

## Legislative Council Hansard – 18 October 2017 – Proof

**PAROLE LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2017***Second Reading***The Hon. DAVID CLARKE ( 16:31 ):** On behalf of the Hon. Niall Blair: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to incorporate the second reading speech in *Hansard*.**Leave granted.**

The Government is pleased to introduce the Parole Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. The bill implements the Government's commitment to reforms to the criminal justice system that will improve community safety and reduce reoffending. The New South Wales parole system already works to reduce reoffending through Corrective Services' supervision of approximately 5,600 parolees at a time coupled with proven interventions targeting the causes of criminal behaviour. However, parole can be further strengthened to improve community safety and to maximise opportunities to return offenders to normal community life after release from custody.

A 2014 study undertaken by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research [BOCSAR] showed that offenders who are supervised on parole reoffend at a lower rate than offenders released from custody unsupervised. By reducing reoffending, we reduce crime, which means fewer victims and a safer community. These reforms build on some of the recommendations in the Law Reform Commission's 2015 report on parole. The reforms are part of the New South Wales Government's package of criminal justice reforms, which contains the most significant criminal justice reform agenda in many years. The reforms complement the package of changes to community-based sentences introduced by the Attorney General to increase the number of offenders under supervision in the community. The evidence-based parole reforms proposed in this bill will contribute to the Premier's and the State's priorities to reduce domestic violence and adult reoffending and to improve community safety.

The Government has already started work on increasing access to supervised parole. The Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Regulation 2014 was amended on 31 July 2017 to introduce more flexible manifest injustice exceptions to the 12-month rule, which requires offenders to wait 12 months to have parole reconsidered after revocation or refusal. These changes give the State Parole Authority more flexibility to consider appropriate offenders for release during this 12-month period. This will ensure that, where possible and safe, the community receives the benefit of suitable offenders being subject to a supervised period on parole to address their offending behaviour before their sentence ends, which leads to better outcomes than releasing them from prison unsupervised.

I turn to the Parole Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. The bill has eight purposes. First, the bill replaces the current public interest test for release on parole with a clearer, more specific community safety test. Second, the bill introduces a reintegration home detention scheme to provide a step down between custody and parole for eligible and suitable offenders to assist them with reintegration into the community. Third, it makes supervision a mandatory parole condition. Fourth, it replaces the current system of court-based parole with statutory parole. Fifth, the bill introduces a framework of sanctions for Community Corrections and the State Parole Authority to impose on offenders who have breached their parole orders. Sixth, the bill makes changes to the Victims Register to ensure that all victims registered can receive information about offenders being considered for parole and reintegration home detention, and to give all victims the right to make submissions to the State Parole Authority as part of the decision-making process. Seventh, the bill makes miscellaneous changes to improve the adult parole system. Eighth, the bill introduces a separate legislative framework for juvenile parole that provides an appropriate decision-making supervision and management framework for the release of young offenders on parole in a new part 4C of the Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987. I take this opportunity to thank the stakeholders consulted and involved in the drafting of this bill.

I now outline the details of the bill. Schedule 1 will introduce changes to improve the adult parole system. The focus on community safety is paramount. The New South Wales Government is committed to community safety and this bill ensures it is at the heart of parole legislation and decision-making. In June 2017 the Government strengthened the parole laws in New South Wales through the introduction of a presumption against parole for terrorism-related offenders in division 3A of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999. These changes build on the Government announcement in May 2017 that radicalisation will now be considered as part of parole decisions in New South Wales. The State Parole Authority must not release a terrorism-related offender on parole unless it is satisfied that the offender will not engage in, or incite, or assist others to engage in terrorist acts or violent extremism.

The community safety test introduced at schedule 1 [12] replaces the current public interest test for release on parole. Currently, community safety is one of a range of factors that the State Parole Authority must consider when deciding if release on parole is in the public interest. The test in the proposed new section 135 of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999 is based on a recommendation by the Law Reform Commission to introduce a community safety test for release on parole. The Government is committed to improving this area of the law and is implementing this recommendation to make it clear that the primary focus of the State Parole Authority's decision-making is always community safety. The new test will focus the legislation more clearly on the overriding goal of the parole system, which is to protect the safety of the community by reducing reoffending. Similar tests where community safety is of paramount consideration are already used in South Australia, Western Australia, Queensland and Victoria. An approach based on assessing and balancing risks to community safety better reflects the essential question that must be asked when deciding whether to release an offender on parole.

