

Press release: UK aid protecting women from trafficking in Burma – and helping them into jobs

On her first visit to Burma, International Development Secretary Penny Mordaunt called for the most vulnerable to be given a say in their country's future after shifting the work of UK aid there to help disadvantaged and conflict-affected people.

Her words come after the ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya in Rakhine State and violations in Kachin and Shan States, all in Burma.

In Yangon, Ms Mordaunt met women who are being protected from modern day slavery, trafficking, gender inequality and poor sexual and reproductive health, at the Eden Project and Aung Myin Hmu, both supported by UK aid through the Department for International Development (DFID).

Women training at the Aung Myin Hmu project learn how to make garments safely in a factory setting, so they can go on to work for registered, safe and fair employers and support their families.

The garment sector in Burma is expected to grow from 400,000 to 1.5 million workers over the next five to 10 years, and these women migrants from Rakhine and Kachin will be protected from trafficking through better jobs and improved livelihoods.

Across the country, UK aid is providing life-saving humanitarian assistance in conflicted affected areas, and helping provide the healthcare, education and livelihood opportunities needed to build a more democratic, safe, and prosperous country.

UK aid is also providing life-sustaining humanitarian assistance to many of the Rohingya in Rakhine State, as well as to almost one million Rohingya refugees in neighbouring Bangladesh.

This visit follows the terrible violence in Rakhine in August 2017 when the British public donated incredibly generously towards the Rohingya crisis through the Disasters Emergency Committee (DEC) Appeal, raising £28 million, including £5 million matched pound-for-pound by the UK government.

International Development Secretary Penny Mordaunt said:

I believe the British people want human rights to be at the heart of the work we do and for UK aid to be delivered in the smartest way possible.

In Yangon I've seen UK aid doing just that by tackling organised crime, protecting vulnerable girls from trafficking, training women

to have jobs and livelihoods and giving British businesses confidence in the standards of their supply chains here.

The British public showed tremendous compassion for the Rohingya and it's clear to me that protecting those who are still here and supporting them to live side-by-side and in peace in their communities is what we should be focusing on here in Burma.

Around 600,000 Rohingya remain in Rakhine State. However, many Rohingya have been killed and over 700,000 have fled over the border into Bangladesh.

During her visit, Ms Mordaunt met Rohingya leaders and heard about the terrible conditions many Rohingya are now facing. Even those not caught up in the violence live in difficult conditions.

UK aid has been supporting the Rohingya in Rakhine state since 2012:

- More than 100,000 people have been given food or cash assistance including 24,000 children under the age of 5
- More than 100,000 people now have access to safe water
- UK aid has helped expand and refurbish Sittwe General Hospital
- 8,000 people across Rakhine State now receive sanitation services

Almost 16 million people live in extreme poverty in Burma and one in every three children in Burma is malnourished.

Children who receive the right nutrition in their first 1,000 days complete more grades at school, earn up to 21% more as adults and are 10 times less likely to die of childhood diseases.

Poor nutrition is linked to 45% of child deaths and losses of up to 11% of GDP. DFID Burma is improving the nutrition of the poorest people. This is one of best development interventions that can be made – with every US\$1 giving a return of US\$16 from health and education outcomes.

Notes to editors

UK aid supports all communities in Rakhine State and the UK has led the way in terms of both the speed and scale of its humanitarian response. It is one of the largest donors to the Rohingya refugee crisis, providing £129 million in funding in Bangladesh, since the crisis began.

The Department for International Development does not provide financial aid to the Burmese government.

[News story: New research on the long-term health of 2 groups of older veterans](#)

Very little is known about this topic despite the continued use of chemical agents (e.g in Syria, and Salisbury UK) so the findings will be relevant to all those who have been, or are at risk of, coming into contact with chemical agents, including military personnel, emergency services, and the general population.

The new research is an update to an original study conducted by the University of Oxford. In the original study, researchers used historical records to compare patterns of cancer development and mortality between 2 groups of approximately 18,000 male veterans. The first group were the 'Porton Down veterans' those who were exposed to small doses of chemical agents as part of the 'human volunteer programme' at Porton Down between 1941 and 1989 and the second group were veterans in service during the same period, but who did not go to Porton Down. This, earlier, study found little evidence of a link between those exposed to chemical agents (including mustard gas, nerve agents, and protective chemicals e.g. antidotes) and cancer or death up until 2004.

The main objective of this new research is to update cancer and mortality data by an additional 15 years. This extra data will allow researchers to gain a greater understanding of the relationship between chemical agent exposure and long term health at a level of detail not possible in the original study.

