C.A.	102
Smith (1976), 64 Cr. App. Rep. 116, C.A.	33
Smith and Woolard (1978), 67 Cr. App. Rep. 211, C.A.	94, 143
Soanes, [1948] 1 All E.R. 289, C.C.A.	118
Spencer (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 75	50
Stapleton and Lawrie, [1977] Crim. L.R. 366, C.A.	65
Starie, [1979] Crim. L.R. 731	32
Stone, [1977] 2 All E.R. 341, C.A.	164

TABLE OF CASES

xvii

Storey (1973), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 840, C.A.	138
Street, [1974] Crim. L.R. 264, C.A.	192
Taggart (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 144	92
Tait and Bartley (1979), 24 A.L.R. 473	116
Tarry, [1970] 2 Q.B. 561, C.A.	58
Taylor, [1977] 3 All E.R. 527, C.A.	135, 176, 184
Termine (1977), 64 Cr. App. Rep. 299, C.A.	183
Thomas (1973), 57 Cr. App. Rep. 496, C.A.	173
Thornett (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 1	50
Toland (1973), 58 Cr. App. Rep. 453, C.A.	71
Tolley (1978), 68 Cr. App. Rep. 323, C.A.	135
Tonks, [1980] Crim. L.R. 59	118
Tremayne (1932), 23 Cr. App. Rep. 191	88
Trowbridge, [1975] Crim. L.R. 295, C.A.	56, 60
Tucker, [1974] 2 All E.R. 639, C.A.	18
Turner (1947), 32 Cr. App. Rep. 45, C.C.A.	188
Turner (1967), 51 Cr. App. Rep. 72, C.A.	99
Turner, [1970] 2 Q.B. 321, C.A.	115
Turner (1975), 61 Cr. App. Rep. 67, C.A.	183, 184
Upton (1980), 71 Cr. App. Rep. 102	135, 136, 174, 201
Usher, [1980] Crim. L.R. 601	189
Veen v. R (1979), 23 A.L.R. 281	50
Verrier v. Director of Public Prosecutions, [1967] 2 A.C. 195, H.L.	40,
	113, 151, 156
Vivian, [1979] 1 All E.R. 48, C.A.	66
Wallace (1978), 67 Cr. App. Rep. 291, C.A.	43
Wallis (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 168	66
Wehner, [1977] 3 All E.R. 553, C.A.	13
West (1959), 43 Cr. App. Rep. 109, C.C.A.	34
Whybrew, [1979] Crim. L.R. 599, C.A.	194
Wigley, [1978] Crim. L.R. 635, C.A.	194
Wilde (1978), 67 Cr. App. Rep. 339, C.A.	184
Wilkes (1769), 4 Burr. 2527, H.L.	100
Wilkins (1977), 66 Cr. App. Rep. 49, C.A.	92
Wilkinson (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 69	65
Williams, [1974] Crim. L.R. 558	129, 140
Willis (1974), 60 Cr. App. Rep. 146, C.A.	135
Wilson, [1965] 1 Q.B. 402, C.C.A.	101, 136, 196
Wishart (1979), 1 Cr. App. Rep. (s) 322	91

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Preface to Third Edition</i>	v
<i>Preface to First Edition</i>	vii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiii
 INTRODUCTION	 1
 CHAPTER 1—THE ENGLISH SENTENCING SYSTEM	 5
<i>Section 1—Non-Custodial Measures</i>	6
A. Absolute discharge	7
B. Conditional discharge	10
C. Binding over	13
D. Probation	14
E. Fines	23
F. Community service orders	29
G. Deferment of sentence	33
<i>Section 2—Types of Prison Sentence</i>	34
A. Ordinary fixed term sentences of imprisonment	39
B. Life sentences	43
C. Extended sentences	51
D. Suspended sentences	55
E. Suspended sentence supervision orders	60
F. Partially suspended sentences	61
G. Proliferation of penal measures and trends in the use of imprisonment	62
<i>Section 3—Ancillary Orders</i>	63
A. Restitution	64
B. Compensation	64
C. Criminal bankruptcy	67
D. Miscellaneous	68

