

Standing Committee for Youth Justice and Prison Reform Trust Joint Briefing on the Offensive Weapons Bill

House of Lords, Report Stage,
26 February 2019

Introduction

- The Offensive Weapons Bill started in the House of Commons, completing its progression there in November 2018. The Bill had its second reading in the House of Lords on 7 January 2019, and its committee stage began on 28 January 2019 and finished on 12 February. Its first day of report is on 26 February.
- The Bill creates a number of new laws around the sale, possession and intended use of knives, firearms, and corrosive substances.
- Amendments introduced by the government in committee and retabled at report create a new knife crime prevention order.
- We all want to prevent violent behaviour, but believe many of the proposed measures will be ineffective:
 - They increase the use of ineffective short mandatory minimum custodial sentences
 - They create legal uncertainty and may lead to disproportionate sentences
 - They are likely to increase BAME disproportionality and further damage trust in the justice system.
 - We are extremely concerned about the government's proposals for a knife crime prevention order, which can be imposed on the balance of probability and are highly likely to be net-widening, labelling, disproportionately impact BAME communities, and impose more criminal sanctions on vulnerable children and young people.
- **We urge Peers to support the following amendments: 5, 6, 7, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34.**
- **We urge Peers to oppose the following amendments: 35-52 (Knife Crime Prevention Orders).**

Key amendments and new clauses

Amendment 5, 6 and 7

- These amendments would remove the short-term prison sentences from the offence in Clause 1.

Key points:

- **We urge Peers to support Amendments 5, 6 and 7**
- Clause 1 creates a new offence of sale and delivery of corrosive products to under 18s with a maximum sentence of 51 weeks in custody (or six months under current enacted legislation).
- We agree that the use of corrosive products should be tightly regulated and that this could include the creation of new offences relating to their sale and delivery, including appropriate grounds for defence.
- We question, however, whether a short prison sentence of 51 weeks is an appropriate sanction, particularly when a large fine or regulatory penalty, such as a restriction on the ability of a retailer to trade in specific products, is likely to be an effective deterrent for any large or small trader.
- The Justice Secretary David Gauke has recently expressed a desire to limit the use of short prison sentences and increase the use of community orders. In a speech to the Reform thinktank in February 2019, he said: “In the last five years, just over a quarter of a million custodial sentences have been given to offenders for six months or less; over 300,000 sentences were for 12 months or less. But nearly two-thirds of those offenders go on to commit a further crime within a year of being released. Why would we spend taxpayers’ money doing what we know doesn’t work, and indeed, makes us less safe?”ⁱ
- David Gauke’s comments were made in response to evidence published by the Ministry of Justice which showed that for people with matched offending backgrounds community orders were more effective than a short prison sentence at reducing reoffending.ⁱⁱ
- In view of this, it seems illogical to have one government department legislating for a sanction which another has deemed counterproductive. Therefore, we would like to see custody removed as an option for punishment for the offences specified in clauses 1 and 3 and replaced with an upper limit of a high-level community order.

Amendment 20, 21 and 22

- These amendments would remove the short-term prison sentences from the offence in Clause 3.

Key points:

- **We urge Peers to support Amendments 20, 21 and 22**
- Clause 3 creates a new offence of, for the purposes of supplying corrosive products to the buyer, delivering the product, or arranging for its delivery, to residential premises. The offence is punishable with up to 51

weeks in custody (or six months under current enacted provisions) and / or a fine.

- Our reasons for supporting these amendments are the same as for amendments 5, 6 and 7.

Amendments 28, 29, 30 and 31

- These amendments would remove the short-term prison sentences from the offence in Clause 6.

Key points:

- **We urge Peers to support Amendments 28, 29, 30 and 31**
- Clause 6 creates a new offence of possessing a corrosive substance in a public place. The offence is punishable with a sentence of up to four years in prison.
- We understand the serious, justifiable concern around recent acid attacks. However, the clause creates a very loose and ill-defined offence, that fails to satisfy requirements of legal certainty and will lead to unjust prosecutions and custodial sentences.
- Custody should be reserved for the most severe offences, where it is the last resort and required for public protection. This is especially true in the case of children.
- There is no evidence that the threat of custody acts as a deterrent:
 - For harsher punishments to deter people from committing crime, they must be aware of the punishment, then make a rational choice, acting in their own best interest, whether or not to offend. Deterrence theory does not hold true for most people in trouble with the law, and especially so for children and young people: not only is awareness of sentencing amongst children and young adults very low,ⁱⁱⁱ there are many children and young adults in trouble with the law who we would not expect to make rational choices.^{iv} This is particularly true when they are carrying weapons believing it is for self-protection, especially if they perceive other forms of protection like the police as unavailable to them. Here, carrying a weapon seems like the rational choice.
 - Evidence consistently supports this. A recent evidence review (Nagin 2013) concluded that “lengthy prison sentences and mandatory minimum sentencing cannot be justified on grounds of deterrence.”^v Evidence shows the certainty of getting caught, rather than the severity of the sentence, can have a deterrent effect.
 - Since the introduction of mandatory minimum custodial sentencing for weapon possession offences in 2015, numbers of children and young adults convicted of possession or threatening offences involving knives or offensive weapons have risen (see below).
- There is very little evidence to support the argument that locking up those carrying out crimes will reduce the level of crime on the streets (aka the public protection argument). Home Office research found that a large increase in the use of custody would be required to see a very small decrease in crime.^{vi} This is particularly true for children in trouble with the law who tend to be a more transient group.

- Custody is not rehabilitative, and is harmful to children and adults. It goes against the principal aim of the youth justice system, according to UK law, to prevent offending by children.
 - Reoffending rates for those leaving custody are very high and consistently higher than for those on community sentences, even when one factors in the more serious and persistent offending of those sentenced to custody. Evidence indicates that custody is in itself criminogenic.^{vii}
 - There is a growing body of evidence that diverting children away from the formal youth justice system is more effective at reducing offending than any punitive responses.^{viii}
 - The damage that custody does is clear: the poor state of custodial conditions; lack of education provision and trauma-informed care; impact of overcrowding; the disruption that a custodial sentence causes through lost accommodation, interrupted education, emotional distress and loss through separation from friends and family.

Amendments 32 and 34

- These amendments would remove mandatory custodial sentences for people convicted under the new offence in Clause 6 who have had at least one previous relevant conviction.

Key points:

- **We encourage Peers to support Amendments 32 and 34.**
- Clauses 8 and 9 create mandatory minimum custodial sentences for children (16 and 17 year olds) and adults convicted under clause 6 with a previous relevant conviction.
- In the case of a person who is aged 18 or over when convicted, clause 8 mandates a sentence of imprisonment for a term of at least 6 months;
- In the case of a person who is aged 16 or 17 when convicted, clause 8 mandates a detention and training order of at least 4 months.
- Clause 9 provides details of the convictions that amount to a "relevant conviction" for the purposes of Clause 8
- Mandatory sentences remove judicial discretion and the ability of courts to ensure that the penalty best fits the circumstance of the offence.
- Sentencing Council guidelines acknowledge the need to look closely at children's particular circumstances when sentencing, considering the background, circumstances and vulnerability of the child, and developmental age as well as chronological age.^{ix} There is an emphasis on avoiding unnecessary criminalisation and promoting reintegration. By removing judicial discretion, the proposals work against the Sentencing Council's guidance.
- In relation to the current bill, the government has claimed that there are sufficient safeguards in place in existing legislation to ensure that mandatory custodial sentences for possession offences are not used disproportionately. While we were pleased that following intensive lobbying, a "get out" clause (that "the court must have regard to its duty under section 44 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1933" – to have regard for the welfare of the child) was

added to the provisions on mandatory custodial sentences in the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015, we believe this to be far from sufficient. What is more, this only applies to children, with no such provision for young adults.