To learn more about the study, and your right to object to your records being used for health research, please see <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/kcmhr/research/kcmhr/porton-down/porton-down.aspx>, email: PDveterans-study@kcl.ac.uk, or call +44 (0) 20 7848 0505.

Members of this cohort study may object to their records being used.

[Speech: Beyond prison, redefining punishment: David Gauke speech](#)

Since the early 1990s, we've seen the prison population almost double, from about 45,000 in 1993 to just over 83,000 in 2008. Since then, it has been broadly stable and currently stands at a little below 83,000.

This is the highest rate of imprisonment almost anywhere in western Europe.

For every 100,000 people...

... in the Netherlands 61 are behind bars

... in Denmark 63

...in Germany it's 76

...in Italy it's 99

and

...in France it's 104.

In England and Wales our incarceration rate is 139 people per 100,000.

Why do we have such high rates of imprisonment – both by international standards and our own historic standards?

Part of this is about our society and government rightly recognising and responding to the rise in certain types of crime.

More offenders are being jailed for violent crime for example. And last year, over a third of people sentenced for crimes involving knives or other weapons were given immediate custodial sentences. That's up from 23% in 2009.

And the length of sentences is increasing – sentences for sexual offences for example have gone up from 43 months in 2007 to just under 61 months in 2018.

It's also about changing expectations about the kinds of crimes for which we expect perpetrators to be more severely punished.

Look at sexual offences where we've seen more victims feel able to come forward, more people brought to justice, and with many more convictions and much longer sentences than a decade ago.

But it's not just about violent or sexual offences. Prison sentences, in general, have been getting longer.

Even for offences which aren't violent or sexual, the average sentence length overall has increased. Take fraud: the average custodial sentence for that has gone up from just under a year in 2007 to over 18 months in 2017.

Now, whatever your own views on what should happen, as a matter of fact it is clearly not true that sentences overall are getting shorter or justice is somehow getting softer – as some argue.

When it comes to the length of prison sentences we are now taking a more punitive approach than at any point during Mrs Thatcher's premiership.

Let me be clear...

...I do not want to reverse the tougher sentencing approach for serious offences. But equally, we should be extremely cautious about continuing to increase sentences as a routine response to concerns over crime. We have to recognise that such an approach would lead us to becoming even more of an international and historical outlier in terms of our prison population.

Instead, we need to take a step back and to ask ourselves 3 questions:

...Is our approach to sentencing actually reducing crime – when reoffending remains stubbornly high, creating more victims and putting the public at risk?

...Are we running our prisons in a way which maximises offenders' chances of turning their lives around, of going on to gainful employment and re-joining society as a responsible citizen?

...And should we be seeking opportunities in the coming years to find better and alternative ways of punishing as well as rehabilitating offenders?

It is these questions – how we punish people for their crimes – which I'd like to talk about today (18 February 2019).

I think now is the time for us as a society, as a country, to start a fresh conversation, a national debate about what justice, including punishment, should look like for our modern times.

Because as I see it, there is a false choice between the narrow and often polarising discussion about 'soft' justice versus 'hard' justice.

In my view, we should be talking about 'smart' justice.

Justice that works.

Now, for most of us in society, the very idea of going to prison for even a short amount of time, and the loss of liberty that entails, is a real deterrent.

But that thinking fails to get into the mindset of many of today's criminals – who are either reckless, or who don't fear prison because they have friends and family who have all done time. Perhaps their lives are so chaotic that prison, in the scheme of things, might not seem so bad.

That is true of no group more than those serving the shortest sentences.

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.

27% of all reoffending is committed by people who have served short sentences of 12 months or less.

For the offenders completing these short sentences whose lives are destabilised, and for society which incurs a heavy financial and social cost, prison simply isn't working.

The most common offence for which offenders are sentenced to less than 6 months – some 11,500 offenders – is shoplifting.

We know that offenders who commit this kind of crime often have drug or alcohol problems, and many are women. Almost half of women sentenced to a short custodial sentence are there for shop theft.

The impact of short custodial sentences on women generally is particularly significant. Many are victims, as well as offenders, with almost 60% reporting experience of domestic abuse and many have mental health issues.

For women, going into custody often causes huge disruption to the lives of their families, especially dependent children, increasing the risk they will also fall into offending.

And for many offenders, both men and women, who may not have a stable job or home, and who are likely to have alcohol or drug problems, a short stay in prison can result in them losing access to benefits and drug or alcohol support services and treatment. Coming out of prison, they find themselves back at the start of the process and feeling like they have even less to lose.

