

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee](#)
Subject: Submission regarding Smoke Alarms. (Finalised by 23rd of May, 2016, I believe.)
Date: Saturday, 30 April 2016 3:53:42 PM

Dear Sirs,

I am forwarding my submission that I disagree that Ionization Smoke Alarms are inferior to the Photoelectric Smoke Alarms in their speed of sensory response, and alarm activation.

Firstly, the radioactive particle in the Ionization Smoke Alarm has been Scientifically Documented to be safe for humans, to the point that even if it were ingested (swallowed), by a person, it would cause no harm whatsoever and would pass out as any safe particle would.

Secondly, as someone who has both types installed at my premises, I have tested both of them for their speed of sensor response and alarm activation, and have always found that the Ionization Smoke Alarms exceed in their performance over the Photoelectric Smoke Alarms, in various and multiple trials.

I have utilized the smoke from mosquito coils (a simple method anyone can safely implent and verify my case of argument).

I have applied them at different angles and distances to the alarms, to obtain my results.

At each test I would clean the Alarms, from the smoke residue deposits.

After testing, and for each test applied, the Ionization Smoke Alarms have been the quickest to respond, responding immediately to almost immediately, unlike the Photoelectric Smoke Alarm, which responded in a minute in a few cases to several minutes in most cases.

Although the tiny smoke that comes from mosquito coils cannot be compared to the larger volume of smoke that comes from a real house fire, nevertheless it is an adequate test to determine the initial smoke that reaches the alarms to see how quickly they will respond.

I have seen many ads and testimonials of house fires claiming that Ionization Smoke Alarms have failed to warn sleeping residents in time to get out of the house, where as that if they had installed the "superior" Photoelectric type, they would not have perished in the smoke/fire.

The way those ads come across seem biased to me in 80% of cases. They do not provide any substantial proof, only hearsay of "scientific findings".

My proof is the SIMPLE TESTING by using the mosquito coils to verify my case, anyone who has both types of alarms installed, can immediately implement and test for themselves.

I am therefore asking that prior to the finalization of this case, that several unbiased people (people that have both types of alarms installed or are willing to install them for this purpose) be appointed to test by using mosquito coils or any practical method but that the same method be used for all testers, for the purpose of submission.

My main argument is the PRACTICAL outcome of the Smoke Alarm tests may be in conflict to Scientific THEORIES and/or bias.

Furthermore, I have 10 Smoke Alarms installed in my 2 storey house: 2 Photoelectric, 8 Ionization types. One of the Ionization Smoke Alarms is installed in the attic. This particular one is a Dual Ionization Chamber Smoke Alarm, it has to be, in order of not giving a false alarm that normal/single Ionization Chamber Smoke Alarms would give due to the dust and changes to the atmospheric pressure in the attic area. If a Photoelectric type were installed up there, it's photo-apertures and reflectors would be corrupted by dust and debris in a very short time. All 10 Alarms are interconnected and all are hardwired to a SAFE NINE VOLT power supply with ONE AMP OUTPUT, more than adequate for a hearty but a safe 9 volt supply to all alarms, safe from shortcircuiting sparking in the long wiring connections that leads to a fire. The hardwiring is routed into a CONTROL PANEL that is powered by 240 Volts and has a transformer inside that transforms down to 9 volts

at the beginning of the hardwiring to the alarms, not a risky 240volt hardwiring system. There is also inside, a SINGLE backup SLA battery, 12 volts, 1.2 AH, for ALL the Smoke Alarms, if needed in a 240 volt blackout. This a superior and safer system for Domestic Smoke Alarm Systems.

I have obtained this system/project from "Silicon Chip Australia" magazine, in their January & February 1997 editions, and am also putting this System up for your consideration, and am in no way affiliated with Silicon Chip.

Respectfully,
Wally Fietkau.