



## Ministerial Statement

### Senator the Hon Amanda Vanstone

Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs  
Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Indigenous Affairs

VPS 64.05

Wednesday, 25<sup>th</sup> May 2005

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT TO SENATE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

There has been considerable public comment and debate on the circumstances surrounding the detention of Ms Cornelia Rau and the removal of Ms Vivian Alvarez Solon.

The Government is absolutely committed to determining the facts of each case and taking all appropriate steps that might flow from that. In February I appointed Mr Mick Palmer, the former Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police, to conduct an inquiry into the circumstances of Ms Rau's detention. Mr Palmer's report will determine independently the facts and recommend measures to address lessons learned. Following consultation with Mr Palmer and in the light of his assessment of the scale of inquiries required, I extended Mr Palmer's reporting date from the end of March and provided significant augmentation of resources with the appointment of Mr Neil Comrie, former Victorian Chief Commissioner of Police.

During my absence overseas in May, Mr McGauran, the acting Minister, asked Mr Palmer to add to his inquiry the case of Ms Vivian Alvarez Solon.

Mr Palmer made clear last week his desire to report at the earliest opportunity and I welcome this. Until his report on Ms Rau is concluded in late June, it is not possible to speak with authority on that case. The other cases which have been referred to the Palmer Inquiry will be the subject of later reports.

Despite pressure and speculation from the media, I am of the firm belief that it is better to avoid, as far as possible, public airing of gossip, innuendo or comments, the veracity of which can only be confirmed by a full examination of all of the information available.

Without pre-empting the findings of Mr Palmer, there are some improvements that can be made now.

Following the Rau case I asked my department to consider changes that could be put into place forthwith to improve performance. As a consequence, in February 2005, I announced:

- A 28 day limit - in all but exceptional circumstances - on the time immigration detainees can be held in prison, a watch-house or similar state corrections facility in those jurisdictions where an Immigration Detention Facility is not available.
- Fingerprinting of people detained. Following regulatory changes people detained can be required to provide a finger print, without their consent if necessary.
- Further advice was given to staff clarifying and strengthening procedures that should be followed to try to establish a person's identity. While the then current

procedures worked in the majority of cases, the very complex circumstances surrounding Ms Rau's case highlighted the need for clearer and more precise guidance for staff.

- Access to data-bases. I wrote to the Justice Minister, Senator Ellison, asking him to formally pursue the issue of access to databases with relevant Commonwealth and State law enforcement agencies. I also asked the Secretary of my department to pursue the same issue with the Heads of Commonwealth Law Enforcement Agencies (HOCOLEA).
- Referral of complex cases to Canberra for guidance. Where a person's identity or status is not confirmed within 28 days, staff would be required to consult with senior staff in Canberra on the ongoing management of the case.

Today I am announcing further changes which have either been already implemented or are in the process of being implemented. This is as a result of the department acknowledging the Government's desire for continuous improvement. These are:

**Establishment of a National Identity Verification and Advice Unit in DIMIA Head Office in Canberra** – established at the beginning of May 2005.

- The unit ensure complex cases are identified as early as possible and are rigorously, consistently and quickly dealt with.
- It provides advice to state and territory case officers about how to go about identity checking, and be a point of referral for difficult cases.
- It manages an "early warning" mechanism, whereby cases involving complex identity issues are systematically referred to it for advice.
- It analyses complex cases to help the ongoing development and review of policy on establishing identity; and
- The unit is staffed by experienced officers with legal and/or systems experience and a manager has already been appointed.

**Appointment of immigration detention review managers in each state and territory where people are detained** – by the end of May 2005.

- The managers will review cases where the person's identity and status are not quickly confirmed and ensure compliance with standard procedures.
- These officers will stand apart from the daily compliance activities of my department. They will ensure that decisions to detain are soundly based and regularly reviewed and will keep detention arrangements for individuals under constant review.

**Enhancement of health services in immigration detention centres**

- A psychiatrist will now visit Baxter Immigration Detention Facility every two weeks – or more frequently if required - (beginning 28 May 2005) compared to every six weeks previously.
- Commencing next week will be the progressive implementation of two new psychiatric nursing positions which will achieve 7 day coverage at Baxter, including on-call arrangements at night.
- My department has already started working on implementing procedural changes identified in the recent Federal Court judgement about detention health services.
- Work to improve access to care outside of detention facilities for immigration detainees.

