

Key Brief Number: IG-01

**Home Affairs Portfolio
Department of Home Affairs
Supplementary Estimates Hearing – November 2024**

KEY BRIEF**Topic: Migration Strategy and Reform****Responsible Deputy:** Dr Emma Cassar PSM, Associate Secretary Immigration**Key Top Lines**

- The Migration Strategy, released on 11 December 2023, contained 8 key actions. The Department of Home Affairs is on track to implement the Migration Strategy reforms.

2024-25 Budget measures

- The Government has allocated \$22.2 million over 4 years from 2024-25 for delivery of the Migration Strategy in 2024–25 Budget, comprising:
 - o \$1.4 million in 2024–25 to create a new National Innovation visa, including the permanent closure of the Business Innovation and Investment visa Program (BIIP). The new National Innovation visa is on track for implementation in late 2024 and the BIIP closed to new applicants on 31 July 2024;
 - o \$3.9 million over 4 years from 2024–25 to transition to a multi-year migration planning model using a four-year horizon for permanent non-humanitarian visas, excluding the Pacific Engagement visa. The new planning model is on track to commence from the beginning of 2025–26. Department engagement with states and territories on this initiative is ongoing;
 - o \$1.9 million in 2024–25 to design a data-matching arrangement with the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) to strengthen detection of employers who may be underpaying, or otherwise exploiting, temporary skilled visa holders. The Department and ATO are developing a pilot arrangement, including settling specifications for data requirements and safeguards for data usage; and
 - o \$15.0 million over 3 years from 2024–25 to design an information and education package to empower migrant workers by providing accurate and appropriate information about workplace safeguards, protections and compliance measures related to migration rules. Work is under way to develop the content of the package and consider arrangements for its delivery.

Handling Notes:

- Lead witness is Michael Burke, First Assistant Secretary, Immigration Policy.
- For implementation of skilled visa changes and international education (including the National Planning level), the lead witness is Damien Kilner, First Assistant Secretary, Immigration Programs.

Key Points

- **Targeting temporary skilled migration to address skills needs and promote worker mobility:**
 - o The new temporary Skills in Demand visa is on track to commence in late 2024.

Key Brief Number: IG-01

- This will cover the Specialist Skills and Core Skills Pathways.
- **Reshaping permanent skilled migration to drive long-term prosperity:**
 - On 24 April 2024, the Government published a discussion paper *Reform of the skilled visa points test* for public consultation. Submissions closed on 24 May 2024. We received 204 submissions within scope of the Review and these are being considered.
 - On 31 July 2024, the BIIP closed to new applications, with refunds now available for withdrawals after that date. The National Innovation visa will commence in late 2024.
- **Strengthening the integrity and quality of international education:**
 - On 23 March 2024, English language requirements for Student and Temporary Graduate visas were raised and a Genuine Student requirement was introduced. Regulations were also made on 23 March 2024 to support the Immigration Minister's powers to issue suspension certificates to high-risk education providers.
 - On 1 July 2024, Migration Regulations reduced the general age cut-off for the Temporary Graduate visa from 50 to 35 years and restricted onshore visa-hopping by preventing some temporary visa holders from applying for a Student visa in Australia.
- **Tackling worker exploitation and the misuse of the visa system:**
 - The Department is planning for the commencement of a public register of approved sponsors by the end of 2024 – subject to passage of legislation before Parliament.
 - 2024 Budget measures are on track to develop an information and education package for migrant workers, and develop data sharing arrangements with ATO to identify employers who might be exploiting temporary skilled visa holders.
- **Planning migration to get the right skills in the right places:**
 - The Migration Program multi-year planning model is on track to start from 2025–26.
- **Tailoring regional visas and the Working Holiday Maker program to support regional Australia and its workers.**
 - On 15 December 2023, a Ministerial Direction (No. 105) made visa processing for employer sponsored migrants working in regional areas the top priority.
 - On 21 June 2024, the Government published a discussion paper *Supporting strong and sustainable regions – Review of Regional Migration Settings*. 341 submissions were received. A program of in-person and virtual consultation sessions is under way.
- **Deepening our people-to-people ties in the Indo-Pacific.** (partnering Foreign Affairs)
 - On 29 March 2024, Migration legislation changes enabled use of ballots to select applicants for the new Pacific Engagement visa. The first ballot opened for registrations on 3 June 2024 and has now closed. The visa has 3,000 places annually.
- **Simplifying the migration system to improve the experience for migrants and employers:**
 - Skilled, family, visitor and student visa reforms are expected to enable the removal of unneeded visa subclasses in these areas later in 2024. This work is progressing.

