



LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr PS Russo MP (Chair)
Mr JP Lister MP (via teleconference)
Mr SSJ Andrew MP (via teleconference)
Mr JJ McDonald MP (via teleconference)
Mr CG Whiting MP (via teleconference)
Ms CP McMillan MP (via teleconference)

Staff present:

Ms M Westcott (Acting Committee Secretary)
Ms R Pye (Committee Support Officer)

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE COMMUNITY BASED SENTENCES (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) BILL 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FRIDAY, 30 AUGUST 2019

Brisbane

MONDAY, 30 AUGUST 2019

The committee met at 11.02 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Community Based Sentences (Interstate Transfer) Bill 2019. My name is Peter Russo. I am the member for Toohey and chair of the committee. Attending by teleconference are: James Lister, the member for Southern Downs and deputy chair; Jim McDonald, the member for Lockyer; Stephen Andrew, the member for Mirani; Corrine McMillan, the member for Mansfield; and Chris Whiting, the member for Bancroft, who is substituting for Melissa McMahan, the member for Macalister, who is unable to make it today.

On 21 August 2019, the Hon. Mark Ryan, the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services, introduced the Community Based Sentences (Interstate Transfer) Bill 2019 into the parliament. The bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for examination, with a reporting date of 8 October 2019. The purpose of the briefing today is to assist the committee with its examination of the bill.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and will be subject to my direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff if required. All those present today should note that it is possible you might be filmed or photographed during the proceedings. These images may be posted on the parliament's website or social media sites. Only the committee and invited officers may participate in the proceedings. As these are parliamentary proceedings, any person may be excluded from the hearing at my discretion or by order of the committee. I ask everyone present to turn mobile phones off or to silent mode.

HUMPHREYS, Mr Tom, General Manager, Strategy and Governance, Queensland Corrective Services

HUTCHINS, Ms Annika, Manager, Policy and Legislation, Strategy and Governance, Queensland Corrective Services

HYDE, Ms Sarah, General Manager, Community Corrections, Queensland Corrective Services

PORTER, Ms Rhiannon, Director, Operations, Community Corrections, Queensland Corrective Services

CHAIR: I welcome representatives from Queensland Corrective Services. I invite you to brief the committee, after which committee members will have some questions for you. Do you wish to make an opening statement?

Mr Humphreys: Yes, I do, Mr Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Community Based Sentences (Interstate Transfer) Bill 2019. Australian states and territories have longstanding national schemes based on model legislation to facilitate the interstate transfer of adult prisoners and parolees. The Community Based Sentences (Interstate Transfer) Bill 2019 complements these existing schemes to provide the ability for offenders on a community based sentence to have their sentence registered and managed interstate.

In Queensland, community based sentences may be issued for a range of offences. Orders include probation, community service orders, intensive corrections orders and drug and alcohol treatment orders. For many of these, depending on the specific conditions imposed, there are comparable community based sentences in jurisdictions across Australia. The ability for an offender to transfer a community based sentence between jurisdictions within Australia can enhance family and community support, provide employment or study opportunities and support offender rehabilitation.

In relation to the history of the bill, in 2003 the Corrective Services Ministers' Conference agreed to implement a nationally consistent legislative scheme to facilitate the transfer of community based sentences between jurisdictions. Ministers approved the development of model legislation, with any
Brisbane

necessary local variations, to implement an agreed national policy to give statutory support to the supervision and monitoring of community based offenders as they move and travel around Australia, including the capacity to deal with offenders who breach the conditions of their orders.

The model legislation defines which community based sentences are eligible for transfer; outlines the documents required to be provided when requesting a transfer; provides registration criteria the offender is required to meet to be transferred; outlines the criteria the interstate jurisdiction must consider prior to accepting or declining the transfer request; and, if the transfer request is accepted, provides for the registration of the sentence in the accepting jurisdiction and future responsibility of the sentence, including breaches.

In 2011 the model legislation was endorsed by the former Standing Committee on Law and Justice, which is now known as the Council of Attorneys-General. All other jurisdictions, with the exception of the Northern Territory, are adopting the model legislation. Western Australia and Tasmania enacted the legislation in 2009, Victoria in 2013 and South Australia in 2015.