<i>Section 4—Mentally Disordered Offenders</i>	69
A. Probation with psychiatric treatment	70
B. Hospital and guardianship orders	70
C. Reform	73
<i>Section 5—Offenders Under Twenty-One</i>	75
A. Children	77
B. Young persons	80
C. Young adult offenders	81
 CHAPTER II—THE SYSTEM IN OPERATION	85
A. The judgment in <i>English</i>	85
B. Taking other offences into consideration	87
C. Information available to the judge	89
D. Limitations on judicial discretion as to length of prison sentences	97
E. The effect of remission and parole	99
F. Consecutive and concurrent sentences	100
G. Observations of the judges	103
H. Sentencing in Magistrates' Courts	107
I. Appeals against sentence	111
J. The prerogative of mercy	114
K. Plea bargaining	115
 CHAPTER III—THEORIES OF PUNISHMENT	120
<i>Section 1—Introduction</i>	120
A. The general object of State punishment	121
B. Punishing the innocent	123
C. Punishment and desert	125
<i>Section 2—The Different Theories of Punishment and the General Aims of Sentencing</i>	127
A. Retributive Theories	128
B. Utilitarian Theories	135
C. The judgment in <i>Sargeant</i>	143
<i>Section 3—Theories of Punishment in Practical Cases</i>	145
A. Intention, knowledge and recklessness	146
B. Negligence	150
C. Attempts and other inchoate crimes	151
D. Causing harm which was not contemplated	157
E. Intoxication	158
F. Provocation	161
G. Mental disorder	162

CHAPTER IV—FIXING THE LENGTH OF A PRISON SENTENCE	166
<i>Section 1—The Ranges of Prison Sentences—“The Tariff System”</i>	167
A. The notion of a tariff	167
B. The normal ranges of sentence	170
C. Determining the sentence	175
D. The question of publication	177
<i>Section 2—Gravity</i>	178
A. Grading of offences	178
B. The circumstances of the offence	184
<i>Section 3—The Avoidance of a Sense of Injustice and the Exercise of Mercy</i>	191
A. Co-defendants	191
B. Occurrences at the trial	192
C. Credit for going straight	193
D. Contrition	193
E. Cooperation with the police	194
F. Mercy	195
<i>Section 4—A Further Illustration and Conclusions</i>	196
A. The Case of <i>Wilson</i>	197
B. Conclusion	199
CHAPTER V—SOME FURTHER QUESTIONS	200
A. Retribution	200
B. Sentencing reform	204
APPENDIX I—STATISTICAL TABLES	220
APPENDIX II—FURTHER READING	235
INDEX	237

INTRODUCTION

The aim of the first two chapters of this book is to give a reasonably comprehensive account of the law and practice of sentencing in England and Wales with the exception of the practice followed by the Courts in fixing the length of a prison sentence. This is considered in Chapter IV after the different theories of punishment which influence it have been examined in Chapter III. In Chapter V we discuss some recent proposals for reform of the sentencing system.

At the beginning of Chapter V we raise the question, "Is the present English sentencing system too retributive?" The answer must of course be largely dependent on the meaning to be attached to the word "retributive"; but the question has a special contemporary relevance on account of the recent return to forms of retributivism, following widespread disillusionment with reformation and rehabilitation as aims of sentencing. Such research as has taken place has produced little evidence that sentences intended as reformatory or rehabilitative are more effective in preventing reconvictions than other kinds of sentence. It is in this sense that some contemporary penologists refer to the decline of the rehabilitative ideal. There has also been a general decline in confidence in the ability of research to provide satisfactory evidence of the effectiveness of sentences, as awareness of the difficulties which beset thorough research has grown. Both sources of penological pessimism result partly from the building of artificially high hopes. For years we have all been too ready to say that the answer to some problem will be provided by research and all that we need to do is to contrive some short-term makeshift. It is essential to realise that there are sentencing problems which will probably never be solved by research, that in the case of others the research will be very long term, and that there are matters with regard to which it is difficult even to see how a satisfactory beginning to research can be made.