As a statutory body representing the community and its interests, the legislation of the State Parole Authority should focus on risk to community safety above all considerations. The proposed new test provides that the State Parole Authority must only release an offender on parole if it is satisfied that releasing the offender is in the interests of community safety. In making its decision, the State Parole Authority will be required to consider the risk to community safety of releasing the offender on parole, whether release on parole is likely to address the offender's risk of reoffending, and the risk to community safety if the offender is released at the end of the sentence without a period of parole supervision or is released at a later date with a shorter period of parole supervision.

The risk to community safety is broader than an assessment of the risk of reoffending. Many different considerations such as offence seriousness, criminal history, behaviour and progress in custody, family support, availability of counselling—to name just a few—are likely to be relevant to a full and balanced assessment of a risk that an offender would pose to community safety if he or she is paroled. Similarly, many factors would need to inform an assessment of the risk that an offender is likely to pose to community safety if he or she is not paroled. To inform its decision under the community safety test, the State Parole Authority will still be required to consider additional factors such as the nature and circumstances of the offence, the offender's criminal history and the effect of parole on the victim as is currently the case.

For offenders serving sentences for murder or manslaughter, the State Parole Authority will also be required to take into account whether the offender has disclosed the location of the victim's remains, giving those offenders some incentive to disclose this information. Requiring the State Parole Authority to focus on whether an offender has failed to disclose the location of a victim will help to hold offenders accountable for their behaviour by focusing attention on what they have done to make amends for their crime. It is also relevant to whether an offender has made progress towards rehabilitation and still presents a risk to the community. Overall, the reform to the test for release on parole will send a strong message that community safety is the paramount consideration when deciding to release an offender on parole and reinforces the goal of parole in considering community safety and reducing reoffending.

Item [6] introduces a requirement for the State Parole Authority before making changes to parole conditions to consider risk to the safety of the community, the likely effect on the victim, or whether changing a condition will assist in the management of the risk of breaches of parole. Item [10] provides that the State Parole Authority may revoke a parole order prior to an offender's release when there is a serious identifiable risk to community safety, or the offender poses a serious and immediate risk to their own safety, or the offender requests the revocation. Proposed new section 130 also enables the Attorney General, the Minister, the commissioner or a Communities Corrections officer to request such a revocation. Item [20] introduces a new power to allow the State Parole Authority to revoke parole where there is an increased risk to community safety, even if the offender has not breached a condition. The State Parole Authority will be able to exercise this power when it considers that the offender poses a serious and immediate risk to the safety of the community or any individual, or there is a serious and immediate risk that the offender will leave New South Wales.

The NSW Law Reform Commission recommended that the new power be introduced to ensure the State Parole Authority can act to protect the community regardless of whether an offender has technically complied with conditions. Proposed new section 170B imposes this recommendation. Schedule 1 [3] implements the recommendation of the Law Reform Commission to introduce a reintegration home detention scheme for the release of eligible and suitable offenders under home detention conditions for a period of up to six months before an offender's parole orders take effect and for procedures for the revocation of these orders. The scheme will create a short period of structured transition between custody and parole for those offenders. A similar scheme is used in South Australia and the United Kingdom. The Law Reform Commission noted that a reintegration home detention scheme provides offenders with opportunities to link with employment, training and community-based services and to re-establish family and social support networks while under more intense supervision than they would experience on parole.

Proposed section 124B sets out that the scheme will not be available for serious offenders or any offenders serving sentences for a domestic violence offence, a child sexual offence, a serious sex or violence offence, or a terrorism offence. Offenders will not be able to apply for reintegration home detention; referral by Community Corrections is the only avenue to reintegration home detention. Community Corrections will select offenders who are suitable to be referred to the State Parole Authority for consideration for reintegration home detention. The State Parole Authority will only make a reintegration home detention order if it is in the interests of community safety.

Proposed section 124F provides that for offenders serving sentences of more than three years, the State Parole Authority will first need to determine whether the offender is suitable for parole. The offenders participating in the reintegration home detention scheme will be subject to home detention conditions. Offenders will be required to remain at home unless an absence has been pre-approved, submit to electronic monitoring, and participate in programs and treatment. All offenders serving a sentence of more than three years will be reviewed by the State Parole Authority before transitioning from reintegration home detention to parole. If the State Parole Authority has concerns about an offender at this point, it can recall the offender to custody or extend the period the offender must spend on home detention by adding the home detention conditions to the offender's parole order.