- We are firmly of the position, in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, that custody must only be used as a last resort. We do not believe that available data signifies that custody is currently used as such, and this is especially true for mandatory minimum custodial sentences. Before depriving a child of their liberty, placing them in custodial establishments that are deemed largely unsafe at high costs to the taxpayer, there must be clear evidence that everything else has been tried and has not built sufficient desistance. We would argue that this is clearly not the case, for example, for the 28 children in custody for weapon possession offences who are First Time Entrants.^x
- Nor is it the case, we would argue, for the vast majority of the children in the following data we have obtained through FOI requests:
 - Between April 2015 and March 2018 there were 396 occasions in which a child aged 16-17 was given a mandatory minimum custodial sentence under the provisions of Section 28, Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015 (possession). This figure includes 328 individual offenders.
 - Between April 2015 and March 2018 there were 89 occasions where a child aged 16-17 was given a mandatory minimum custodial sentence for the offence of threatening with an offensive weapon or article with a blade or point. This figure includes 86 individual offenders.
 - On 28th September 2018 there were at least 90 children in custody whose most serious offence was possession of a weapon (The number is most likely higher but where there are less than five children, specific numbers are not provided due to data protection/privacy concerns). This is over a tenth of the children in custody at that time - so clearly is not an insignificant issue.
- Overall, quarterly knife offence statistics show mandatory minimum custodial sentences are used for children just under half of the time for children prosecuted for 'more than one relevant' possession offences. Custody in the vast majority of these cases is simply not a last resort, and these numbers are proof that having a "get out" clause is not enough to safeguard children from unnecessary imprisonment.
- Magistrates and judges are often risk-averse, and the quality of advocacy in youth courts is variable. Having a mandatory sentence in law sets a precedent or norm that sentencers are likely to stick to if they do not see/are not presented with good reason not to. Extending these sentences to corrosive substance possession will therefore expand the numbers of children on such sentences, which we know to be ineffective and extremely damaging to children.

Knife Crime Prevention Orders

Amendments 35 to 51

- **These amendments** would make provision for knife crime prevention orders and interim knife crime prevention orders imposing requirements and prohibitions on defendants and subjecting them to certain notification requirements.

Key points:

- **We urge Peers to oppose Amendments 35 to 51**
- We are extremely concerned that these proposed orders are civil orders which will be imposed on children as young as 12 on the basis of probability rather than a criminal standard of proof. This is despite the severe, lengthy and potentially unlimited restrictions which could be imposed as part of an order, and the punitive criminal sanctions for breach of up to 2 years in custody.
- As such, these “knife crime ASBOs” are highly likely to be net-widening, labelling, disproportionately impact BAME communities, and impose more criminal sanctions on vulnerable children and young people.
- We note that these amendments have been introduced unaltered from Committee Stage despite the serious concerns raised about the proposed new orders by Parliamentarians, human rights bodies and professional and voluntary sector organisations working with children and young people in the criminal justice system. In addition, we note that the government has altered the position of the amendments in the bill so that they will be debated on the first day of report. It seems that the government is determined to limit opportunities for debate and scrutiny of the proposed orders. This is the opposite of the open, consultative and evidence-led approach which it ought to be taking to tackling such a serious and complex problem as preventing knife crime.
- As we highlight below, the government’s new amendment tabled at report to pilot the proposed orders prior to national roll out is not a sufficient safeguard against the severe and negative consequences of the proposed orders. Under the piloting amendment, Parliament could do nothing to alter the legislation or prevent the roll out of the orders even if the results of the pilot were negative.
- A wide coalition of professional bodies and voluntary sector organisations working for and on behalf children and young people in the criminal justice system have expressed strong reservations about the proposed orders, including the Magistrates’ Association,^{xi} the Association of Youth Offending Team Managers,^{xii} the Local Government Association,^{xiii} the Probation Institute,^{xiv} and the Children’s Society.^{xv}
- The new orders have not been subject to any kind of meaningful public consultation. Key stakeholders, including the Youth Justice Board, the Children’s Commissioner, the prison service, local government and children’s services do not appear to have been given any kind of input on the development of the proposals.
- Strong objections have also been made to the proposed orders on human rights grounds, including by the respected charities Liberty^{xvi} and Justice. The Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights has written to the Home Secretary expressing concern “that the proposed amendments may criminalise children who have no previous criminal convictions, not for carrying a knife (which is already against the law), but for breaching requirements which could be imposed in ways which prevent them conducting a normal life.”^{xvii}
- Similarly, Sarah Jones MP, the chair of the all-party parliamentary group (APPG) on knife crime, has expressed strong reservations about the proposed orders, describing them as “flawed” and “completely

disproportionate”. She said: “It risks criminalising a generation of young people who have grown up unsupported and who often turn to carrying weapons out of fear.”^{xviii}