In relation to the existing processes for offenders to move interstate, there are a number of circumstances where it is appropriate and desirable for an adult offender to be voluntarily transferred to another jurisdiction to serve the remainder of their community based sentence. This includes support for an offender's rehabilitation prospects—for example, where an offender has family residing interstate or a confirmed employment opportunity outside of Queensland—or offenders who usually reside in another jurisdiction, however they have committed their offence in Queensland.

Without this bill, no legislative authority exists for community based sentences to be transferred in or out of Queensland. Instead Queensland Corrective Services relies on informal arrangements with other states and territories to transfer the administration of orders interstate via the issuing of a travel permit with limited conditions, which is permitted under the Penalties and Sentences Act. Under these informal arrangements, an offender on a community based sentence is able to move interstate and be informally supervised by a relevant corrections authority. Queensland manages approximately 87 interstate community based offenders under this informal arrangement. Offenders are predominantly from New South Wales. Other states and territories manage approximately 147 Queensland offenders under this arrangement.

Turning to the bill, the bill provides that a community based sentence imposed in one state or territory can be transferred to another state or territory by registration—thereby transferring all responsibility for the sentence from the issuing state or territory to the receiving state or territory. The scope of the bill is limited to the interstate transfer of community based sentences of adult offenders under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992. This excludes juvenile offenders, offenders on a forensic order under the Mental Health Act 2016, offenders on parole, offenders with a sentence that imposes a fine or financial penalty and offenders with a sentence that requires them to make a specific act or reparation to a specific person who has been caused harm or loss by the offender.

Turning to the process for requesting transfer, a request for a transfer must be made in writing in a prescribed form. This includes providing details of the offender and any other information that is required for Queensland Corrective Services to make a decision about the transfer. This could include, for example, documents detailing protection or domestic violence orders against the offender or the offender's previous criminal history. Queensland Corrective Services has the authority to request any additional information on the offender that may be held by the interstate jurisdiction. Similarly, other jurisdictions can request additional information from Queensland Corrective Services when considering a transfer request of a Queensland offender. The offender can withdraw their consent for the transfer at any time. However, if this is done after the sentence is registered in an interstate jurisdiction, another interstate request is required.

Turning to the registration criteria, the bill provides criteria that must be met for an offender to transfer their community based sentence to another jurisdiction. The requirements include: the offender has consented to the order and has not withdrawn consent; there is a sentence in the receiving jurisdiction that corresponds to the sentence imposed in the interstate jurisdiction; the offender can comply with the sentence in the receiving jurisdiction; and the sentence can be safely, efficiently and effectively administered in the receiving jurisdiction. The registration criteria allows Queensland Corrective Services to exercise discretion when deciding to register an interstate sentence in Queensland—for example, where an offender has a history of not complying with directions issued by community corrections officers.

Turning to the decision process, for each transfer request Queensland Corrective Services can decide to register the sentence, require the offender to meet certain preconditions before registering the sentence or decline to register the interstate sentence. Imposing preconditions allows the receiving

jurisdiction to clarify whether an offender can and is willing to comply with the sentence in their jurisdiction—for example, evidence to demonstrate the offender will live at a certain place or that they will report to a corrective services officer in the receiving jurisdiction within a certain time frame. The ability to decline registering the sentence exists even if all eligibility criteria and/or preconditions are met. This is particularly relevant in cases where, for example, Queensland Corrective Services becomes aware of concerns expressed by an individual for their safety if the offender were to reside in Queensland. Once an offender's sentence is registered in the receiving jurisdiction, the offender is managed in the receiving jurisdiction as if the court in the receiving jurisdiction had imposed the order. This includes that the offence for which the sentence was imposed is taken to be an offence against the law of the receiving jurisdiction.

Turning to breach action and resentencing, significantly, breaches of the community based sentence by the offender are dealt with by the courts of the receiving jurisdiction. Once a sentence is registered interstate, breach action is no longer able to be dealt with in the original jurisdiction. This includes whether the breach happened before or happens after the registration of the sentence in the receiving jurisdiction. This recognises that, while rare, a case may arise in which a breach that occurred prior to registration is not discovered until after registration. It therefore allows the receiving jurisdiction to still act on that breach. It also prevents offenders from being subject to separate proceedings in each jurisdiction for the same breach.