Consultation

- The Chief Finance Officer has cleared financial data contained within this brief.

Key Brief Number: IG-02

**Home Affairs Portfolio
Department of Home Affairs
Supplementary Estimates Hearing – November 2024**

KEY BRIEF**Topic: Removals Bill****Responsible Deputy:** Dr Emma Cassar PSM, Associate Secretary Immigration**Key Top Lines**

- A robust legislative framework is critically important for the management of the migration system. There is no more important element than decisions on who may come to Australia, and who has to leave.
 - o The Bill provides the Government with new powers to assist in the removal of non-citizens who have come to the end of a lengthy set of processes to determine their right to remain in Australia, and who have no valid reason to remain.
- The Bill will not expand the cohort of people required to be removed from Australia, and does not change Australia's commitment to our non-refoulement obligations.
- The proposed Government Sponsored amendments are intended to clarify and strengthen removal powers and support ongoing effective management of the Bridging Visa (Removal Pending) cohort in the community.

Handling Notes:

- Michael Burke, FAS Immigration Policy Division will lead on the policy rationale for the Bill. Clare Sharp, GM Legal will lead on legal matters. Michael Thomas, GM Immigration Compliance will lead on caseload statistics. CJATF will lead on matters related to Operation Sovereign Borders.

Key Points

- The primary purpose of this Bill is to strengthen the tools available to the Government to effect the removal of non-citizens who have no valid reason to remain in Australia and to effectively manage Bridging Visa R holders in the community.

If asked: Is this legislation still required following the ASF17 outcome?

- Yes, the proposed new powers are required. Without legislative amendments, the Migration Act would not provide a means to robustly and appropriately manage removal pathway non-citizens who are not engaging with their removal efforts.

If asked: Why does the Bill include the power to prescribe other substantive visas for the purposes of the definition of 'removal pathway non-citizen'?

- This power is intended to provide appropriate flexibility should another type of visa be determined in future to be the most appropriate visa for non-citizens to maintain lawful status in the community while making arrangements to depart or be removed from Australia.

Key Brief Number: IG-02

- Any regulations that are made to prescribe other visas would be disallowable by either House of Parliament, and subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

If asked: Does the Bill risk non-compliance with Australia's non-refoulement obligations?

- Australia does not return individuals to countries in respect of which they have been found to engage Australia's non-refoulement obligations. The Bill does not change this.

If asked: Does the Bill create a risk to personal safety where a person is directed to engage with a country they are fleeing from?

- A removal pathway direction cannot require a person to interact with a country in relation to which a protection finding has been made for that person, and cannot be issued while the person has an ongoing protection visa process.

If asked: Will mandatory sentencing constrain judicial discretion?

- The penalty provisions are equivalent to those associated with offences agreed to by the Parliament in the *Migration Amendment (Bridging Visa Conditions) Act 2023* and the *Migration and Other Legislation Amendment (Bridging Visas, Serious Offenders and Other Measures) Act 2023*.
- The Government considers that the offence set out in this Bill is of equal gravity given the frustration of migration law involved and the damage to the integrity of Australia's migration and temporary entry programs.
- Any charges brought as a result of non-compliance with a direction would be subject to the standard criminal justice process. Any sentence imposed, including a term of imprisonment, would be a matter for the courts, if the non-citizen is convicted for the offence under section 199E following prosecution and trial.

If asked: What countries may be designated removal concern countries?

- PII has been claimed by the Minister on this question ([Attachment A](#), IQ24-000113 refers), on the basis a response could damage international relations and national security.
- Disclosure of this information would likely impact Australia's ability to engage with international partners and to pursue removal of unlawful non-citizens in the future.

If asked: Will those rejected by the 'fast track' process have their claims re-assessed?

- Under legislation establishing the Administrative Review Tribunal on 14 October 2024, the Immigration Assessment Authority (IAA) and Fast Track assessment process are being abolished, to standardise and harmonise migration and protection visa review processes with other Tribunal caseloads.
- Any decision under review at the IAA, or which would have otherwise been referred to the IAA for review, will be transitioned to the new Administrative Review Tribunal upon commencement.
- Those with new, credible protection claims relating to changes in their country of origin or personal circumstances may request Ministerial Intervention.