## **Improvement in case related information management processes**

- Records will be centralised within the portfolio and across other agencies or service providers relating to individual detainees.
- Integration of departmental information and detention services provider information is important for progressing cases and meeting detainees' individual needs.
- However, it needs to be recognised that appropriate controls still need to be in place to ensure the privacy of sensitive medical information.

Mental health issues have clearly played a part in a number of cases. This includes circumstances where an individual comes to the attention of DIMIA with a pre-existing mental health issue, the provision of appropriate mental health services in detention facilities and access to state mental health services.

I anticipate that Mr Palmer will have a number of recommendations in this regard, including the management of people who present to immigration with pre-existing mental health issues. As interactions between mental health agencies and law enforcement agencies is a broad issue with which Mr Palmer is familiar, I will be particularly interested in what he recommends in this area.

People with pre-existing mental health issues can exacerbate complexities in establishing their identity. In view of the relevance of identity issues, I have also asked my department to look at any further options for the use of biometrics.

I am fully aware of the importance of proof of identity as it has been an important issue in two of my previous portfolios. I am aware that the prospect of biometric technology raises complex issues of policy and implementation. There are considerations of privacy, the merits of the various technical options open and the need to maintain the speed and efficiency of Australia's current entry procedures (Visas and ETA).

I have already indicated that I consider that there may be a need to look at the Migration Act to identify any areas where greater flexibility may be possible to assist the department to be more responsive to individual circumstances.

You can make changes to policy, processes and legislation. But these will be of little benefit without cultural change.

In DIMIA, I envisage this cultural change will include customer focus, timeliness, openness to complaints and appropriate mechanisms to identify problem areas. To achieve this, the culture of the department must recognise that complaints are an opportunity to review, change and improve performance to do things better.

The Department of Immigration is in many respects a can-do department. It manages a highly successful and rapidly growing skilled migration program; it delivers the world's third-highest refugee and humanitarian intake, backed by the delivery of world-class settlement services for new arrivals.

In the extremely difficult area of unauthorised boat arrivals and offshore processing the department demonstrated an excellent ability to meet the Government's policy requirements, despite being faced with the demands of more than 3,000 unauthorised boat arrivals per year, for a number of years.

Nonetheless, the Government now wants the Department of Immigration to be a can-do department in terms of changing its own culture to be one that is user-friendly and has an open culture of continuous improvement.

I have asked the Secretary to position the department to be able to rapidly respond to whatever changes are required as a consequence of the Palmer report. I have also asked him to identify people suitable to be directly involved in driving and playing a lead role in the implementation of identified or necessary changes.

I recognise that it may be appropriate to involve external expertise.

To move ahead, it is important to have a clean slate. It's also important for those outside the department, to understand the nature of cases which are being examined.

The category of "released not unlawful" is not necessarily an indication of wrongful detention. Consequently, not all these cases will be cases of concern.

I am advised by my department that the range of circumstances encompassed by "released not unlawful" is very broad. For example:

- People detained for very short period of time whilst their identity and legal status is determined
- People whose status changed whilst in detention including legal outcomes and children attaining citizenship on their 10<sup>th</sup> birthday.

Minister McGauran added a term of reference to enable the Palmer Inquiry to examine and make findings in relation to any cases referred during the course of the Inquiry.

The cases referred are those where the individual is listed as having been 'released not unlawful.' The total number of cases to be examined through the Palmer Inquiry is 201. The department has gone back as far as the records will allow. All will receive careful, independent review to establish the facts.

As Mr Palmer indicated in his media statement of 20 May 2005 he discussed with me the future conduct of the inquiry and his desire to finish his report before the end of June. I agreed with his proposals; a) that he would complete the Rau Inquiry; and; b) that Mr Palmer would make recommendations for handling the completion of those cases.

Mr Comrie, who has had major conduct of the Alvarez and other cases, is continuing that work.

Given Mr Palmer's statement last Friday, that investigations to date into the Alvarez case confirm key issues of concern and will be reflected in his findings and recommendations to be completed shortly, I'm confident that Mr Palmer's report will provide a strong basis for the department to move forward with the challenges ahead.