For the purpose of determining the penalty to be imposed for resentencing the offence, the penalty is taken to be the penalty imposed under law of the originating jurisdiction. Treating breaches in this way avoids the need for offence or penalty matching between jurisdictions which would be administratively inefficient and ineffective to establish and maintain. This also ensures that the transfer does not serve to avoid the sentencing intentions of the original jurisdiction. However, these provisions do not apply if Queensland is the originating jurisdiction—for example, if a Queensland offender has transferred their sentence interstate and then transfers the sentence back to Queensland.

Turning to travel permits, the bill also enables ministerial arrangements to be entered into to oversee the administration of offenders on community based sentences travelling interstate on an approved travel permit rather than a formal transfer. This provision enables offenders to temporarily travel interstate—for example, for short-term work—and return to their originating jurisdiction, while ensuring risks to the community for any noncompliance can be mitigated. This includes, but is not limited to, empowering the interstate authority to issue an arrest warrant if the offender's travel permit is no longer in force.

New South Wales and Tasmania are the only jurisdictions to include the ministerial arrangements provision in their legislation, and it is included in the Queensland bill. The inclusion of this provision does not require Queensland to enter into a ministerial arrangement; however, given that the majority of offenders travelling in and out of Queensland are going to New South Wales or from New South Wales, it would be open to Queensland to use this provision once the legislation is enacted. The ministerial arrangement enables flexibility to manage the risk of in-state community based offenders travelling interstate which is mutually beneficial and responds to the operational needs of each jurisdiction. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to address the committee about the bill. We are happy to take questions.

CHAIR: Will this legislation result in offenders who have transferred out of Queensland receiving the same level of supervision or having different obligations than they would here?

Mr Humphreys: Firstly, community based orders are a vital component of the criminal justice system. They are crucial in reducing the risk of reoffending and achieving rehabilitation through supervision as well as diverting offenders from a sentence of imprisonment. There are a number of circumstances where it is appropriate and desirable for an adult offender to be voluntarily transferred to another jurisdiction to serve the remainder of their community based order. Some examples include: where a person has family residing interstate or a confirmed employment opportunity outside of Queensland and their rehabilitation prospects would be enhanced by the transfer; a perpetrator wishing to move interstate to remove themselves from a domestic violence situation; a person wishing to move interstate to move away from criminal associates; a person needing to access medical treatment in another state or territory; or a person normally residing in another state or territory who committed their offence in Queensland or vice versa.

Before a sentence can be transferred, certain requirements must be met including: that there is a corresponding order in the other jurisdiction; that the offender is capable of complying with the receiving jurisdiction's order; and that the order is capable of being effectively administered. These requirements are really about ensuring there is parity between how people are managed in each jurisdiction. In deciding whether there is a corresponding order in the receiving jurisdiction, that

jurisdiction must consider whether the penalty is of the same nature as the penalty imposed in Queensland and that the conditions of the order are substantially the same as those in the Queensland order.

QCS decisions as to whether to support an offender to transfer out of Queensland will be based on the risk and needs of the offender, including consideration of whether the sentence in the receiving jurisdiction will provide an appropriate level of supervision and/or conditions to support the offender's rehabilitation.

Mr LISTER: If someone on some sort of community corrections order is granted an interstate transfer they are subject to the conditions of the original jurisdiction, even if such conditions would not normally be imposed or are not part of the legal system in the receiving state; is that correct?

Mr Humphreys: That is correct. In deciding whether there is a corresponding order in the receiving jurisdiction, that jurisdiction must consider whether the penalty is of the same nature as the penalty imposed in Queensland and that the conditions of the order are substantially the same as those in the Queensland order, so the answer to that question is yes.

Ms McMILLAN: From the time the interstate transferee applies for the process, what is the time frame of being relocated?

Mr Humphreys: We consider transfer requests and they are considered by other jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis. Of course, it is in everyone's interest for these decisions to be made as expeditiously as possible, but it is a case-by-case scenario. For example, either party may request additional information prior to formally considering the request, and depending on the level of detail required that information might take some time. Our understanding is that at a maximum a transfer process would take around three months, but, as I said, that is a maximum and they may be completed considerably more quickly than that. It is a case-by-case process and it does depend on the nature of the offender and their risks and needs. In some cases the process will conclude with a decision not to support the transfer, in which case the transfer does not proceed.