If asked: Effect of the Bill on irregular migration pull factors?

- The Department is confident the Bill itself does not create any potential pull factors.
- The Department is aware that people smugglers may seek to misrepresent the Bill to market their services to vulnerable potential irregular immigrants, as is the case with any legislative or policy changes (real or perceived).

Key Brief Number: IG-02

- The Bill includes an express provision that means that persons outside Australia can continue to apply offshore for resettlement under Australia's Refugee and Humanitarian Program even if their country of nationality is designated as a removal concern country.

If asked: Response to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee Inquiry Report

- The Committee released its report into the Bill on 7 May 2024 [note: a summary of the Report is at Attachment B. The Government is currently considering the Report.
- The Bill is currently before the Senate.

If asked: What is the timeline for the development of this Bill?

22 February 2024	Potential legislative options and related policy matters were discussed with Ministers and advisors.
5 March 2024	A submission proposing legislation was provided to the Minister for Home Affairs, copied to the Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs.
5 March 2024	The first drafting instructions for the Bill were issued by the Department to the Office of Parliamentary Counsel.
22 March 2024	The draft Bill was settled for consideration and text approval by the Minister for Immigration, Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, ahead of the Legislation Approval Process (LAP) and related processes in line with the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet's <i>Legislation Handbook</i> .
26 March 2024	The Bill was introduced into the House of Representatives and passed by the House on the same day.
27 March 2024	The Bill was subsequently introduced into the Senate and was referred by the Senate to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee.
Current	The Bill remains before the Senate.

Consultation

- JATF-OSB. Legal Group (AS Legislation) has cleared the legal information in this brief.

Attachments

Attachment A: MS24-000687 – PII claim for matters raised in QoNs (letter from Minister Giles to Chair Green)

Attachment B: Summary of Committee Report



**THE HON ANDREW GILES MP
MINISTER FOR IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP AND
MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS**

MS24-000687

Senator Nita Green
Chair, Senate Standing Committee
Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Senator Green

I refer to the written Questions on Notice asked by the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs regarding the Migration Amendment (Removals and Other Measures Bill) 2024 on 14 and 19 April 2024. The questions, one asked by Senator Paterson and five asked by Senator Shoebridge, have been attached to this letter.

Paragraph (3) of the order of the Senate of 13 May 2009 provides that:

If a minister, on a reference by an officer under paragraph (2), concludes that it would not be in the public interest to disclose the information or document to the committee, the minister shall provide to the committee a statement of the ground for that conclusion, specifying the harm to the public interest that could result from the disclosure of the information or document.

Grounds

I consider that the disclosure of information as part of associated responses to these questions, including any subsequent requests for the production of documents, could reasonably be expected to cause damage to Australia's international relations, national security and be an unreasonable disclosure of personal privacy.

Released by Department of Home Affairs
under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

Reasons

In relation to the damage to Australia's international relations and national security, the disclosure of this information would likely impact Australia's ability to positively engage with mentioned country partners through diplomatic avenues, and to pursue the removal of unlawful non-citizens from Australia in the future. This harm to the ability to remove unlawful non-citizens from Australia in the future would have a flow on prejudice to the integrity of the wider migration system and the deterrent effect of Operation Sovereign Borders.

In relation to personal privacy, responding to these questions would present a strong likelihood of individuals being unreasonably identified through the combination of visa status, location (i.e. if in immigration detention), and country of origin. This personal identification could potentially also result in unsolicited or unwanted attention to these individuals, or people in similar circumstances. Their identification is not only a concern for those individuals. Their identification would likely lead to identifying the countries they come from and result in the above harm to international relations and national security.

For these reasons, I believe that providing a response to these questions would not be in the public interest. As such, I claim public interest immunity in relation to a response to these six Questions on Notice.