Ends//

**Senate Legal & Constitutional Affairs  
Legislation Committee  
Budget Estimates 2005-2006  
23-27 May 2005**

**Tabled Document No** 12  
**By:** M. VANSTONE  
**Date:** 25/05/05

Bill Farmer/ACT/IMMI/AU  
24/05/2005 07:02 PM

Senate Legal & Constitutional Affairs  
Legislation Committee  
Budget Estimates 2005-2006  
23-27 May 2005

Tabled Document No 13

By: BILL FARMER

Date: 25/05/05

Madam Chair

I wd like to make a statement about matters which flow from the cases of Ms Rau, Ms Alvarez and others which have been referred to Mr Palmer's enquiry.

I want to start by making two things clear.

First, we profoundly regret what has happened in some cases. We are intensely conscious that our day to day business affects the lives of people and it is distressing, and unacceptable, that our actions have in respects fallen so short of what we would want, and the Australian people expect. We are deeply sorry about that.

That sentiment, I know, is widely shared by my colleagues in the Department. This is a group of men and women who work in a Department which combines a range of nation-building tasks with some responsibilities which must be among the most difficult borne by any Australian public servant. They deliver outstanding results in many areas, including migration management, settlement services and entry systems. I know they will want me to say to the Committee that they share a desire to do whatever is necessary to avoid a recurrence of circumstances like those of current concern.

That leads to a second point. The department has made mistakes. If these mistakes are the result of systems, processes or attitudes, these will be changed. If appropriate, there are also processes under the Public Service Act which I would ensure are applied scrupulously and fairly. But we must all learn from these mistakes. We are already drawing some conclusions ourselves about these matters, and taking action to fix things which have not worked properly. We expect that Mr Palmer will present findings and recommendations about issues which need to be addressed and we will work earnestly to act on his recommendations.

We are working to understand why processes which work effectively for many have failed in some cases; and then to change what needs to be changed. This is not going to happen with change only in the Department's operations and approaches. It will require attention beyond the Department in other areas including national approaches to issues like mental health and identity. In some respects, including the Senate enquiry into mental health issues in Australia, that is already happening. But in others, particularly the issue of identity, there is a need for concerted action between all jurisdictions. I do not excuse shortcomings by us in saying that some of the cases under discussion throw into stark relief the broader disadvantages of not having, for example, a single, or coordinated national system for registering missing persons. They also, to my mind, illustrate the difficulties which numbers of agencies have because of identity issues, which were core issues in the cases of Ms Rau and Ms Alvarez. There is certainly a question whether more regular and broader use of biometrics should be contemplated, especially to assist in dealing with complex identification cases. We will look to any recommendations Mr Palmer may make in these and other crucial areas.

I want to give the Committee an outline of the actions which we have taken, and are taking, to deal with issues which have been highlighted by these cases.

A first set of issues relates to identity and, in particular, the need to establish identity quickly and accurately. In light of the difficulties, exacerbated in some instances by cross-jurisdictional factors, in determining identity in some cases, we have now established, in our Canberra office, a national identity verification and advice Unit. This will be a mandatory referral point for any case where our officers in the states have not been able quickly to determine an individual's identity and will enable us to develop expertise in and sharp focus on issues relating to identity. The Unit will be responsible for developing and overseeing new procedures for handling missing persons enquiries to and from police. The Unit will, additionally, enable us to escalate cases where there is any suggestion or claim of permanent residence or citizenship status and we will be issuing revised instructions to that end.

We have also issued revised instructions on identity issues including analysis and interrogation of data. We have, in addition, taken a number of steps aiming to extend our access to databases: this issue has been raised with Commonwealth law enforcement agencies and it will need to be extended also to the States.

We now have in place the necessary approvals to fingerprint people detained, without consent if necessary, and this process has begun. To illustrate what that enables us to do, we have had a recent case where a newly detained person claimed to be someone who did not feature in our records, but whose identity was determined comparatively quickly. This was done because of new arrangements instituted following Ms Rau's case. The detainee was fingerprinted, the prints were given to the AFP and this led to identification of the person by the Victorian police. The person was determined to be lawfully in Australia and released from immigration detention. We want our other new measures to have a similar impact in helping us to do our job better.