Ms McMILLAN: Obviously, having family support would be significant.

Mr Humphreys: Absolutely. Family support is well recognised as a very central factor in an offender's rehabilitation. It is certainly something that we try to strengthen where possible. In the absence of other mitigating factors, family support would be considered a significant and valid reason for an offender seeking to transfer in or out of Queensland.

CHAIR: Mr Andrew, member for Mirani, do you have a question?

Mr ANDREW: I am good at this stage, thank you, Mr Chair.

Mr WHITING: My question is about the register of sentences. Obviously, we have a pre-existing Queensland database. Do we need to establish a new database or would it exist within the current one?

Mr Humphreys: No. We have a single database within Queensland Corrective Services for registering and managing people on community based orders. That database is called the Integrated Offender Management System, IOMS. As I have said, we already manage people from other jurisdictions and those who are informally transferred to other jurisdictions, and we have done so for many years. IOMS does cater for that, so there is no need to establish a new database under this bill.

Mr McDONALD: Maybe I am a parochial Queensland, but if I was an offender from a different jurisdiction and I could move to Queensland and fulfil my order then I would like to do that. Has any contingency or budget been allowed for this, or is there an interstate transfer scheme to meet the service demands that I believe we will see in relation to this scheme?

Mr Humphreys: Of course everyone would want to move to Queensland, so we can certainly understand the question. As at 30 June 2019 there were 87 interstate community based offenders being supervised by Queensland Corrective Services and 147 Queensland community based offenders being supervised interstate. At the moment there are actually more Queensland offenders in other states than we are managing here, but overall the ratio is generally one to one and we would expect that that would be maintained. We do not consider that we would expect any significant increase under the legislation of offenders either seeking transfer in or seeking a transfer out. I should also mention that the bill allows us in all cases to reserve the right to refuse a transfer in, even if a person may be otherwise eligible on all other criteria.

CHAIR: This piece of legislation is purely to deal with people who are on community based orders. It does not deal with interstate transfers in relation to sentenced prisoners?

Mr Humphreys: No, it does not.

CHAIR: I think you touched on this before, but what kind of information will be considered during the application for incoming and outgoing transfers, and who will make that decision?

Mr Humphreys: For a community based order to be transferred to another jurisdiction under the national scheme, the offender, the originating jurisdiction and the receiving jurisdiction must all consent to the transfer. That is one important piece of information.

The bill stipulates that the information is required to be provided to the receiving jurisdiction when making a request for an interstate transfer. This includes the offender's name, date of birth and last known address, for obvious reasons; a copy of the original sentence; a copy of the offender's consent; a copy of all relevant pre-sentence reports about the offender; a copy of all relevant psychological or other assessments; all details about the offender held by the originating jurisdiction, including their criminal history and compliance for any non-custodial sentences; a statement outlining which part of their sentence has already been served; a statement outlining that the offender understands that once their sentence is registered in the receiving jurisdiction they are bound by the law of the receiving jurisdiction, any breach action will be undertaken by the receiving jurisdiction and the consequences for a breach in the receiving jurisdiction may be different than in the originating jurisdiction; and any other information that may be required—of course, that really depends on the specific case.

The criteria that must be met before a sentence can be registered in the receiving jurisdiction are: that the offender consents to the transfer; that there is a corresponding community based sentence in the receiving jurisdiction; that the offender is capable of complying with the interstate sentence; and that the interstate jurisdiction is capable of safely, efficiently and effectively administering the sentence. The decision-maker will be the delegate of the chief executive of Queensland Corrective Services, the commissioner.

CHAIR: Member for Southern Downs, do you have a question?

Mr LISTER: No further questions from me, thank you, Mr Chair.

CHAIR: From some of the information that you have already presented to the committee, I understand that Queensland can refuse to accept an offender, even if all the formal criteria are met. Is that assumption correct?

Mr Humphreys: Yes, that is the case.

CHAIR: Could you expand on the circumstances in which that may occur?