- The new orders could place the providers of interventions for children and young people, including children’s and youth services and voluntary sector organisations, in the invidious position of having to police and monitor children and young people for compliance with the new orders. This will seriously undermine the trust which is crucial to effective engagement with children and young people involved in knife carrying.
- There is no evidence that orders like these are effective at tackling harmful behaviour, or will address the root causes of knife carrying. The Ministry of Justice has acknowledged this lack of evidence on effectiveness of such orders, with Justice Secretary David Gauke originally opposing the proposals on these grounds. He stated that he did not want to see large numbers of young people sent to custody for breaches of civil orders, and any new measures must be “preventative, proportionate, and affordable”.^{xix}
- Knife carrying is not the cause of serious violence, it is a symptom of wider social issues. Interventions should be evidence-based and take this context into account. New offences and sanctions are unlikely to be effective in tackling the root causes of behaviour, nor act as a deterrent.
- Children and young people carry weapons for numerous and complex reasons, often including the perception it is necessary for self-protection.^{xx} Where a child is carrying a weapon because of fear for their own safety, and especially if they perceive other forms of protection such as the police to be unavailable to them, punitive orders and the threat of custody will not discourage them from carrying a knife.
- More children and young people will end up with criminal records, further marginalising them and preventing them from accessing legitimate mainstream employment opportunities.
- It is not clear why these new orders are needed. There are already a number of different disposals available to the police and the courts to tackle knife possession, including cautions and conditional cautions, gang injunctions, criminal behaviour orders and court sentences. Neither magistrates nor youth courts have called for additional powers, and youth courts in particular have a number of different options available to them to respond to knife crime.
- Many youth offending teams (YOTs) already have programmes to address knife carrying, and the Youth Justice Board is currently considering how to develop and share best practice. YOTs report interventions through outreach with children to be more engaging and effective than when enforced. It would be better to invest in and support YOTs to use these interventions, which will educate and support the children.
- We are very concerned that these orders would further exacerbate racial disparity in the criminal justice system. BAME people in the criminal justice system are subjected to conscious and unconscious biases, which means they may be disproportionately impacted by the introduction of more subjective tests, such as orders imposed on the basis of likelihood of someone carrying a weapon. The introduction of these orders is likely to damage already strained relations between BAME communities and the police, and damage trust in the justice system. Despite these concerns, the

government has not published any equality impact assessment of the proposals.

- There is no detail on how the proposed orders are going to be resourced or how much they will cost. The Local Government Association has raised concerns about the ability of local authorities to resource the new orders. The Police Federation of England and Wales has questioned the capacity of the police to enforce the orders given the impact of cuts to police budgets and resources. Its chair John Apter said: “How the home secretary thinks we have the officers available to monitor teenagers’ social media use or check they are at home at 10pm when we are struggling to answer 999 calls is beyond me.”^{xxi} The cost of the likely increase in custody numbers due to order breaches is also not factored in.

Our concerns in relation to the specific provisions of the proposed orders are as follows:

- Twelve is far too young for the imposition of such an order. It is also inconsistent with the other provisions in the bill, which start at 16.
- There is no mention of the importance of safeguarding child welfare. In each case, the court should require the equivalent of a pre-sentence report and all children should be assessed to check that they have not been subject to grooming/exploitation before an order could be imposed. The current requirement that a person seeking to impose an order on an individual who is under 18 must consult with the local youth offending team is not a sufficient safeguard to ensure that the full circumstances and welfare needs of the child are taken into account.
- There is no detail given on the evidence base required for the imposition of an order, given it can be imposed on a balance of probabilities. This is particularly concerning given the lengthy “relevant period” of two years over which evidence can be considered. This is likely to lead to orders being imposed on a subjective and unspecified basis.
- Requirements are not specified but left carte blanche on face of the bill. This leaves individuals subject to a potentially unlimited and unspecified number of unreasonable and disproportionate requirements over a lengthy duration of up to two years. Examples of requirements are included in the accompanying ECHR Memorandum. To ensure proper transparency and oversight, these should be specified in the legislation.
- Responsibility for who monitors compliance is not specified, and can be assigned to “an individual or an organisation”. This could include children and youth services and voluntary sector organisations delivering interventions for children and young people involved in knife carrying. This could severely undermine the trust which is crucial to effective engagement with children and young people.
- Sentence of imprisonment for breach is not appropriate for children. However, there is no distinction made between the penalty for breach by a child or adult. We are firmly of the position, in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, that custody must only be used as a last resort. Before depriving a child of their liberty, placing them in custodial establishments that are deemed largely unsafe at high costs to the taxpayer, there must be clear evidence that all other available options have been tried and have not built sufficient desistance.