We are actively examining other identity-related issues like the development of more accessible checklists for compliance officers.

Among other issues are policy concerns including what appear to be reform needs in the bridging visa regime. Such policy issues are not, of course, matters which I can discuss here, but I will comment here that in some respects our prescriptive legislative and regulatory regime does not have some of the flexibilities which our officers feel the need of, for example when dealing with unusual cases or events. We are examining the bridging visa regime to see whether it could be made more flexible in the sense of enabling officers to exercise further options other than detention of people in the first instance. We are preparing advice for the Minister on these issues.

Another set of issues relates to record keeping. It is unacceptable that individuals should be disadvantaged by shortcomings in the entering of records, or by systems which do not have adequate linkages. We have, over the past year, strongly reinforced with our officers the importance of improving our records; and our State Directors have been charged with driving improvement in this area. In terms of our IT systems, we have set in train processes to integrate detention records of the department and our detention services provider, with the aim of having a single client record for detainees; and to link DIMIA and Review Tribunal systems to ensure data about a person's status are up to date.

We have also taken action on issues relating to our duty of care. We have introduced a 28 day limit for detention in prisons, except in exceptional circumstances; we have asked our detention services provider to arrange for increased psychiatric services at Baxter, including two new psychiatric nurses on-site and fortnightly visits by a psychiatrist; and we have the issue of adequacy of psychiatric care at other centres under active consideration with the detention services provider. We have issued further instructions about the care of dependants who may be left in the community as a result of compliance actions. We have also asked that Detention Review Officers be established in each state and territory office to play a crucial quality assurance role, namely to ensure that proper procedures are followed as compliance cases are being managed through the system. These officers will be independent of our compliance units.

Beyond these areas, we have identified other training and quality assurance issues which we are

addressing.

These challenges reflect the complexity of our legislative framework and operating environment, as well as the difficult human dynamics we deal with in the compliance and detention functions. The Minister and I have discussed these matters and in particular the need to position the Department to respond rapidly to findings by Mr Palmer. This will involve, among other things, identifying people to play a leading role in driving the implementation process necessary to produce the outcomes which the Government expects of the department across the whole range of its operations. We have begun, over the past year, an examination of some of the requirements to make our services more user-friendly, for example in the presentation of public material about the highly complex legislation we administer; and through possible simplification of the visa regime. But we will need to develop further an organisational culture, or set of attitudes, values and approaches, which gives us greater assurance that we are securing outcomes which are lawful, commonsense, and will be found to be appropriate in the light of scrutiny. I have already emphasised to our senior managers that this will require leadership across the Department as it involves in some respects the way we approach our whole job..

We are, we know, the subject of criticism because of some of our actions in cases of current interest; and we have set out deliberately and energetically to make our own assessment of things which need change, both within the Department and, on issues like mental health and identity, more broadly in Australia; and to put change into practice in our own operations. We expect that further issues and recommendations will flow from Mr Palmer's recommendations and we will approach them with the same determination.



Australian Government

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

Senate Legal & Constitutional Affairs  
Legislation Committee  
Budget Estimates 2005-2006  
23-27 May 2005

The Chair  
Senator Marise Payne  
Legal and Constitutional Committee  
The Senate of Australia

Tabled Document No 14  
By: *BILL FARMER*  
Date: *25/05/05*

**IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS  
PORTFOLIO – PORTFOLIO BUDGET STATEMENTS 2005-06**

**CORRIGENDUM**

Please be advised that the Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs Portfolio wishes to request a corrigendum with respect to the following Portfolio Agencies:

**1) Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA)**

Page 89

- Table 3.1: Total resources for Outcome 3 contains an incorrect addition in the line **Total administered expenses**. This line incorrectly adds in the amount at *subtotal special appropriations*, which is also included in the *Total administered appropriations* line.

Pages 90-91

- Table 3.1: Total resources for Outcome 3 (continued) contain incorrect footnote numbering. Footnote (1) on pages 90-91 has been replaced with **footnote (5)** and footnote (2) on page 90 has been replaced with **footnote (4)** to maintain continuous numbering across the table.


