

Parliamentary Budget Office - Election Policy Costing

NSW Parliament • Parliament House, Macquarie Street Sydney NSW 2000

Referred By: Coalition Proposal No: C015
Date Referred: 10/03/2015 Date Published: 23/03/2015

Proposal Title: TOUGH SENTENCING FOR CRIMINALS

Cluster: Justice

General Government Sector Impacts

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	4 Year Total
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Expenses (ex. depreciation)		925	2,030	2,275	5,229
Depreciation					-
Less: Offsets					-
Revenue					-
Net Operating Result:	-	(925)	(2,030)	(2,275)	(5,229)
		•			
Capital Expenditure					-
Capital Offsets					-
Capital Expenditure:	-	-	-	-	-
Net Lending/(Borrowing)	-	(925)	(2,030)	(2,275)	(5,229)
Net Financial Liabilities:	-	925	2,955	5,229	
Total State Sector Impacts					
Net Financial Liabilities:	_	925	2,955	5,229	

Notes and costing assumptions

The policy proposes to raise the current Standard Non-Parole Period (SNPP) for a range of firearms offences and to include additional firearms offences in the SNPP scheme.

The costing assumes the non-parole period for all newly convicted and existing incarcerated prisoners is increased by one year for offences under the *Firearms Act* and two years for offences under the *Prohibited Weapons Act* from 1 July 2015. Parole decisions will arise through the year so the 2015-16 costs reflect only a half year impact.

Based on the number of people sentenced under these two acts between June 2008 and June 2014, the costing assumes 27.3 people will be convicted in 2015-16. This has been escalated at 5 per cent per year, consistent with the average growth rate of recorded incidents for prohibited weapons offences over the past 9 years. The costing assumes the cost of housing an inmate is \$195 per day (\$71,175 per year) in 2015-16, escalated at 2.5 per cent per annum.

The policy also increases the maximum penalty for sexual intercourse with a child under 10 from 25 years to life imprisonment and includes 13 additional child sexual assault offences in the SNPP scheme. The costing assumes no budget impact: i) the number of convictions for these offences is negligible and, ii) of these, the average sentence is well below the maximum, so unless sentencing behaviour changes, changing the maximum penalty will not result in a material budget impact.