That's why there is a very strong case to abolish sentences of six months or less altogether, with some closely defined exceptions, and put in their place, a robust community order regime.

Let's be honest. The public will always want to prioritise schools or hospitals over the criminal justice system when it comes to public spending. But where we do spend on the criminal justice system, we must spend on what works.

Why would we spend taxpayers' money doing what we know doesn't work, and indeed, that makes us less safe?

We shouldn't.

The reception of a new offender into custody – that first night inside – is one of the most resource heavy moments in an offender's journey through the system.

Every offender must have their property logged. They must be issued with their prison essentials – toothbrushes; clothing; bedding. They must be risk assessed for self-harm risks and the risks they pose to other offenders. There are full security procedures including a strip search for many.

And then once these offenders are set up inside, there's no time for the prison service to do any meaningful rehabilitative work with them.

In 2017, almost 50,000 offenders were sentenced to immediate custody for 6

months or less. By abolishing these sentences we'd expect also to reduce the number of receptions carried out.

Just think how much better we could use the prison officers' time and resources, whether focusing on security, whether looking after those at risk of self harm, or whether spending more time on running regimes which really will make a difference – those built around temporary release for work, education, and tackling drug addiction.

And offenders are less likely to reoffend if they are given a community order, which are much more effective at tackling the root causes behind criminality.

Now, I do not want community orders which are in any sense a 'soft option'. I want a regime that can impose greater restrictions on people's movements and lifestyle and stricter requirements in terms of accessing treatment and support.

And critically, these sentences must be enforced.

That's why on Saturday I announced the rollout of our new GPS tagging programme which will allow offenders' movements to be more effectively monitored.

Working with our justice partners, I hope that GPS tags will be available across the country by April.

It will be an important new tool in controlling and restricting the movement and certain activities of offenders.

It will also help manage offenders safely in the community and strengthen the protection available for victims by monitoring exclusion zones.

Other new technology and innovations are opening up the possibility of even more options for the future too.

For example, technology can monitor whether an offender has consumed alcohol, and enables us to be able to better restrict and monitor alcohol consumption where it drives offending behaviour.

We are testing the value of alcohol abstinence monitoring requirements for offenders on licence, building on earlier testing of its value as part of a community order.

Underpinned by evidence of what works to reduce reoffending, we are also increasing the treatment requirements of community orders.

Our research shows that nearly 60% of recent offenders who engaged with a community-based alcohol programme did not go on to reoffend in the two years following treatment. Offenders given a community sentence including mental health treatment have also shown to be significantly less likely to reoffend.

That's why we have worked with the Department of Health and Social Care, NHS

England and Public Health England to develop a Treatment Requirement Programme which aims to increase the number of community sentences with mental health, drug and alcohol treatment requirements.

The programme is currently being tested in courts across five areas in England –Milton Keynes, Northampton, Birmingham, Plymouth and Sefton.

It dictates a new minimum standard of service, with additional training for staff to improve collaboration between the agencies involved – all of which is increasing confidence among sentencers to use them.

I look forward to seeing the outcomes of those trials shortly.

Many offenders in prison have mental health problems, but often struggle to engage with treatment on the same terms as they could in the community. That is why the Health Secretary and I want to explore how innovative digital technologies can be put to use to serve the mental health needs of our prisoners.

We also know stable accommodation is a key factor in reoffending. As part of the Government's Rough Sleeping agenda, we are investing up to £6.4 million in a pilot scheme to help individuals released from three prisons – Bristol, Leeds and Pentonville – who have been identified as being at risk of homelessness into settled accommodation, while providing them with wrap around support for up to two years.

This is part of a cross-government action necessary to cutting reoffending and tackle the root causes of criminality.

But if we want to successfully make a shift from prison to community sentences it is critical that we have a probation system that commands the confidence of the courts and the public.

I will return to the subject of probation in much greater depth later this year. But, in thinking strategically about the future of our justice system I believe in the end there is a strong case for switching resource away from ineffective prison sentences and into probation. This is more likely to reduce reoffending and, ultimately, reduce pressures on our criminal justice system.

I am determined to strengthen the confidence courts have in probation to ensure we can make this shift away from short custodial sentences towards more punitive and effective sanctions and support in the community.

However, as I mentioned earlier, prison will continue to be right for some.

My second question was about what sort of prison regime we want.

For those who are serving longer sentences, we need to ensure that prisons are humane, safe and secure. Much good work has been done over the past year, led by the excellent Prisons Minister Rory Stewart.