These changes in prevailing penal philosophy have led to some changes in the law and practice of sentencing—not great changes,

since the English sentencing system never abandoned retributivism and proportionality as leading principles and bears relatively few marks of the emphasis on rehabilitation and "effectiveness" which characterised penological debate in the 1960s and early 1970s. But some changes have taken place. In the 1960s short prison sentences were anathema to the advanced penologist because they contaminate the offender without reforming him; but now there is scepticism about the reformatory and, as regards the individual offender, the greater deterrent effects, of longer sentences. The late 1970s saw many exhortations to sentencers to pass shorter prison sentences, and in 1980 the Lord Chief Justice added his authority to this movement. In the 1960s it was the unquestioned penological doctrine that, although it might be right for the judge to have the power of determining the maximum period for which an offender should be in custody or otherwise subject to state control, the executive should decide when the offender should be released from custody. This doctrine led to the introduction of parole, and it remained influential with the Advisory Council on the Penal System in 1974 when they recommended changes in the sentencing of young adult offenders (aged 17 to 21). But there is now widespread scepticism about the greater ability of those, such as prison governors, psychiatrists and social workers, to decide upon the optimum moment for release, not to mention reservations about the propriety of leaving such questions to be determined by them. In the 1960s there was optimism about the rehabilitative potential of the probation order; in the 1970s the use of probation declined substantially, and the ethos of "treatment" is now increasingly questioned. The arrival of the community service order may be said to be consistent with the philosophies of both the 1960s and the 1980s, since it contains variable elements of reform and retribution. The interaction of the different and changing views in this paragraph is reflected at various points in this book.

For the benefit of the occasional reader who is neither a lawyer nor a law student a few words may be added about the criminal courts and some of the other matters about which a rudimentary knowledge is assumed in the following pages.

The lower courts are Magistrates' Courts, which try summary offences and offences "triable either way". A summary offence is one which can generally only be tried by a Magistrates' Court; an offence "triable either way" is an indictable offence which may be tried either in a Magistrates' Court or in the Crown Court with a jury. According to the procedure introduced by the Criminal Law Act 1977, where a person appears before a Magistrates' Court charged with an offence triable either way, the Magistrates may

decide that the charge is so serious that it should be tried in the Crown Court; if they do not so decide, then the accused is asked whether he consents to be tried summarily or wishes to be tried by a jury, so that his wishes then determine mode of trial. The powers of Magistrates' Courts are now consolidated in the Magistrates' Courts Act 1980: the sentencing powers of Magistrates are in general limited to six months' imprisonment, but they may commit someone convicted of an indictable offence to the Crown Court if they think that the sentence which they can impose would be inadequate. A glance at Table I, in Appendix I, should suffice to show that the vast majority of crime in this country is tried by the Magistrates. The table is confined to offenders of 21 and over. When it is recalled that a great deal of crime is committed by persons under that age and that practically all offenders under seventeen are tried in Magistrates' Courts, it should not come as a shock for anyone to discover that nearly 98% of the offenders brought to trial each year are tried by Magistrates' Courts. The Crown Court tries indictable offences with a jury. Its judges are High Court judges, Circuit judges and Recorders, of whom the latter are almost all practising barristers or solicitors serving as judges on a part-time basis. The Crown Court, sitting without a jury, hears appeals from the decisions of Magistrates' Courts. It sits at various places on the six circuits into which the country is divided and, since the beginning of 1972, it has taken the place of Assizes and Quarter Sessions. Indictable offences were formerly tried by Quarter Sessions with a jury and appeals from Magistrates' Courts were heard by Quarter Sessions.

Appeals against convictions after trial with a jury in the Crown Court are heard by the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal, since 1966 the successor of the Court of Criminal Appeal which used to hear appeals from convictions at Quarter Sessions and Assizes. Subject to the fulfilment of the necessary conditions, there is an appeal by the prosecution or the defendant from the Court of Appeal to the House of Lords.

Throughout this book the word "judge" should generally be taken to mean High Court judge, Circuit judge, Recorder or Magistrate.

The sources of the law relating to sentencing are, like the sources of the general criminal law, statutes and judicial decisions. The principal statute is the Powers of Criminal Courts Act 1973, although some provisions of the Criminal Justice Acts of 1948, 1967 and 1972 remain in force. In order to understand the law and practice of sentencing it is necessary, in addition to consulting text-books and periodicals, to refer to reports of Royal Commissions, Departmental and Interdepartmental committees, and white