ANDREW GILES

29 / 4 / 2029



THE HON ANDREW GILES MP
MINISTER FOR IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP AND MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Attachment A - Public Interest Immunity Claims

Parliamentary Inquiry Written Questions on Notice

Ref. Number	QoN Number	Question (highlight reflects part of question over which a PII claim is contemplated)	Date Asked	Asked By	Grounds for PII Claim	Reason
IQ24-000080	18	How many people in detention are on an involuntary removal pathway, including breakdown per country?	19 April 2024	Senator David Shoebridge	Damage Australia's International Relations and national security. Endangers the physical safety of any person	A response could harm relations with another country and negatively impact removals. A response could identify the individual(s) who are the subject of the PII claim through the disclosure of a combination of information, including visa status, location and country of origin.
IQ24-000095	64	Of current Bridging E Visa holders, the Department estimated that it would encounter difficulties in removing approximately 1,200 people should they refuse to depart voluntarily: a. How was that number arrived at? b. Do those difficulties include any barriers to removal other than the refusal of other nations to accept the forced return of its nationals?	19 April 2024	Senator David Shoebridge	Endangers the physical safety of any person	A response would identify and could harm relations with the countries, which would negatively impact on removals. A response could identify the individual(s) who are the subject of the PII claim through the disclosure of a combination of information, including visa status, location and country of origin.

Official: Sensitive Legal privilege

Official: Sensitive Legal privilege

Ref. Number	QoN Number	Question (highlight reflects part of question over which a PII claim is contemplated)	Date Asked	Asked By	Grounds for PII Claim	Reason
		c. What are the nationalities of the 1,200 people identified by the Department?				
IQ24-000092	63	In evidence to the Committee, the Department indicated that some 4,463 Bridging E visa holders may be impacted by the Bill. In relation to those visa holders: a. Please provide a breakdown of their country of origin. b. How many are 'transitory persons' as defined in the Act, who have been transferred to Australia from regional processing countries? c. How many have been refused Protection visas through the 'fast track' process?	19 April 2024	Senator David Shoebridge	Damage Australia's International Relations and national security. Endangers the physical safety of any person	A response could harm relations with another country and negatively impact removals. A response could identify the individual(s) who are the subject of the PII claim through the disclosure of a combination of information, including visa status, location and country of origin.
IQ24-000074	13	Home Affairs gave a figure of about 1,200 people on a BVE removal pathway who they think would be subject to the bill. Please provide a breakdown nationality, how many have applied for protection, number of family members in Australia, age.	19 April 2024	Senator David Shoebridge	Damage Australia's International Relations and national security. Endangers the physical safety of any person	A response could harm relations with another country and negatively impact removals. A response could identify the individual(s) who are the subject of the PII claim through the disclosure of a combination of information, including visa status, location and country of origin.

Released by Department of Home Affairs under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

Official: Sensitive Legal privilege

Ref. Number	QoN Number	Question (highlight reflects part of question over which a PII claim is contemplated)	Date Asked	Asked By	Grounds for PII Claim	Reason
IQ24-000082	19	How many people in detention are on a voluntary removal pathway, including breakdown per country?	19 April 2024	Senator David Shoebridge	Damage Australia's International Relations and national security. Endangers the physical safety of any person	A response could harm relations with another country and negatively impact removals. A response could identify the individual(s) who are the subject of the PII claim through the disclosure of a combination of information, including visa status, location and country of origin.
IQ24-000113	42	Minister Giles, in his second reading speech for this bill, said "the main objective of this designation is to gain the cooperation of that country in accepting and facilitating the removal from Australia of their citizens". Which countries have been the most uncooperative with facilitating the removals of non-citizens in Australia? a. Will those countries be the first targets of any designation to be made by the Minister after passage of this bill?	14 April 2024	Senator James Paterson	Damage Australia's International Relations and national security.	A response could harm relations with another country and negatively impact removals.