Item [19] of schedule 1 sets out the procedures for revoking reintegration home detention orders. The State Parole Authority can decide whether or not to revoke a reintegration home detention order in the event of a breach. The State Parole Authority will also be able to revoke the order regardless of whether a breach has occurred if the offender presents a serious and immediate risk of harm to himself or herself or others. If the State Parole Authority revokes the reintegration home detention order, the offender will be returned to custody. The State Parole Authority can also revoke the offender's parole order when it revokes the reintegration home detention order. If it chooses not to revoke the parole order, the offender will be released on parole at the end of the non-parole period. If the State Parole Authority does revoke parole, the offender will be eligible to be reconsidered for parole after 12 months unless the offender can be reconsidered earlier under the manifest injustice circumstances.

Item [24] makes it clear that review is not available for the revocation of a reintegration home detention decision. This is because of the short six-month time period available for reintegration home detention orders prior to an offender becoming eligible for release on parole. If both reintegration home detention and parole are revoked, the offender will be entitled to a review hearing of the decision to revoke parole. Item [33] requires the State Parole Authority to provide reasons relating to decisions about reintegration home detention. Reintegration home detention will have more structure and a higher level of supervision than parole. It is a way to prepare offenders for life in the community to help reduce their likelihood of reoffending by providing a transitional step down between custody and parole.

Item [9] of schedule 1 imposes supervision as a condition of all parole orders in proposed new section 128C. New South Wales is the only Australian jurisdiction where supervision is not a mandatory parole condition, although supervision is imposed in about 98 per cent of cases. As evidence from Australia and overseas shows, supervision reduces reoffending. All parolees will now be required to accept supervision from Community Corrections and the regulations will continue to set out the implications of offenders subject to supervision. Item [9] also provides for a Community Corrections Officer to suspend supervision positions. This retains Community Corrections' current discretion to focus resources on offenders with higher risks and more complex needs where supervision will have the largest impact.

Resources will be targeted to offenders where they will be the greatest benefit to community safety. Supervision is most effective when it is targeted at the right offenders at the right time. Community Corrections officers will also be empowered to temporarily suspend offenders from curfew and place restriction and non-association conditions to prevent breaches being needlessly reported to the State Parole Authority. For example, an offender may be exempted from compliance with a curfew condition for a certain period of time to attend work or may be temporarily exempted from a place restriction or a condition in order to attend a medical appointment.

Item [16] of schedule 1 requires health service providers to provide information about whether an offender on parole has attended treatment, a program or activity as required under the parole order. This will enable Community Corrections officers to verify that a parolee is complying with conditions of parole or directions by a Community Corrections Officer. This new provision will clarify that privacy legislation does not prevent health service providers from providing this information to Community Corrections. However, this provision will not require the health service provider to disclose the content of any health service provided—for example, the notes of a session with a psychiatrist. It simply requires them to confirm that the offender is participating in the treatment program or other activity mandated by the parole order or a direction by a Community Corrections officer.

Item [13] of schedule 1 implements the Law Reform Commission's recommendations to replace court-based parole with statutory parole. Currently, the Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999 requires courts to set the non-parole period with a parole order. The reforms will provide courts the function of setting a non-parole period but remove the requirement to carry out the administrative step of making a parole order. The legislation simply requires the offender to be released on parole when the non-parole period expires, subject to conditions prescribed by the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999 and the related regulation. If Community Corrections considers additional conditions are necessary, it will apply to the State Parole Authority to have conditions added before the offender is released.

Statutory parole will be substantially the same as court-based parole but will simplify the framework, making sure additional conditions are more relevant and are set closer to the point of the offender's release. This will save courts the administrative task of making parole orders. Currently, the only legislative tools available to deal with breaches of parole are to do nothing, vary the conditions of a parole order, or just revoke parole. This all-or-nothing legislative approach does not reflect the reality that less serious breaches of parole need quick and effective responses that stop short of revoking parole. Community Corrections uses a range of case management strategies to deal with less serious breaches, such as warnings, tighter supervision requirements and referrals to relevant programs and services.