But in prison, to reduce the chances of reoffending on release, there needs

to be a positive outlook for the future and a sense that there is light at the end of the tunnel so long as an offender wants to turn their back on crime.

That's why I have spoken before and we have consulted on a new approach to incentives and privileges that better incentivises prisoners to abide by the rules and engage in education, work and substance misuse interventions, whilst ensuring poor behaviour can still be tackled through the loss of privileges.

It means maintaining a link to the outside world – for example with work and family – so that prisoners don't get institutionalised and lose hope.

If, at the end of a prison term, our objective is to release into the community a responsible citizen, we must first ensure that we have a responsible prisoner.

An important way we can do this for some prisoners is release on temporary license – or ROTL.

Research last year shows the more ROTL a prisoner gets, the less chance there is of them reoffending.

It provides purposeful activity and experience while in prison so that they have the right attitude for work, can get a job when they're released, prepare for re-joining their families and society and turn their back on crime for good.

We are currently consulting on loosening some of the barriers to using ROTL for some prisoners. Our plans will encourage using ROTL more often to get prisoners off the wings and into the workplace by removing blanket restrictions on when governors can consider ROTL, particularly those who have progressed to open conditions.

Rather than blanket bans, the focus will rightly be instead on how safe it is for a prisoner to be released on ROTL, enabling them to go out to work sooner, and helping them to prepare for eventual release.

I am pleased to say that three prisons, HMPs Drake Hall, Ford and Kirkham, are currently testing out new arrangements for ROTL, giving their Governors more discretion over temporary release for men and women. This will be a great opportunity to learn from their experience, and explore the best ways to safely and more quickly get prisoners out for work.

Our other reforms will also make reoffending less likely on release. Whether that's our £7 million investment for new in-cell telephones to maintain family links or looking at how we categorise the risk prisoners pose so they are put in the right type of category prison.

This brings me to my third fundamental question. Is it time to begin to think again about how we punish offenders in future.

Historically, for many offenders our earliest prisons were little more than

holding pens ahead of transportation or indeed capital punishment. Of course, those sanctions are no longer available to us. And, for the avoidance of doubt, I am not advocating their return.

But for the past couple of centuries, we have – almost by default – come to accept the view that punishment essentially means prison.

Looking at reforming short sentences by providing a robust community orders regime is a near term initiative that will help us tackle the problem of reoffending.

But thinking about effective punishment for different crimes isn't limited to those that currently get short sentences.

I believe we are nearing a time when a combination of technology and radical thinking will make it possible for much more intensive and restrictive conditions to be applied in more creative and fundamental ways outside of prison.

I think for some offenders we need to revisit what effective punishment really means.

Home curfew, driving bans, alcohol bans and foreign travel bans are just some of the options that already exist and which might play a bigger role.

I believe the biggest potential comes from being able to better target someone who makes large profits from committing a financial crime like fraud. Or the kingpin drug baron who makes his money one step removed from the violence and misery this illicit trade creates.

Fraud, for example, is a serious offence. It is far from victimless and the consequences for innocent people can be devastating. So, it needs a serious punishment.

And the criminals who commit these offences are calculating. They are premeditated. And they are motivated by greed.

In recent years, the custody rate has increased from 14.5% in 2007 to over 20%, and the average custodial sentence going up from under a year to over 18 months. But once fraudsters have sat out their sentence, they may be able to return to their comfortable lifestyle as soon as they get out.

Indeed, serving a 2 year prison sentence but knowing your illicit cash is still hidden from the authorities, is not an effective punishment.

I can see us being able to take a different approach. For example, this kind of fraudster or kingpin would still need to spend time in prison. And we will continue to pursue relentlessly to confiscate the proceeds of crime.

But we could go further. I want to look at what happens after prison – whether our more effective punishment and deterrent for these criminals might involve jail time and more lasting and punitive community interventions.

After serving part of their sentence behind bars, we could, for example, continue to restrict an offender's movement, their activities and their lifestyle beyond prison in a much more intensive way.

And that could also mean a real shift in the standard of living a wealthy criminal can expect after prison.

I want to look at how, once a jail term has been served, we can continue to restrict their expenditure and monitor their earnings, using new technology to enable proper enforcement.

They would be in no uncertainty that, once sentenced, they wouldn't be able to reap any lifestyle benefits from their crimes and would need to make full reparation to the community as part of the sentence.

I'm keen to get industry working with us to develop the necessary technology. Our banks are looking more and more at their social responsibilities, and they could look at what part they can play in investing to help us to deliver this vision.

Community sanctions like this won't be soft options, but they will be smart ones.

