

Reply all | ▾ Delete Junk | ▾ ...



LockOut Laws

NG

Neil Glick [REDACTED]



Reply all | ▾

To: Liquor Law Review; ▾

Sun 3/04

Inbox

In view of the reduced admissions to hospital Emergency, more peaceful streets, reduced (eliminated) one-punch threats, ... I would prefer that the LockOut Laws continue and be extended to other areas of Sydney with similar problems for the present time.

In addition I would also like to see us do more investigation to uncover what gives rise to the rowdiness, lack of consideration for other members of the public, and aggression in our young people that we still see on our streets. Yes, it is alcohol and, perhaps, other drug or steroid induced behaviour but how do these people feel, and what are they needing, that they seek escape in 'substances'? Does the world seem more bleak for them than it seemed 50 years ago? Are they angry at their inability to enjoy what Sydney offers as much as others? Is their inability to buy accommodation affecting them? Have they learnt little from their parents about respect and consideration for others? Are the licensed clubs and premises taking responsibility for refusing drinks when customers are clearly 'pissed' (offer the customer a blood-alcohol device to demonstrate that they are under, say, a 0.15% or 0.2% limit)?

While we temporarily contain 'bad behaviour' with LockOut Laws let's find the reasons for the behaviour and then treat the problem at 'cause' rather than 'effect'. If the treatment works then the LockOut Laws may be softened if not eliminated.

Neil Glick

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]