

# Proposed Football (Strict Liability) (Scotland) Bill

## Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

an individual

Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic, but not in a subject relevant to the consultation, please choose "Member of the public".)

Member of the public

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

*No Response*

Please choose one of the following; if you choose the first option, please provide your name or the name of your organisation as you wish it to be published.

I would like this response to be anonymous (the response may be published, but no name)

Please provide details of a way in which we can contact you if there are queries regarding your response. Email is preferred but you can also provide a postal address or phone number. We will not publish these details.

[REDACTED]

## Page 7: Your views on the proposal

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal to introduce strict liability for football clubs in Scotland?

Fully opposed

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

This bill is not fit for purpose as a solution to the problem. It is also unfair on football clubs and it will not solve the problem of sectarianism in this country. It is a deviation from other better ways of eradicating the problem.

Q2. Could the aims of this proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

Yes (if so, please explain below)

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

No religion means no sectarianism. Less religion means less sectarianism. Religion is in decline and so is sectarianism. It will go away without doing anything. This can be accelerated if necessary by not promoting religion. State schools should not be aligned with nor promote religion. Promotion of religion should not be funded by the state. Time to move on and advance society. Separate schooling as encouraged by some faiths undoubtedly result in sectarianism.

Q3. What do you think would be the main advantages, if any, of holding clubs responsible for the behaviour of their supporters?

None other than some party making money from fines.

Q4. What do you think would be the main disadvantages, if any, of holding clubs responsible for the behaviour of their supporters?

Waste of time ,effort, and focus. Increase in paranoia from fans and clubs fearing and believing in institutional bias.

## Page 11: Behaviours and sanctions

Q5. If there is to be a system of strict liability, which of the following behaviours do you think should be covered (choose all that apply)--

The invasion or attempted invasion of a field of play

The throwing of objects

The lighting of fireworks or any other incendiary objects

Violent or threatening behaviour

Acts of damage

Disorder in or near the stadium

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

Damage and violence and safety risks are unacceptable and can be clearly identified and defined. Name calling at football is just a part of trying to get a one up on the opposition and to achieve that people just adopt the language that they think will most offend. I find it difficult to understand why people think it is somehow more offensive to target abuse at someone with a religious comment than a comment that suggests they are a pedophile.

Q6. If there is to be a system of strict liability, which of the following sanctions do you think should be available (choose all that apply)--

Warning/reprimand

Ban on selling tickets to supporters for away matches

Community action (e.g. education programmes, working with local schools)

## Page 13: Financial implications

Q7. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have on:

|                    | Significant increase in cost | Some increase in cost | Broadly costneutral | Some reduction in cost | Significant reduction in cost | Unsure |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| (a) Football clubs |                              | X                     |                     |                        |                               |        |

|   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>(b) Football supporters and other individuals</b>                              |   | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>(c) Scottish Government and public sector bodies (such as Police Scotland)</b> | X |   |  |  |  |  |  |

## Page 14: Equalities

Q8. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

There is a risk that it will heighten tensions and make matters worse. It will become another reporters and media feast and I firmly believe that media reporting over the years as well as initiatives such as this have promoted and been a hindrance to the natural decline in sectarianism. Most cases of sectarianism within football are just name calling and not actually founded on a dislike of individuals based on their religion.

Q9. In what ways could any negative impact of the proposed Bill on any of these protected characteristics be minimised or avoided?

Remove all parts that do not involve damage, safety risk, and violence.

## Page 16: Sustainability of the proposal

Q10. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably, i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impacts?

No

## Page 17: General

Q11. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal to introduce strict liability for football clubs in Scotland?

*No Response*