The bill will give Community Corrections and the State Parole Authority a clear range of sanctions to use in response to breaches. This will help them effectively manage risk and ensure compliance by authorising proportionate responses. This is in line with the Law Reform Commission's recommendations for a legislated system of graduated responses to breaches of parole. A similar framework exists in Queensland. Sanctions will be used together with interventions that help offenders take responsibility for their behaviour. This approach—in particular the use of intervention—has a strong evidence base from Australia and overseas, including in Canada and the United States of America. The approach being taken is about doing what has been shown to work to make the community safer and making the justice system work more efficiently.

Item [20] of schedule 1 gives Community Corrections a range of responses to manage less serious breaches of parole, including imposing reasonable directions and curfews. Responses will be applied immediately when the offender has committed a lower level breach. More serious breaches will be reported to the State Parole Authority. The graduated sanctions framework will mean there is a clear escalation for repeated non-compliance. Proposed new section 170A empowers the State Parole Authority to impose more onerous sanctions for the breach of a parole order, such as imposing electronic monitoring or up to 30 days home detention. It also provides for the State Parole Authority to revoke parole and to return an offender to custody. The State Parole Authority's discretion to revoke parole is not limited or otherwise affected by the new sanctions regime. Item [23] provides that when reviewing a revocation of a parole order, the State Parole Authority can now take into account any behaviour of an offender including whether an offender is alleged to have committed any offences while released on parole or after the revocation of a parole order.

The following amendments are proposed to clarify the kinds of information about offenders that can be disclosed to registered victims by the Corrective Services Victims Register. The amendments clarify that all registered victims may make submissions to the State Parole Authority. Sharing information about an offender in response to a registered victim's request shows respect for the victim's concerns and needs. It will help ensure that victims are treated with respect and dignity. Item [39] provides that the Serious Offenders Review Council or the State Parole Authority can delegate to the Victims Register any of their functions in relation to sharing information to registered victims about adult offenders.

This will ensure one point of contact with the correctional system for victims, simplify the process for obtaining information about offenders, and reduce the potential for confusion.

Item [40] requires the State Parole Authority to give notice to all registered victims about decisions on reintegration home detention and parole so they can make submissions to the State Parole Authority about these matters. Currently, only victims of serious offenders have the right to make submissions to the State Parole Authority. This item expands that right to all registered victims of all offenders and requires the State Parole Authority to notify them of the outcome of parole and reintegration home detention considerations. These changes are consistent with the Government's response to the Standing Committee on Law and Justice's 2016 report on the security classification and management of life prisoners, which aims to promote better engagement with victims. It is also consistent with the aim of the victims charter under the Victims Rights and Support Act 2013, which seeks to improve communication of information about offenders to victims.

The change to the information shared with victims also implements a proposal of the NSW Law Reform Commission's 2015 report on parole that registered victims should have equal procedural rights to participate in the parole decision-making process regardless of whether the offender is a serious or non-serious offender. Item [40] clarifies that the commissioner may provide information to registered victims of serious and non-serious offenders about any change to an offender's earliest possible release date, the death of an offender, an offender's escape from custody, the location of the correctional centre, and the security classification of the offender. Providing this information to victims helps them understand how inmates are managed and that changes may be made to an offender's security classification or prison location.

One of the themes that emerged from the Legislative Council's Standing Committee on Law and Justice 2016 inquiry was a lack of information or clarity for victims about how Corrective Services manages inmates and how this can negatively impact on victims. Legislating to share this information will support a more personal approach and will help ensure that victims are treated with respect and dignity. Item [16] provides for the Governor, in exercising the prerogative of mercy, to make a parole order in respect of an offender and to apply the legislative provisions for parole orders. This means that offenders released under the prerogative of mercy can be made subject to the same regime of supervision, monitoring and control as other offenders released from custody on parole, including revocation by the State Parole Authority in the event of a breach. This will streamline processes for managing offenders released to supervision in the community under the prerogative of mercy.

I will now turn to schedule 2 to the bill. Schedule 2 proposes amendments to the Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987. New South Wales has a separate juvenile parole system, where the Children's Court performs State Parole Authority's role as parole decision-maker and Juvenile Justice New South Wales supervises parolees. However, the juvenile parole system is currently governed by the same Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999 provisions as apply to the adult system. This is not fit for purpose and creates procedural difficulties. Under the proposal, the parole legislative framework will be improved by introducing separate age-appropriate provisions to govern the juvenile parole system. This will make the legislation governing the juvenile parole system more transparent and enable some aspects of the system to be made more appropriate for juveniles.

