

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee](#)  
**Subject:** SUBMISSION: Fire and Emergency Services (Domestic Smoke Alarms) Amendment Bill 2016  
**Date:** Monday, 11 April 2016 11:32:32 AM

---

## TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

### Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Further to my submission on the Fire and Emergency Services (Domestic Smoke Alarms) Amendment Bill 2015 I wish to add the following as observations only.

The 2016 Bill does offer a far better level of protection than the 2015 Bill and I do support best possible protection.

This is in part, I believe, because the 2015 Bill considered that the cost of full implementation might discourage many people from making any changes at all – I agree.

#### **People will die in five years and ten years -**

Perhaps this timeframe, whatever it might be, as a long term goal might allow a more gradual transition and spread the cost but, in the interim, I would like to see a **minimum** requirement from ASAP.

If, in complying with this minimum, people understand that if alarms are selected that are compatible with other possible added alarms, these would then form a system which, in time, complies with the legal requirement of that time. One PE alarm **now** I believe is better than 7 ionisation now and better than 7 PE in ten years time.

However, I think that common sense would tell us that 7 PE at any time is better than 1.

At one time we did not have to wear seat belts in cars and no cars had airbags. Pool fencing was not a legal requirement. There are many more examples of things that we now know save lives.

#### **PEOPLE NEED TO BE GIVEN THE FACTS.**

One PE alarm on Boxing day 2011 I believe would have saved my family.

Regards

Keith Golinski

[Redacted signature block]