

CONSULTATIVE DOCUMENT

THE DRAFT SMOKING (NORTHERN IRELAND) ORDER 2006

QUESTIONNAIRE

March 2006

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This Questionnaire seeks views on the **Draft Smoking (Northern Ireland) Order 2006** (the draft Order) which will introduce comprehensive controls to protect employees and the public from exposure to second-hand smoke.

Comments would be particularly welcomed on a number of key areas:

- the definition of smoking;
- the definition of smoke-free premises;
- the extent of any proposed exemptions;
- offences and level of penalties;
- requirement for fixed penalties; and
- the power to raise the age limit for sale of tobacco to young people.

The Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (the Department) carried out an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) screening exercise on the proposed legislation. The results, which include equality considerations and a partial Regulatory Impact Assessment, are set out in the IIA Overview.

Background

On 17 October 2005, Shaun Woodward, Minister for Health, Social Services & Public Safety, announced his intention to introduce legislation by April 2007 to protect employees and the public from exposure to second-hand smoke. He also indicated that he would seek views on specific issues such as exemptions and penalties. This followed a public consultation exercise carried out by the Department between December 2004 and March 2005, on options to strengthen existing controls on tobacco use. The consultation elicited over 70,000 responses with 91% of respondents expressing support for comprehensive controls. In framing the draft Order, account was taken of similar legislation and proposals in Scotland and England.

Responses to this Questionnaire must be received by not later than 5.00pm on Friday 5 May 2006.

In order to facilitate analysis it is important that respondents use the Questionnaire.

Responses to this consultation may be made online at:

http://www.dhsspsni.gov.uk/index/consultations/current_consultations.htm

QUESTIONNAIRE

Q1. *Article 2 (a) and (b)* of the draft Order defines “smoking” as covering all lit tobacco or any other lit substance in a form which could be smoked, for example, herbal cigarettes. This is to avoid enforcement difficulties in cases where smokers claim their cigarettes do not contain tobacco.

Do you agree with the definition of smoking as set out in the draft Order?

Yes X

No

If you wish to comment, please do so here.

We agree with the definition of smoking as set out in the draft order.
--

Q2. *Article 3* of the draft Order defines “smoke-free premises”.

Do you agree with the definition of smoke-free premises as set out in the draft Order?

Yes X

No

If you wish to comment, please do so here.

--

Q3. *Article 4* of the draft Order provides for the Department to make regulations to specify premises or parts of premises not to be smoke-free. In accordance with the Minister’s announcement, the intention is that these exemptions will be limited and *Article 4(3)* specifically precludes exemptions in respect of licensed premises. **The regulations will be the subject of a separate consultation later in the year.** However, the Department is taking this opportunity to seek views. There are premises which act as a person’s home, either on a permanent or temporary basis, but which are also another person’s workplace, for example, residential accommodation, hotel bedrooms, prisons and psychiatric facilities. Different approaches to this issue have been adopted by other jurisdictions. In the Republic of Ireland psychiatric hospitals are exempt. In Scotland designated rooms in psychiatric hospitals are exempt while in New York it is necessary to apply for a waiver.

Set out below are examples of premises that serve as a person’s home, either on a temporary or permanent basis.

Do you think that hotel bedrooms, designated rooms, or areas within the following premises should be exempt?

Hotel Bedrooms	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don’t know	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Care Homes	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don’t know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Psychiatric Units	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don’t know	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prisons	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Don’t Know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you wish to suggest any other exemptions? If yes, please specify below.

It may be prudent to also include homeless hostels and ‘sheltered accommodation’ within this category .

Q4. Articles 7, 8, 9 and 12 of the draft Order sets out the following four offences and penalties:

- (i) a person failing to display the prescribed no-smoking signs in smoke-free premises commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (£1,000);
- (ii) a person who knowingly smokes in smoke-free premises commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (£1,000);
- (iii) a person who controls or is concerned in the management of smoke-free premises and fails to prevent a person smoking in a smoke-free place commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 4 on the standard scale (£2,500); and
- (iv) a person who intentionally obstructs an authorised officer of a district council acting in exercise of his duties under the Order commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (£1,000).

Do you agree with the offences and level of penalties set out in the draft Order?

Yes

No



If you wish to comment, please do so here.

We are unsure about the level of penalty proposed particularly being people categorised as being in the lower socio-economic groups are more likely to smoke and therefore more likely to attract a penalty if they break the law. £1,000 is a huge amount of money, particularly to someone on a low income. We therefore welcome the further consultation on fixed penalty amounts and how people from lower socio-economic groups will be enabled to pay.

Q5. *Article 10* of the draft Order provides for an authorised officer of a district council to issue a fixed penalty notice where he believes an offence has been committed under Articles 7, 8 or 9. Schedule 1 makes further provision about fixed penalties. The levels of fixed penalties will be specified in regulations which will be the subject of consultation this year.

Do you agree with the fixed penalty notice procedures as set out in the draft Order?

Yes

No

Don't know

If you wish to comment, please do so here.

Q6. Tobacco control measures are currently enforced by Environmental Health Officers of district councils.

Do you agree that smoke-free legislation should also be enforced by district councils?

Yes

No

Don't know

If not, please state your reasons below.

Q7. At present *Articles 3 and 4* of the Health & Personal Social Services (Northern Ireland) Order 1978 make it an offence to sell tobacco products to young people under 16. In the Republic of Ireland, the Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2001 increased the age limit from 16 to 18 and in Scotland the Smoking, Health & Social Care (Scotland) Act 2005 provides the power to raise the age limit there. The draft Order provides the power (*Article 14*) for the Department to raise the age limit from 16. Any proposal to raise the age limit would be the subject of further consultation.

Do you agree that the Department should take this power?

Yes

No

Don't know

If you wish to comment, please do so here.

INTEGRATED IMPACT ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

General

Q8. Do you have any views on the conclusions reached by the Department to screen out from further assessment the implications of the draft Order in respect of:

- (a) Social Impact Assessment (New TSN, Homelessness etc);**
- (b) Rural (see Q21 –Q23);**
- (c) Environmental;**
- (d) Human Rights;**
- (e) Victims;**
- (f) Community Safety & Other Areas?**

Is there any other evidence which you consider should have been taken into account in these assessments?

In terms of the Social Impact Assessment we would have some concerns in relation to the evidence showing that people categorised as being in the lower socio-economic groups are more likely to smoke. This may mean that as smokers are more prevalent in lower socio-economic groups they therefore may be more likely to attract a penalty if they break the law. Our concern is that these penalties may have a disproportionate impact on people who live on lower incomes.

Submitted by:

Women's Support Network

109-113, Royal Avenue

Belfast

BT1 1FF