



28 RECEIVED 2012
IN DCU
- 2 JAN 2013

Home Office

Re: Alcohol Pricing

Dear Home Office

Even in the harsh conditions of the military school I attended in the days when society let barbarians roam free in such establishments, it was recognized as wrong to punish the many when irritated by failure to tackle the few unknown guilty.

During the swansong of New Labour, Voices Off Stage might promised an end to treating citizens en masse as criminals-in-waiting, to be harassed and bled as a whole every time disparate elements confounded social mores.

Young, rowdy souls parade stupidly, often offensively, befuddled with drink, so let's assume they represent all the lower orders and price alcohol out of reach of the ordinary burgher.



No matter that such wanton behaviour (I mean of the young, the Government's is often more heinous) may merely mirror a generational phase, nothing must impede a need to punish those poorer elements].

I struggle to afford one bottle of wine a week when barely a year or two ago supermarkets stocked a potable claret for under £3 (perhaps your chef used it for cooking in emergencies) at which price I occasionally indulged in another bottle midweek. Now you seek to set a minimum price greater than £4 so ensuring anything drinkable, by the likes of me, remains a fortnightly pleasure at best.

By all means operate stricter licensing laws (or enforce those extant), raise the age for those who would purchase, restrict place and time of sales, punish the inebriated who cause harm (not merely offence) in public but, please, do not burden me who have little for the sins of others engaging in Bullington Club type escapades. Further, I remain unconvinced that halving consumption for such as myself will affect one iota the statistics for crime and health.

Perhaps I should address more serious

topics such as the desire to treat us all as potential terrorists in the name of security (company profits), or see everyone past the age of 16 as a child molester unless continually deterred, or the need to prevent benefit claimants gaining 10p more than they ought and so bankrupt the nation (how dare they echo the rich who steal millions or feel entitled to bogus expenses from the public purse)? But my concerns are modest.

These weightier matters impinge on us all, rich (at least nominally) and poor, whereas I protest that beating those struggling to survive, besides being wicked, will serve as no example to those with the means to indulge excessively coupled with a fancy to do so.

Yours sincerely