Pages 89-91 with the corrected Table 3.1 are provided at Attachment A.

**2) Torres Strait Regional Authority (TSRA)**

Page 224

- Table 5.2: Budgeted departmental statement of financial position as at 30 June contains the incomplete line title “accumulated deficits”, which should read “**Retained surpluses or accumulated deficits**”.

Page 224 with the corrected Table 5.2 is provided at Attachment B.

  
Louise Gray  
Chief Financial Officer



### Outcome 3 resourcing

Table 3.1 shows how the 2005-06 Budget appropriations translate to total resourcing for Outcome 3, including administered expenses, revenue from government (appropriation), revenue from other sources (departmental) and the total price of outputs.

**Table 3.1: Total resources for Outcome 3 (\$'000)**

	Estimated actual 2004-05 \$'000	Budget estimate 2005-06 \$'000
<b>ADMINISTERED</b>		
Cross portfolio Indigenous flexible funding arrangements	3,115	-
Indigenous affairs litigation	440	1,500
Indigenous Women <sup>(2)</sup>	5,157	6,306
Native Title and Land Rights <sup>(2)</sup>	52,921	59,055
Public Information <sup>(2)</sup>	2,357	2,733
Reconciliation Place in Canberra – continuous development	1,000	1,000
Repatriation <sup>(2)</sup>	400	518
Shared Responsibility Agreements Implementation Assistance <sup>(2)</sup>	19,944	28,778
Community Development and Employment <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	177,083	-
Community Housing and Infrastructure <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	50,073	-
Legal and Preventative <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	23,786	-
Business Development <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	234	-
Arts, Culture and Language <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	9,692	-
Broadcasting <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	7,867	-
Sports and Recreation <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	5,738	-
Family Violence Prevention <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	3,195	-
Effective Family Tracing and Reunion <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	1,121	-
Maintenance and Protection of Indigenous Heritage <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	1,311	-
<b>Subtotal Bill No.1</b>	<b>365,434</b>	<b>99,890</b>
<b>Special appropriations</b>		
Indigenous land fund <sup>(3)</sup>	63,104	75,689
Aboriginal benefits account <sup>(3)</sup>	60,000	64,500
Ranger payment <sup>(3)</sup>	200	200
<b>Subtotal special appropriations</b>	<b>123,304</b>	<b>140,389</b>
<b>Total administered appropriations</b>	<b>488,738</b>	<b>240,279</b>
<b>Non appropriations Expenses</b>		
Indigenous land fund <sup>(3)</sup>	404,163	200,144
Community Development and Employment <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	697	-
Business Development <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	7	-
<b>Total non appropriations expenses</b>	<b>404,867</b>	<b>200,144</b>
<b>Total administered expenses</b>	<b>893,605</b>	<b>440,423</b>

1 These items transferred to other Commonwealth portfolios as a result of the Administrative Arrangements Order of 24 June 2004.

2 These items were reported under Outcome 5 in the 2004-05 PBS and PAES.

3 These items were reported under Outcome 4 in the 2004-05 PBS and PAES.

**Table 3.1: Total resources for Outcome 3 (continued)**

from Special Accounts (estimated payments from Special Account balances) <sup>(4)</sup>		
	Estimated actual 2004-05 \$'000	Budget estimate 2005-06 \$'000
Aboriginal Benefits Account		
- s62 (1) <i>Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976</i>	60,000	64,500
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund		
- s192W (1) ATSI Act 2005	477,699	275,832
<b>Total Special Account Outflows</b>	<b>537,699</b>	<b>340,332</b>
<b>DEPARTMENTAL</b>		
<b>Departmental appropriations 2005-06 structure</b>		
<b>Outcome 3</b>		
<b><i>Output Group 3.1 - Whole-of-government coordination and collaboration in policy development and service delivery for Indigenous people</i></b>		
Output 3.1.1 - Support Partnership Development with Indigenous Communities	-	57,634
Output 3.1.2 - Policy Development and Innovation	-	3,052
Output 3.1.3 - Performance assessment and Evaluation	-	5,724
<b>Subtotal Output Group 3.1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>66,410</b>
<b><i>Output Group 3.2 - Services to Indigenous Australians</i></b>		
Output 3.2.1 - Administration of Native Title and Land Rights Program	-	5,252
Output 3.2.2 - Support the Repatriation and Reconciliation Programs	-	2,605
Output 3.2.3 - Incorporation, Regulation and Building Capacity of Indigenous Corporations	-	8,445
<b>Subtotal Output Group 3.2</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>16,303</b>
<b>Total Departmental appropriations 2005-06 structure</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>82,713</b>
<b>Departmental appropriations 2004-05 structure</b>		
<b>Outcome 3<sup>(5)</sup></b>	<b>5,815</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Outcome 4<sup>(5)</sup></b>	<b>9,490</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Outcome 5<sup>(5)</sup></b>	<b>99,598</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Subtotal Outcome Group 3,4,5</b>	<b>114,903</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total revenue from government (appropriations)</b>	<b>114,903</b>	<b>82,713</b>
<b>Contributing to price of departmental outputs</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>85%</b>

