




Speech By
Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe

MEMBER FOR SANDGATE

Record of Proceedings, 24 February 2016

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (DOMESTIC SMOKE ALARMS)
AMENDMENT BILL; FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (SMOKE ALARMS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.08 pm), in reply: I acknowledge the contributions we have heard to the debate on the motion from the member for Rockhampton and the member for Springwood. I thank them for those. Both of those honourable gentlemen are committed to the best process and the best outcome in terms of consideration of the legislation that is before the House.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, you will be warned if you persist. It may be standing order 252 or 253.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Other contributors to the debate have put forward some fallacious and rather erroneous suggestions. They are suggestions that indicate that this course of action will see a delay in the legislative outcomes that people in this state want to see in terms of responding to the coronial findings and the issues associated with those dreadful and terrible fires. I do not want to go to the core of the matters that will be debated and considered by the committee and then by the House down the track. I want to stick to this procedural matter about how we get the best analysis and consideration of these bills in the committee process.

This issue of timing is a fundamental matter that is before us. A suggestion has been made in this debate tonight by those opposite that the course that the government proposes would delay the implementation of these laws. There is no such suggestion. These matters will ultimately be debated by the House and the House will choose which of the bills before it goes forward and which of the bills before it is adopted—one that has a 10-year implementation phase or one that has a three-year implementation phase. This decision tonight makes no difference to how that is considered and what choice this House makes when the time comes. I do not want to go to the nub of those matters and that debate, because that will come, but this motion tonight does not mean that there will be quicker implementation of one bill over the other because both bills will be considered by the House.

What this motion seeks to do is provide the community and this chamber with the best opportunity to consider and compare the pathways forward before them. On the one hand, we have the member for Kawana's bill and, on the other hand, we have the bill introduced into the House by the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services. Those two bills are best compared together by the committee and analysed together by the community through submissions and contributions to and engagement with the committee process that will be undertaken through to 23 May. This motion would allow for those bills to come back to the House in a cognate debate in a time frame that would in fact be quicker than what is currently provided for under the standing orders for the member for Kawana's bill. This

motion would allow those matters to be considered by this parliament within a shorter time frame than the time frame that would be seen to be supported by those opposing the motion.

I encourage and implore those members who want to see this matter dealt with on behalf of those communities that have been affected by tragic and terrible domestic house fires—those members who want to see action around this happen and happen in a way that is timely and effective—to support this motion. There will be different views as to which of the bills is the best way forward, but this motion provides the best opportunity for both bills to be considered and for this House to make the best decision in a timely manner. I support the motion before the House.