Mr Humphreys: As I have said, the registration criteria allows Queensland Corrective Services and other jurisdictions to exercise discretion when deciding to register an interstate sentence. The foremost example is where an offender has a history of not complying with directions issued by community corrections orders. It is in neither the receiving state's nor the originating state's interests for an offender who is not compliant with their order to transfer. That is not in the interests of community safety or rehabilitation. We certainly would reserve the right to refuse a transfer request for an offender who is clearly noncompliant with their order. By the same token, if an offender in Queensland is seeking to transfer out of Queensland and is noncompliant with their order, we are not likely to support that request.

CHAIR: Member for Mirani, do you have any questions at this point?

Mr ANDREW: No, I am right at this point. I am still listening, thank you, Mr Chair.

CHAIR: Member for Mansfield, do you have any questions?

Ms McMILLAN: No further questions.

CHAIR: Given the informal arrangements that have existed with other jurisdictions for many years, why is the bill necessary?

Mr Humphreys: Without this legislation in place, no legislative authority exists for community based sentences to be transferred in or out of Queensland. We currently rely on informal arrangements with other states and territories to temporarily transfer the administration of community based sentences interstate by the issuing of a travel permit with limited conditions. Of course, travel permits, as the name implies, really are more appropriately used for offenders who are leaving a jurisdiction and returning. Under these informal arrangements, an offender on a community based sentence order is able to move interstate and be informally supervised by a relevant corrections authority. This arrangement does require agreement by the offender, Queensland Corrective Services and the originating or receiving corrections authority. To that extent, it is similar to the scheme that will exist under the bill.

However, without participation in the national scheme, there are no powers to initiate breach action where an offender is not abiding by the conditions of their sentence. Instead, responsibility to manage the sentence resides with the originating jurisdiction. You can imagine that the process for prosecuting a breach of an order where that person is interstate and the responsibility for prosecution has to be sent back to the originating jurisdiction can be quite cumbersome. Jurisdictions also have different internal processes and each one requires a diverse range of information prior to accepting the interstate transfer of an offender. Without legislative clarity, there is often difficulty in identifying comparable sentences and conditions between jurisdictions. Sentencing is obviously a state jurisdiction and states do have different frameworks for their sentencing legislation.

We see Queensland's participation in the national scheme via this legislation mitigating the risks associated with the current informal transfer arrangements by providing an ability for an offender to have their community based sentence formally transferred, ensuring appropriate management and supervision can occur in the receiving interstate jurisdiction and ensuring that any contravention can be dealt with swiftly in the receiving interstate jurisdiction and particularly limiting the requirement for costly enforcement and extradition action following an offender's contravention of a community based sentence, so that they do not have to be brought back to Queensland to be dealt with by a Queensland court.

I should mention that these informal arrangements are certainly not new. I cannot actually pinpoint when they commenced, but to our knowledge it certainly commenced no later than the 1990s and possibly before. Those arrangements have served us well, but the model legislation does provide a more solid framework for managing people who need to move between states.

Mr McDONALD: Thanks again for the answers given. The ministers agreed originally in 2003. With community based orders being such a critical part of corrective action and corrective efforts in prisoners' rehabilitation, why has it taken so long to get to this point?

CHAIR: Jim, I do not know if that is an appropriate question for the representatives from Queensland Corrective Services to answer. You are asking a policy question. You are also asking them for an opinion as to why it took so long.

Mr McDONALD: Could I ask a different question, then?

CHAIR: Yes, or you can rephrase the one that you asked. It is up to you.

Mr McDONALD: I accept your guidance, Mr Chair. Mr Humphreys, were there any delays from the department in regard to this bill coming to parliament, given that the 2003 conference of ministers agreed?

Mr Humphreys: Obviously the timing of consideration of legislation is a matter for government and I am not able to comment specifically on that. However, I can give a chronology of the development of this legislation over time, which I think might answer most of your question. There is a very extensive history behind this. Anyone who has been involved in model legislation knows that it can be a very slow process for all jurisdictions to come on board.