- More generally, we do not believe a criminal sanction of up to two years in prison is a proportionate sanction for breach of a civil order. Custody is not rehabilitative and is harmful to children and adults. The damage that custody does is clear: the poor state of custodial conditions; lack of education provision and trauma-informed care; impact of overcrowding; the disruption that a custodial sentence causes through lost accommodation, interrupted education, emotional distress and loss through separation from friends and family.
- The guidance which will be issued to accompany the new order will be advisory and not statutory. This risks Parliament's proper function in the oversight and scrutiny of the orders, meaning there will be little accountability for how the orders operate in practice.

Amendment 52 (and Amendments 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60)

- Amendment 52 makes provision to pilot knife crime provision orders and to lay a report of the pilot before Parliament before the orders can be rolled out nationally.

Key points:

- **We urge Peers to oppose Amendment 52 to pilot knife crime prevention orders.**
- The government's last-minute decision to pilot the proposed orders prior to national roll out is not a sufficient safeguard against the severe negative and disproportionate impact of the proposals.
- As we highlight above, we have detailed concerns about many individual provisions of the statute itself, not just with the principle or idea of the proposed orders. However, if this amendment is passed, Parliament could do nothing to alter the legislation or prevent the roll out of the orders even if the results of the pilot were negative.
- The amendment simply requires the government to produce a report on the pilot and lay it before Parliament. There is no provision for Parliament to review or alter the legislation or to influence the decision on the roll out of the proposed orders on the basis of the pilot and the report. **We note that Amendment 57 requires more detailed reporting on the outcome of the pilot.**
- **We further note that Amendment 55 would create an additional condition "that both Houses of Parliament have passed the motion "That this House notes the findings of the report on the pilot of Knife Crime Prevention Orders and approves their continued use.""**
- **While we welcome the additional safeguard intended by Amendment 55, we do not believe Parliament should authorise a pilot which is ill-defined; whose provisions have not been subject to wider consultation; and are not rooted in the evidence of what works to prevent knife crime.**
- In addition, the proposed pilot is ill-defined and could take place in any number of unspecified areas and for any number of unspecified purposes. **We note that Amendments 53, 54, 56, 58, 59 and 60 are designed to probe**

what purposes may be specified by the government's piloting amendment.

- Amendment 52 puts the cart before the horse, and merely serves to highlight the failure of the government to follow an evidence-based approach in the development of the proposals. There ought to have been proper consideration of the evidence and a thorough process of consultation on the proposed orders prior to introducing them as statute.
- The government conducted a public consultation on the development of domestic abuse protection orders and is allowing Parliament to consider them as part of a draft domestic abuse bill. It is unclear why it has not adopted a similar approach to the development of KCPOs.

Amendment 63

- This amendment would require that, before knife crime prevention orders can come into force, the government must publish a report and consultation on the new orders and lay a report before Parliament. It would also require the government to produce a yearly report on the performance of the new orders.

Key points:

- **We urge Peers not to see support for this amendment as a reason to abstain on or support the government's proposals for knife crime prevention orders.**
- Amendment 63 would only be workable if Amendments 35-52 to introduce knife crime prevention orders are passed. We are strongly opposed to the introduction of the proposed new orders.
- Before the proposed orders could come into force, Amendment 63 would
 - require the government to produce a report on KCPOs and lay it before Parliament
 - require the government to consult with key organisations and the wider public on KCPOs and lay a report before Parliament
- In addition, it would require the government to produce a yearly report on the performance of KCPOs according to a number of key indicators.
- While we welcome greater scrutiny, this amendment is not a sufficient safeguard against the severe negative and disproportionate impact of the proposed orders.
- There is no provision for Parliament to review or alter the legislation on the back of the findings of the proposed report or consultation.
- The reporting requirements in the proposed yearly report would enhance scrutiny but do not provide Parliament with any authority over the exercise or continuance of the orders.
- Like the government's amendment on piloting, this amendment risks putting the cart before the horse, and merely serves to highlight the failure of the government to follow an evidence-based and consultative approach in the development of the proposals.
- There ought to have been proper consideration of the evidence and a thorough process of consultation on the proposed orders, allowing for

comprehensive and informed parliamentary scrutiny, prior to introducing them as statute.