They will enable us to impose an unprecedented level of punitive sanctions outside of a prison, with punishment hitting closer to home and hitting criminals where it always hurts – the pocket.

It will allow us not only, as the old adage goes, to 'let the punishment fit the crime', but to let the punishment properly hit the criminal in a more tailored and targeted way outside of prison.

Prison will always play a part in serving as punishment for serious crimes and in rehabilitation, and our reforms will deliver that. But we need to think more imaginatively about different and more modern forms of punishment in the community. Punishments that are punitive, for a purpose.

As with our approach to short sentences, ultimately, it's about doing what works to reduce reoffending and make us all safer and less likely to be a future victim of crime.

In that sense, I believe the choice – and the debate – isn't one of soft justice or hard justice. It's a choice between effective justice or ineffective justice.

I know that there will be some who argue that the only problem with our criminal justice system is that it isn't tough enough, that the answer to short sentences is longer sentences, that the best way of stopping recently released prisoners from reoffending is not to release them. And that the endless ratchet effect of higher sentences is giving the public what it wants.

But I believe that those in positions of responsibility have a duty to show leadership. To confront difficult issues, be led by the evidence and pursue

policies that are most likely to deliver for the public.

That, I hope, is the approach I have set out today – thank you.

Related link

[Justice Secretary David Gauke sets out long-term for justice](#)

News story: Will you Trust your Instincts? Project Servator launches at Hunterston

Civil Nuclear Constabulary (CNC) police officers based at Hunterston launch Project Servator today (18/2), an innovative and collaborative community approach to policing.

Project Servator has been running at Sellafield and other CNC sites since 2016 and has now rolled out across the Hunterston Operational Policing Unit.

Project Servator sees see highly visible yet unpredictable deployments of specially trained officers around the Hunterston site and the surrounding local community. The operational deployments involve officers working together with our communities to report suspicious activity. These officers are deployed to deter, help detect, and provide reassurance and confidence to members of the public.

The tactics used as part of Project Servator are not new and are used regularly by the City of London Police, British Transport Police and several Home Office police forces. They have been developed to enhance the effectiveness of our resources and not as a response to any change in threat.

Supt Tony Cole, who is the CNC lead for the implementation of Project Servator, said: “These tactics are not new but allow us to have a focus on community engagement. This is not restricted to the Hunterston site but also to the surrounding areas. We are aware of the vast amount of information members of our community have and they are aware of what is out of the ordinary. All we ask is that they report any suspicions to us.


“The deployments will be unpredictable and on occasion may be highly visible or more covert on another. The aim is to work with our local communities to deter any hostile threat.

“Remember, Trust your instinct and report any suspicious activity directly to the CNC by calling 01847 811229.”

The CNC is the armed police force in charge of protecting civil nuclear sites and nuclear materials in England, Scotland and Wales. We employ over 1,500 highly trained police officers and police staff across the UK. Counter terrorism is a major part of our policing.

The CNC have launched their own twitter page, so keep up-to-date with recruitment information, Servator deployments or anything CNC follow us @nuclearpolice or on Facebook

[Press release: Welsh Secretary discusses Wylfa Newydd Future at Hitachi HQ](#)



From left to right – Ambassador Paul Madden (British Ambassador to Japan), Hiroaki Nakanishi (Chairman and CEO of Hitachi), Secretary of State for Wales Alun Cairns and Toshikazu Nishino (Hitachi).

Welsh Secretary Alun Cairns met representatives from Hitachi at its headquarters in Tokyo earlier today to discuss the future of the Wylfa site in north Wales.

It follows the announcement that Hitachi has suspended plans to build the new multi-billion pound Wylfa Newydd power station on Anglesey.

The meeting forms a key part of Secretary Cairns' visit to Tokyo, Nagoya, Kyoto and Osaka where he'll meet with Japanese businesses who have significant investments in Wales. During the visit, he will set out the UK Government's commitment to supporting Japanese investment in Wales and the opportunities ahead as we prepare to leave the EU.

Following the meeting, Secretary of State for Wales Alun Cairns said:

I am grateful to Hitachi for the constructive meeting today to discuss options for their future plans in Wales. "While I fully recognise their decision was a disappointment to people on Anglesey and across north Wales, the UK Government remains committed to developing a broad-based, resilient economy. We believe that nuclear has an important role to play in the UK's future energy mix as we transition to a low-carbon economy, but any future offer must represent good value for both the taxpayer and the consumer.

I look forward to future discussions on Wylfa's new nuclear future and will continue to push for greater investment and additional job creation across north Wales.

Published 18 February 2019