

## Dear sir,

I am an Australian citizen, father of one. I would like to lodge my objection to a) the lockout laws, and b) the state wide 10pm take away liquor laws.

## Regarding the lockout laws:

- Overall, I think the laws were hastily brought in, without true thought to the consequences. There is the fact that Kieren Loveridge has not even been to a drinking establishment on the night he gave the "king hit", so why was the thought that the laws would fix this type of problem?
- I feel that the violence situation in the Cross could have been fixed in a different manner more like Melbourne where they have no such laws, but appear not to have the violence problem that Sydney purports to. The statistics which are presented to support the laws do show a drop in the amount of alcohol related offences. But at what cost? If you overlay the number of businesses that are operating over the number of assaults, you will see a correlation. The decrease in assaults is because the nightlife has been decimated. There is no-one on the streets anymore, so of course there will be less offences. The laws are killing the vibrancy of the city. Kings Cross is dead, with the punch of the lockout laws.

## Regarding the 10pm take away limitation:

- This appears to be a nanny-state law: that because of the actions of a few, the whole state has to be punished. If I finish a restaurant meal late at night and wish to buy a bottle of wine to take home - I am not able to. This is punishing the many for the actions of the few. But in saying that, where is the evidence that supports an early finish to off license sales helps the cause?

I look forward to your report into the lockout laws.

regards, Chris & Karen Dorrington