4 Special Account outflows are shown in the payments column of the Special Account table in Table 2.6. The estimated payments from special account balances are provided by way of note only and do not form part of the total estimated resourcing.

**Table 3.1: Total resources for Outcome 3 (continued)**

	Estimated actual 2004-05 \$'000	Budget estimate 2005-06 \$'000
<b>Other resources available to be used</b>		
<b>Resources available to be used 2005-06 structure</b>		
<b>Outcome 3</b>		
<b><i>Output Group 3.1 - Whole-of-government coordination and collaboration in policy development and service delivery for Indigenous people</i></b>		
Output 3.1.1 - Support Partnership Development with Indigenous Communities	-	10,249
Output 3.1.2 - Policy Development and Innovation	-	543
Output 3.1.3 - Performance assessment and Evaluation	-	1,018
<b><i>Subtotal Output Group 3.1</i></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,809</b>
<b><i>Output Group 3.2 - Services to Indigenous Australians</i></b>		
Output 3.2.1 - Administration of Native Title and Land Rights Program	-	934
Output 3.2.2 - Support the Repatriation and Reconciliation Programs	-	463
Output 3.2.3 - Incorporation, Regulation and Building Capacity of Indigenous Corporations	-	1,502
<b><i>Subtotal Output Group 3.2</i></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,899</b>
<b>Total resources available to be used 2005-06 structure</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14,708</b>
<b>Resources available to be used 2004-05 structure</b>		
<b>Outcome 3 <sup>(5)</sup></b>	<b>43</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Outcome 4 <sup>(5)</sup></b>	<b>20,735</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Outcome 5 <sup>(5)</sup></b>	<b>7,729</b>	<b>-</b>
<b><i>Total resources available to be used 2004-05 structure</i></b>	<b>28,507</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total other resources available to be used</b>	<b>28,507</b>	<b>14,708</b>
<b>Total price from departmental outputs</b>		
(Total revenue from government and from other sources)	<b>143,410</b>	<b>97,421</b>
<b>Total estimated resourcing for Outcome 3</b>		
(Total price of outputs and administered appropriations)	<b>632,148</b>	<b>337,700</b>
	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>
<b>Average staffing level (number)</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>517</b>