CONTACT DETAILS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

pippa.goodfellow@scyj.org.uk or mark.day@prisonreformtrust.org.uk

ⁱ <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/feb/18/prison-simply-is-not-working-justice-secretary-david-gauke-calls-for-end-to-short-jail-terms>

ⁱⁱ Ministry of Justice (2018) Analytical Summary 2018: Do offender characteristics affect the impact of short custodial sentences and court orders on reoffending?, London: Ministry of Justice. Available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/706597/do-offender-characteristics-affect-the-impact-of-short-custodial-sentences.pdf

ⁱⁱⁱ See for example Redthread oral evidence to the Home Affairs select committee serious violence inquiry available here: <http://bit.ly/2NZBc9H>. See also Bevan, M. (2016) Investigating young people's awareness and understanding of the criminal justice system: An exploratory study Howard League for Penal Reform <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Investigating-young-people%E2%80%99s-awareness-and-understanding-of-the-criminal-justice-system.pdf>

^{iv} Many children involved in the justice system have mental health and learning difficulties (Carlile 2014), or problems with drug and alcohol abuse. Children have "limited capacity to determine the consequences of their decisions, and are "both more suggestible ('the tendency to change one's mind as a result of pressure or suggestion from others') and compliant ('the tendency to go along with others' propositions or instructions without internal agreement')" (Farmer E, Gudjonsson G H, cited in Centre for Social Justice, 2012). The National Institute of Mental Health has found changes in adolescent brains that alter behaviour, with studies (Blakemore & Choudhury 2006) suggesting that adolescent frontal lobes experience excess production of grey matter. As the frontal lobe is associated with rational thinking, this change impacts on decision making, organisation, self-control, emotional and impulse regulation, and risk-taking behaviours.

^v Nagin, D (2013) Deterrence in the Twenty-first Century: A Review of the Evidence Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon University <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c788/48cc41cdc319033079c69c7cf1d3e80498b4.pdf>

^{vi} Home Office (2001) Making punishments work: report of a review of the sentencing framework for England and Wales Appendix 6, Impact of sentencing on crime, Home Office https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/Making_Punishments_Work.html?id=XD_qMgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y

^{vii} MoJ (2018) Criminal Justice System Statistics Quarterly: June 2018 Ministry of Justice; and MoJ (2018) Do offender characteristics affect the impact of short custodial sentences and court orders on reoffending? Ministry of Justice https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/706597/d_o-offender-characteristics-affect-the-impact-of-short-custodial-sentences.pdf

^{viii} See for example Wilson, D., Brennan, I., and Olaghere, A. (2018) Police-initiated diversion for youth to prevent further delinquent behaviour Campbell Collaboration <https://campbellcollaboration.org/library/police-initiateddiversion-to-prevent-future-delinquent-behaviour.html>

^{ix} Sentencing Council (2017) Overarching Principles and Offence Specific Guidelines for Sexual Offences and Robbery https://www.sentencingcouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Sentencing-Children-and-young-people-Definitive-Guide_FINAL_WEB.pdf

^x Criminal Justice Statistics Quarterly March 2018

^{xi} https://www.magistrates-association.org/system/files/05%20MA%20statement%20on%20Knife%20Crime%20Prevention%20Orders_HL%20Committee%20Stage%20of%20Offe...pdf

^{xii} <http://aym.org.uk/news/>

^{xiii}

<https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/06022019%20Offensive%20Weapons%20Bill%20HL.pdf>

^{xiv} <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/edition/comment/times-letters-importance-of-beauty-in-new-developments-zr90smw7r>

-
- xv <https://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/knife-crime-prevention-orders-parliamentary-briefing.pdf>
- xvi <https://www.libertyhumanrights.org.uk/news/blog/knife-crime-prevention-orders-would-only-harm-fight-against-violent-crime>
- xvii <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/joint-committees/human-rights/correspondence/2017-19/Home-Office-Minister-Offensive-Weapons-Bill.pdf>
- xviii <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/jan/31/sajid-javid-introduces-knife-prevention-orders>
- xix <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/sajid-javid-plan-for-knife-asbos-is-blocked-by-justice-chief-david-gauke-l6fj86dt6>
- xx Palasinski, M., and Riggs, D. (2012) Young White British Men and Knife-Carrying in Public: Discourses of Masculinity, Protection and Vulnerability Damien Riggs
<http://www.damienriggs.com/blog/wpcontent/uploads/2013/09/Young-white-British-men.pdf>
- xxi <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/knife-crime-prevention-orders-children-violence-home-secretary-sajid-javid-new-law-a8755031.html>