OFFICIAL

Summary of the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee Report

Key Points

1. On **7 May 2024** the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (the Committee) released their **Report on the Migration Amendment (Removal and Other Measures) Bill 2024** (the Report)
2. The Committee is chaired by Senator Nita Green (ALP), deputy chaired by Senator Paul Scarr (LP) and has a permanent membership made up of Senators Varun Gosh (ALP), Senator Helen Polley (ALP), Senator David Shoebridge (AG), and Senator Alex Antic (ALP). The Committee also had contributions from participating members Senators James Paterson (LP), David Pocock (IND) and Lidia Thorpe (IND).
3. The Committee report considered evidence from 217 submissions to the enquiry (120 of which have been published in full), and a public hearing on 15 April 2024 which heard evidence from the several legal and human rights organisations and experts, several Australian diaspora community organisations, as well as the Department of Home Affairs and Operation Sovereign Borders.
4. The Majority Report recommends the Bill be passed, and that the Minister should consider “community impacts when designating a country as a removal concern country”.
5. The Majority Report also outlined some concerns witnesses raised around:
 - a. Creating a duty to cooperate in relation to removal and removal concern countries
 - b. The scope of removal pathway directions, mandatory minimum sentences, and Australia’s obligations under international refugee and human rights law
 - c. The power of the Minister to designate a country as a ‘removal concern country’ and whether a designation would achieve cooperation from other countries with removals
 - d. Revisiting protection findings for non-citizens on a removal pathway
6. The Report contained three dissenting reports from the Coalition, the Greens, and Senator Pocock, with the full list of the report’s recommendations detailed on the following pages. Key issues raised in the dissenting reports include:
 - a. concerns that removal pathway directions could be given to those with ongoing judicial review or ministerial intervention applications;
 - b. concerns around the broadness of the definition of removal pathway non-citizens outlined in proposed s199B(1);
 - c. concerns around best interest of children relating to removal pathway directions;
 - d. concerns the exemptions in the proposed removal concern country visa bar are too narrow and would have negative impacts on diaspora communities;
 - e. concerns on the lack of proposed safeguards and oversight of powers delegated to the Minister by the legislation;
 - f. the Greens and Senator Pocock recommended that the Bill is not passed; and
 - g. the Coalition report expressed concerns that the removal concern country designation would act as a pull factor and may encourage people smuggling.

Released by Department of Home Affairs
under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

OFFICIAL

Report Recommendations

Recommendation Number	Recommendation in full
Majority Report	
1 (par. 2.120)	The committee recommends that the Minister considers community impacts when designating a country as a removal concern country.
2 (par. 2.121)	The committee recommends that the Senate pass the Bill
Coalition Senators	
1 (par. 1.63)	Proposed subsection 199B(1) be amended to reflect the Government's stated intention that the cohort of 'removal pathway non-citizens' be only those individuals who have neither legal proceedings (relevant to their migration status) on foot, nor any pending ministerial intervention requests. Alternatively, consideration could be given to amending section 199D(2) to expand the circumstances in which a removal pathway direction cannot be given to include circumstances where judicial review proceedings are still on foot or there is an outstanding application for Ministerial intervention.
2 (par. 1.71)	Subsection 199B(1)(d) be amended to clarify that the power only applies to additional visas issued for non-citizens to maintain lawful status in the community while making arrangements to depart or be removed from Australia.
3 (par. 1.75)	Subsection 199B(1)(d) should be amended to specifically refer to prescription by regulation under section 504 of the Migration Act 1958 to remove any doubt that the exercise of the power will be by way of delegated legislation subject to disallowance.
4 (par. 1.86)	The Bill be amended to insert a requirement after section 199D(5) that, prior to giving a removal pathway direction in relation to any child, the Minister must conduct an assessment of whether the direction is in the best interests of the child, as one of the factors to be considered by the Minister prior to making a removal pathway direction.
5 (par. 1.87)	Consideration be given to amending the Bill to provide for the additional safeguards proposed by the Scrutiny of Bills Committee in relation to the Minister's power to give removal pathway directions; namely: (a) providing a minimum time for compliance which would allow a person to take steps to comply and seek legal advice; and (b) better delimitation of the directions that may be given by the Minister.
6 (par. 1.97)	The imposition of mandatory minimum criminal penalties elevates the need for additional safeguards to be inserted into the Bill through amendment (including through the amendments proposed in recommendations 1 to 5 of this report). Proposed amendments to the Bill should be considered in this context.
7 (par. 1.100)	Within seven days of the end of each month, the Minister should be required to provide a statement to be tabled in Parliament in relation to each removal pathway direction which is given by the Minister during the month with the detail proposed by the Coalition in its amendments to the Bill moved in the House of Representatives.