Item [3] of schedule 2 introduces a separate legislative framework for juvenile parole that provides an appropriate decision-making, supervision and management framework for the release of young offenders on parole in a new part 4C of the Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987. The proposed new section 38 introduces a new principle into the juvenile parole provisions. This principle notes that the purpose of parole for juveniles is to promote community safety, recognising that the rehabilitation and reintegration of children into the community may be a highly relevant consideration in promoting community safety. Most statutes that apply to juveniles in the criminal justice system contain objects or principles that guide decision-making or frame the operation of the Act to take into account the specific needs of young people. Rehabilitation is a particular focus of policy and law in the context of young people, and, therefore, has been included alongside the concept of community safety.

Proposed new section 40 also provides that the juvenile parole framework applies to offenders under 18 years. The Law Reform Commission noted that the criminal justice system makes a distinction between adults and children and draws the dividing line at 18 and that a dividing line needs to be drawn in the parole system for the sake of certainty. There will be two exceptions to the age-based cut-off. First, if the offender reaches the age of 18 years while on parole and the birthday occurs during the last 12 weeks of the parole period, it is operationally more efficient for the offender to remain in the juvenile parole system to finish his or her sentence. Secondly, there may be offenders who are over 18 who are particularly vulnerable.

New section 40 (3) provides that the secretary can consider if it is appropriate that an offender continues to be dealt with under this framework. It has been made clear that the secretary can determine a class of offenders who can continue to be dealt with under this framework. It may be more appropriate for Juvenile Justice officers to complete the report to the Children's Court and for the Children's Court to make the decision about release on parole for certain offenders. These provisions seek to strike an appropriate balance between these competing considerations.

Proposed section 41 retains the current jurisdiction of the Children's Court to determine matters relating to the parole of juvenile offenders. Children's magistrates have the necessary expertise to deal with children and can operate the parole system flexibly and with discretion. Proposed section 44 replaces court-based parole in the same way as for adults with statutory parole. Proposed section 46 introduces a community safety test to replace the current public interest test for release on parole. The test is the same as the test for adult parole, but the Children's Court will also be required to consider that the rehabilitation and reintegration of young offenders may be highly relevant to the safety of the community. The Law Reform Commission in particular noted that this is an important consideration for the Children's Court to apply in its parole decision-making.

Proposed division 3 of part 4C of the bill re-enacts machinery provisions from the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999. These relate to the release of offenders on parole, including considerations for the release date, release near public holidays and weekends and the continuance of a detention order while an offender is released on parole. Proposed division 4 of part 4C of the bill provides for the conditions and obligations of parole orders. It re-enacts provisions currently set out in the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999 permitting non-association and place restriction conditions to be imposed. When considering changing or imposing new conditions on the parole of a juvenile offender, the Children's Court is required to have regard to: whether the change in conditions will assist in the management of a risk to community safety; the likely effect on any victim of the offender; whether the change will assist in the management of the risk of breaches of parole; and whether the change in conditions will assist the offender's participation in rehabilitation programs and reintegration into the community, recognising the special needs of juveniles.

Proposed section 55 of schedule 2 provides that it will be a condition of parole that a juvenile offender is to be subject to supervision, consistent with the evidence that supervision reduces reoffending. Proposed section 56 provides that the Children's Court may grant exemptions from supervision conditions in exceptional circumstances. Proposed section 57 provides that a Juvenile Justice officer may suspend non-association conditions and place restriction conditions and supervision conditions.

Proposed new division 5 of part 4C carries over the presumption against parole for terrorism-related offenders as introduced to division 3A of part 6 of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999 in July 2017. Division 6 of part 4C of the bill provides for the Children's Court's powers to revoke parole before or after release into the community, consistent with the community safety theme in the adult parole bill. Proposed section 63 enables the Children's Court to revoke any parole order if satisfied that the offender would pose a serious identifiable risk to the community or a serious and immediate risk the offender's safety.

Proposed section 64 of the bill also provides for actions that can be taken in the event of a failure by an offender to comply with a parole order. The secretary may record the non-compliance without further action, give an informal warning to the offender, or in a more serious case refer the matter to the court with a recommendation as to the action that may be taken.

Proposed section 65 of the bill provides that the Children's Court may record the non-compliance without further action, give an informal warning to the offender, change the conditions of the parole order, or revoke the parole order. Proposed section 66 of the bill will also permit the court to revoke a parole order after the offender's release if it is satisfied that the offender poses a serious and immediate risk to the community or that there is a serious and immediate risk that the offender will leave New South Wales and that the risk cannot be mitigated sufficiently by directions by a Juvenile Justice officer or by changing the conditions of parole. This section will also permit the Children's Court to revoke parole if the offender has failed to appear in accordance with a notice to attend.

