Copy for David Pannick QC Consorship Policy Working Group Policy Unit (Conlay Street. Libert Democrats, & Conlay Street. Libert Democrats, & SWIP 3NB 0: Stuart Howard

23 Budgen Drive Redhill RHI 2QB

27th March 2003

To: Stuart Howard
Policy Adviser
Sentencing & Offences Unit
Home Office
304, 50 Queen Anne's Gate
London SWIH 9AT

Dear Mr Howard,

SEXUAL OFFENCES BILL

Thank you for your letter of the 11th February. Your assertion that "the Government will examine the scope for a review of the issues surrounding prostitution" is disputed. If that is the true, why were important piecemeal changes to the law on prostitution sneaked into the current Sexual Offences Bill?

I refer you to Clauses 56 and 58 which create victimless crimes relating to adult prostitution, although they are embedded in the part of the Bill relating to protection of children. Why was this done?

These sections are, in any event, unenforceable and will merely lead to unfair, periodic, arbitrary convictions, (a spokesperson for the Metropolitan Police Clubs and Vice Squad stated earlier this month that there were a thousand brothels in South London alone). Why cannot this country tackle the issue properly in one comprehensive, logical statute, as has been done in other parts of the European Union and Australia, and is advocated by the Liberal Democrat Party? Who is trying to protect whom from what and why?

Yours disbelievingly.

E Goodman