 Released by Department of Home Affairs
 under the Freedom of Information Act 1992

OFFICIAL

Recommendation Number	Recommendation in full
8 (par. 1.120)	The power to declare a country as a removal concern country be redrafted to require the Minister to consider a set of factors which must be considered prior to making a designation (e.g. those factors required to be included under the analogous UK legislation), including the potential impact on Australian diaspora communities of making such a declaration.
9 (par. 1.121)	The Minister and/or the PJCIS be required to review the decision to declare a country as a removal concern country on a regular basis and be required to table in both House of Parliament the reasons why continued designation of a country as a removal concern country is justified.
10 (par. 1.127)	The reasons for a declaration of a country as a removal concern country not being subject to disallowance should be clearly explained in the Explanatory Memorandum. If a declaration is not subject to disallowance that elevates the need for further details to be provided in the Bill with respect to the circumstances in which a declaration would be made (refer to Recommendation 9).
11 (par. 1.128)	Any declaration of a country as a removal concern country should be subject to sunseting after three years.
12 (par. 1.133)	That the exemptions under section 199G(2) from the prohibition on applying for visas should be expanded to include: parents of independent children, grandparents, siblings and dependent persons (to take into account non-western kinship systems as suggested by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights).
13 (par. 1.143)	That Government should: • undertake a comprehensive review of all mitigating measures (and resourcing requirements for such measures) beyond strategic communications that may be required to mitigate any potential 'pull factors' that may arise from the Bill; and • commit to agreeing to implement such measures in the event the Bill is passed to ensure that any 'pull factors' are mitigated to the full extent practical.
14 (par. 1.144)	The Government should restore the Operation Sovereign Borders framework in full by: (a) reinstating temporary protection visas; (b) reversing the budget cuts to border protection; and (c) restoring maritime patrols and aerial surveillance levels to at least the levels in 2020-21.
15 (par. 1.147)	A statutory review should be undertaken with respect to the exercise of the powers under the Bill after five years of operation. The review should be open to public submissions.
16 (par. 1.149)	It is recommended that a note to drafting be added to proposed section 199B to clarify the Department's intention not to capture other holders of Subclass 050 (Bridging) General Visas.

Released by Department of Home Affairs under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

OFFICIAL

Recommendation Number	Recommendation in full
17 (par. 1.151)	Given the nature of the powers granted to the Minister under the Bill, it is recommended that the Bill be amended as detailed in this report to provide additional safeguards.
Australian Greens	
1 (par. 1.101)	This Bill should be rejected in full.
Senator David Pocock	
1 (par.143)	That the Senate does not pass the Bill
2 (par. 1.44)	That the Government gives access to an expedited re-application process to everyone who has been subjected to the 'Fast Track system', including access to merits review in the Administrative Appeals Tribunal or the proposed future Administrative Review Tribunal.
3 (par. 1.45)	That all future refugee status determinations are conducted in a fast, robust and fair manner with access to both merits and judicial review, and that applicants are not subjected to protracted processing times that contribute to barriers to their removal should they be found not to be owed protection.
4 (par. 1.47)	That the Bill is amended to ensure that, if an applicant has not been eligible for review by the Administrative Review Tribunal or the Administrative Appeals Tribunal (for example, if they are a Fast Track applicant or a transitory person), they may not be given a removal pathway direction
5 (par. 1.48)	<i>Should the Senate choose not to follow these primary recommendations, and passes the Bill, I make the following recommendations:</i> That the Bill is amended to ensure that where a person's matter is subject to judicial review or where they have a pending request for ministerial intervention due to compelling and compassionate circumstances, they may not be given a removal pathway direction
6 (par. 1.49)	That the Bill is amended to ensure that the immediate family of Australian citizens, permanent residents and stateless persons cannot be given a removal pathway direction
7 (par. 150)	That the Bill is amended to delete proposed paragraphs 199B(1)(c) and 199B(1)(d), to remove Bridging Visa E holders and the holders of additional classes of visas that may be prescribed in the future from the meaning of removal pathway non-citizen

Released by Department of Home Affairs under the Freedom of Information Act 1982

OFFICIAL

Recommendation Number	Recommendation in full
8 (par 1.51)	That the Bill is amended to remove the proposed subsection 199E(2) relating to a 12-months mandatory minimum sentence
9 (par. 1.52)	That the Bill is amended to remove the proposed subsection 199E(4), including paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), relating to exceptions to what is considered a 'reasonable excuse'.
10 (para. 1.53)	That the Bill is amended to remove items 3–9 in Schedule 2, relating to the power to revisit protection claims.
11 (para. 1.54)	That the Bill is amended to ensure that proposed section 199G 'Visa applications by certain nationals of a removal concern country' may only be applied to government officials of a removal concern country and their immediate family members

Released by Department of Home Affairs
under the *Freedom of Information Act 1982*