Proposed section 67 of the bill provides that a hearing may be held by the court at any time into whether an offender has failed to comply with the offender's obligations under a parole order. Power is conferred on the Attorney General, the Minister, or the Director of Public Prosecutions through proposed section 69 to request the court to exercise the power to revoke a parole order for an offender serving a sentence for a serious children's indictable offence on the ground that the order was made on the basis of false, misleading or irrelevant information.

Division 6 of part 4C of the bill also re-enacts the adult parole provision that permits an offender to seek to have the Supreme Court give a direction that information on which a revocation of a parole order was based was false, misleading or irrelevant. Division 7 of part 4C of the bill contains provisions relating to the reconsideration of parole. If the Children's Court refuses to make a parole order, the court must specify a new eligibility date for parole, a new date for a parole hearing or a date after which the juvenile offender may apply for parole. The juvenile parole bill is not carrying forward the 12-month rule that applies to adult offenders. The Law Reform Commission recommended removing this rule for juvenile offenders as it is not appropriate with regard to juveniles' special circumstances. The Law Reform Commission also recommended that the Children's Court should have the discretion to set a new date for parole consideration.

Proposed section 73 of the bill carries this recommendation forward. If the court revokes a parole order, the court must specify a new eligibility date for parole, a new date for a parole hearing, a date after which the juvenile offender may apply for parole, or defer determining any of those matters for up to three months. A juvenile offender may apply to the court for reconsideration of a decision about parole or to revoke parole before the date specified for making an application where new information has become available or the situation of the offender in relation to granting parole has materially changed since the decision to be reconsidered.

Proposed division 8 of part 4C of the bill sets out procedural provisions for hearings conducted by the Children's Court in the exercise of its parole functions. These include provisions relating to production of documents, giving evidence and making submissions. Procedural provisions in relation to breach and revocation have been drafted so that procedures are flexible, involve limited technicality, are responsive and are clear. The court will have flexibility to tailor its procedures as it thinks appropriate to avoid unnecessary delay and formality while ensuring that young offenders can be heard.

The notice-to-attend procedure works well for the Children's Court, giving the court the option to deal with breaches of parole without first returning the young offender to custody—in appropriate circumstances. The court has power to require a juvenile offender on parole to attend the court at a specified time and place and to require other persons to attend as witnesses and to produce relevant documents. Additionally, the options to vary conditions, warn and note a breach without taking action, which are recommended for the adult system, have been added to the range of options available to the Children's Court. This will increase transparency and facilitate the graduated sanctions approach being applied to young offenders.

Division 9 provides for the Governor, in exercising the prerogative of mercy, to make a parole order in respect of an offender and to apply the legislative provisions for parole orders in the same way as for adult offenders, with the exception that parole will be supervised by Juvenile Justice officers. The Juvenile Justice officers will monitor and control in the same way as other offenders released from custody on parole, including revocation by the Children's Court in the event of a breach. Division 10 includes miscellaneous provisions, carried over from the adult framework, regarding the Children's Court exercise of functions, notice of parole decisions, submissions by the secretary, security of information, and records of decisions. Schedules 3 and 4 to the bill make transitional arrangements.

These bills are the product of detailed consultation with stakeholders on the parole reforms. Consultation included the release of a NSW Law Reform Commission report in 2015 and submissions from members of the community, government agencies and non-government and legal stakeholders. Consultation on the bill included roundtables with the judiciary, the legal profession, government, and victims and advocacy groups. Each stakeholder was given copies of the bills and invited to provide written submissions on the bills. The amendments set out in this bill will further improve the parole system in New South Wales. The changes are designed to focus parole decision-making on community safety and increase supervision.

Evidence shows that a parole system that reintegrates offenders back into the community with supervision aimed at addressing offending behaviour works to reduce reoffending. This makes the community safer. Reducing reoffending means fewer victims. The Government's criminal justice reform package is backed by a \$237 million investment in programs designed to reduce reoffending. Community safety is the bedrock of these reforms and this reform package will continue this Government's trend of reducing crime across New South Wales. Overall, this bill will improve parole to make communities safer. With these tougher and smarter reforms, we are ensuring New South Wales will be safer for years to come. I commend the bill to the House.