

To whom it may concern,

Please see my response in regards to the proposed variations for the Barkly Region.

Proposed Variation

109. The Commission proposes to vary the licence conditions of the Tennant Creek Hotel, the Goldfields Hotel and the Headframe Bottle Shop by inserting the following condition

a. The licensee must not knowingly sell liquor to a member of a household on a day when that person or other members of that household have purchased liquor on three or more previous occasions that day.

With four or more persons that are of legal drinking age in one household, you are taking away the right of someone's choice of drink and legal right to purchase alcohol, without them doing anything wrong. It is also not clear who is declared as "member of the household", does this include visitors that are staying there? Also what does household entail, is it the place the person is residing at in town (even if visiting). Some scenarios that will arise from this proposal are:

- Family of four. Mother drinks a wine, dad drinks VB, adult son drinks coopers premium light only and adult daughter drinks vodka. They have a celebration tonight at home and wish to purchase their own drinks. With the three person rule this is not able to be done. Is this proposal forcing the adult son to drink a higher concentrated beer as the rest of his family have purchased already? How is this promoting responsible drinking?
- Tennant Creek Camp draft is being held. You have over 50 people who are camping at one address, Tennant Creek Show Grounds. When buying alcohol they are asked where they are staying and respond "at show grounds". It is then denied as three people have already replied this. This could also be incorporated at other events where people camp e.g. Tennant Creek Races and Tennant Creek Speedway.
- A lot of families have no choice as there is limited housing in Tennant Creek, therefore overcrowding is a major factor of residents in Tennant Creek. So if you had a household of 20 and 06 were drinkers, would this cause more family & domestic violence by limiting who could purchase on each day?

This proposal needs to be clearer and take all circumstances into account. This proposal is not justifiable and is bias towards households, events that bring people to town and a person's right to free choice and legal entitlement.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this proposal.

Kind Regards

Karen Harlan