The first consideration of this legislation was actually in 1996. The Corrective Services Administrators Council—that is, the CEOs—and the Corrective Services Ministers Conference endorsed a project to commence developing the legislation for the reciprocal transfer and enforcement of community based sentences. As I have mentioned, in 2003 the Corrective Services Ministers Conference first agreed to implement a nationally consistent legislative scheme. Following that, the model legislation was drafted by the ACT Parliamentary Counsel's Office on behalf of all jurisdictions and, of course, there were negotiations between jurisdictions in the drafting of that legislation. It was then trialled by New South Wales and the ACT, which of course have to have a very close relationship in relation to the management of offenders.

In 2007, the ministers resolved that all jurisdictions that had not yet done so should enact the model legislation. That was not the conclusion of that process, however. In 2010, the ministers endorsed amendments to the legislation which were this time drafted by the New South Wales Parliamentary Counsel. These included clarifying definitions and the ability to enter into ministerial arrangements for travel permits. In 2011 the model legislation was endorsed by the former standing committee on law and justice.

This is not an unusual process for how model legislation is developed. It can take many years, even after there is a formal agreement to implement it. Certainly jurisdictions have progressively implemented it over time. In Queensland's case, Queensland Corrective Services, under administrative arrangements changes, became a department only relatively recently, in late 2017. Becoming a standalone department has enabled us to commence a legislation program to allow a specific and

sustained focus on the development and reform of the correctional system. This particular bill was the top of our list on that legislation program once we became a department and had the capacity to progress a legislation program.

CHAIR: How does the legislation support offender rehabilitation?

Mr Humphreys: The ability for an offender to transfer a community based sentence between jurisdictions supports rehabilitation in many potential ways—for instance, by allowing for connections to existing family support, employment and training opportunities, assisting to reduce feelings of isolation, and also stabilising accommodation. The research tells us that all of those things are extremely important for offender rehabilitation and there is a variety or a gamut of reasons why those factors may not be present where an offender is in one jurisdiction but those factors could be improved or strengthened if they were to move to another jurisdiction.

There are also some very specific reasons where a transfer might be in each party's interest. These might include where a person wishes to move interstate to remove themselves from a domestic violence situation, for example; a person wishing to move interstate to move away from criminal associates, make a new break and get out of a criminal lifestyle; occasionally, people may wish to access medical treatment that is available in another state or territory or is available in Queensland and not in other places; and of course, as I have mentioned, where someone has committed their offence in Queensland and would normally reside elsewhere.

CHAIR: We are getting fairly close to finishing time. Member for Southern Downs, do you have a further question?

Mr LISTER: No, nothing more from me, thank you, Mr Chair.

CHAIR: Member for Bancroft, do you have a question?

Mr WHITING: Yes. Is it common for community based offenders to temporarily travel to Queensland for us to administer them? Does that happen often?

Mr Humphreys: To give a sense of the scale, in total we manage approximately 21,000 people in the community. Not all of those people are under community based orders. A sizeable proportion of that number are people under parole orders, which is not relevant to this legislation. As I have previously stated, although the member may not have heard, the number of offenders being supervised by Queensland Corrective Services from other jurisdictions is approximately 87. That is quite a small proportion of the overall population of offenders that we manage on a daily basis.

CHAIR: Is the legislation consistent with other jurisdictions? Have any specific local changes been included?

Mr Humphreys: Even though it is model legislation, it is drafted by Queensland Parliamentary Counsel, so there are Queensland references to other acts in the legislation. I draw attention to the capacity under this bill to enter into ministerial arrangements with other jurisdictions in relation to travel permits. This requires reciprocal arrangements, obviously, with other jurisdictions. It could not be implemented in only one jurisdiction, but in this particular case New South Wales and Tasmania have included ministerial arrangements in their legislation. New South Wales in particular, given the geography of the Gold Coast and the Tweed area, is a very important partner for us, so it makes sense for us to include a provision for ministerial arrangements to be entered into to allow travel permits in this bill.

CHAIR: The time allocated for the briefing has now expired. Thank you, Mr Humphreys, Ms Hyde, Ms Porter and Ms Hutchins for appearing today. Thank you to the secretariat staff and Hansard. A transcript of the proceedings will be available on the committee's web page in due course. I declare this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into Community Based Sentences (Interstate Transfer) Bill 2019 closed.

The committee adjourned at 11.46 am.