




Speech By
Tim Mander

MEMBER FOR EVERTON

Record of Proceedings, 31 August 2016

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

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (10.26 pm), in reply: I rise to sum up this debate from the LNP's perspective. I commend the House for a mature and sensible discussion about a very serious issue. There was one exception, and that was the contribution by the member for Springwood, which was an embarrassing disgrace. He gave a political commentary on something as solemn—to use the words of the Deputy Speaker—as this subject.

We have bipartisan support for the mandatory introduction of photoelectric alarms. For those people in the public gallery who are listening, we can assure them that, tonight, they will get that result. We simply disagree on the phase-in period. The government is arguing for a 10-year period, where we believe that this is such an urgent issue that it needs to be dealt with straightaway and that we should have no more than a three-year phase-in period for those who are noncompliant.

The LNP also believes that interconnectivity between the alarms is a desirable thing. It is a good thing and we would recommend that, but we do not believe that it should be mandatory. We do not believe that, because we believe that that will bring extra cost to people who simply cannot afford it. The result will be that they will not—

A government member interjected.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection. It will not save lives; it will cost lives because these people will not install the smoke alarms.

Mr Dick: That's not what the coroner said.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection from the member for Woodridge. The coroner does not live in your electorate of Woodridge with people who are very vulnerable—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! I will ask the member to direct his comments through the chair.

Mr MANDER: These are incredibly vulnerable people. The people who would benefit from that the most are those who cannot afford it. We should encourage interconnectivity, we should recommend it, but we should not make it mandatory.

Tonight, in a spirit of bipartisanship, we will not be voting against the government's bill, but we will be moving amendments to make this bill far more effective and bring about the results that the coroner was looking for as well as the people who have been advocating for this for some time. There is bipartisan support for the essential elements of this bill, but for good reason this side of the House believes there are amendments that need to be brought in to make sure that these smoke alarms are

introduced as quickly as possible—not in 10 years time, but in no longer than three years time—and that they are introduced in a way that people can afford so there are no barriers to implementing these safety measures.

I again commend the member for Kawana. It was the member for Kawana who listened to the lobby groups in the first place and who was moved, with the former opposition leader, the member for Southern Downs, to introduce the private member's bill. It was not until three months later that the government introduced its bill. I commend the member for Kawana on his initiative. I hope tonight that we can continue the spirit of bipartisanship, that we support the mandatory introduction of photoelectric fire alarms, but at the same time that we are incredibly practical about this, that we make sure that they are implemented as quickly as possible and that we put no financial barriers in the way for those families that will find it very difficult to afford that cost.