5 For full outcome description please refer to Supplementary Figure 1 on page 45.

**Table 5.2: Budgeted departmental statement of financial position as at 30 June**

	Estimated actual 2004-05 \$'000	Budget estimate 2005-06 \$'000	Forward estimate 2006-07 \$'000	Forward estimate 2007-08 \$'000	Forward estimate 2008-09 \$'000
<b>ASSETS</b>					
<b>Financial assets</b>					
Cash	12,339	12,700	10,744	11,916	12,254
Receivables	7,738	7,738	8,238	8,438	8,538
<b>Total financial assets</b>	<b>20,077</b>	<b>20,438</b>	<b>18,982</b>	<b>20,354</b>	<b>20,792</b>
<b>Non-financial assets</b>					
Land and buildings	13,510	13,240	12,976	13,532	13,262
Infrastructure, plant and equipment	788	1,758	3,722	3,566	3,636
<b>Total non-financial assets</b>	<b>14,298</b>	<b>14,998</b>	<b>16,698</b>	<b>17,098</b>	<b>16,898</b>
<b>Total assets</b>	<b>34,375</b>	<b>35,436</b>	<b>35,680</b>	<b>37,452</b>	<b>37,690</b>
<b>Provisions</b>					
Employees	929	1,020	1,018	1,070	1,120
Other provisions	600	586	489	445	413
<b>Total provisions</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>1,606</b>	<b>1,507</b>	<b>1,515</b>	<b>1,533</b>
<b>Payables</b>					
Grants	5,100	5,137	4,835	6,097	6,182
<b>Total payables</b>	<b>5,100</b>	<b>5,137</b>	<b>4,835</b>	<b>6,097</b>	<b>6,182</b>
<b>Total liabilities</b>	<b>6,629</b>	<b>6,743</b>	<b>6,342</b>	<b>7,612</b>	<b>7,715</b>
<b>EQUITY*</b>					
<b>Parent entity interest</b>					
Contributed equity	9	9	9	9	9
Reserves	3,062	3,062	3,062	3,062	3,062
Retained surpluses or accumulated deficits	24,675	25,622	26,267	26,769	26,904
<b>Total parent entity interest</b>	<b>27,746</b>	<b>28,693</b>	<b>29,338</b>	<b>29,840</b>	<b>29,975</b>
<b>Total equity</b>	<b>27,746</b>	<b>28,693</b>	<b>29,338</b>	<b>29,840</b>	<b>29,975</b>
<b>Current assets</b>	<b>15,831</b>	<b>16,429</b>	<b>15,578</b>	<b>16,002</b>	<b>16,455</b>
<b>Non-current assets</b>	<b>18,544</b>	<b>19,007</b>	<b>20,102</b>	<b>21,450</b>	<b>21,235</b>
<b>Current liabilities</b>	<b>6,497</b>	<b>6,603</b>	<b>6,204</b>	<b>7,470</b>	<b>7,590</b>
<b>Non-current liabilities</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>125</b>

\*Note: 'equity' is the residual interest in assets after deduction of liabilities.

## RECONCILIATION OF BUDGET PAPERS: INFORMATION NOTE

### Purpose

This note provides a reconciliation between the following three documents:

- the table on pages 217-218 of *Budget Paper No 2 (BP2)*;
- *OIPC Budget 2005 Indigenous Affairs Kit*; and
- *Secretaries' Group Bulletin No 2*.

### Context

It is important to acknowledge the different accounting bases for these reports:

- the budget measures in *Budget Paper No 2* are set out in terms of their impact on the Australian Government's fiscal balance;
- the budget measures in the *Indigenous Affairs Kit* are set in terms of their resourcing impacts on the community; and
- *Secretaries' Group Bulletin No 2* provided an indicative list of budget measures, without purporting to be a complete account. It refers readers to the *Indigenous Budget Kit* for full details.

### Reconciliation of Budget Paper No 2 to Budget Kit

BP2 Total Measures – Impact on fiscal balance (p218)	Expense	\$308.6m
	Capital	\$ 3.2m
	Subtotal	\$311.8m
<u>Plus:</u>		
Extended resourcing for Lapsing Measures		\$193.7m
Election Commitment Measures		\$ 37.0m
Depreciation element of AIATSIS digitization		\$ 0.9m
Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources ITAR Working in Partnership Programme (resourced within existing Departmental resources – a transfer from mainstream uses)		\$ 2.0m
<b>Total (as per Budget Kit)</b>		<b>\$ 545.4 m</b>

### Reconciliation of Secretaries' Group Bulletin to Budget Kit.

	2005-06 \$m	4 Years to 2008-09 \$m
Secretaries' Group Bulletin Number 2	119.4	533.2
<u>Subtract</u> AGIE <sup>1</sup> offsets for SRA <sup>2</sup> Measure	- 8.4	- 24.7
<u>Equals</u> Total Extended and Additional AGIE Resourcing from 2005-06 Budget	111.0	508.4 <sup>3</sup>
<u>Add</u> Election Commitments	12.0	37.0
<u>Equals</u> Total Extended and Additional AGIE Resourcing (as per Budget Kit)	123.0	545.4

<sup>1</sup> AGIE = Australian Government Indigenous Expenditure

<sup>2</sup> SRA = Shared Responsibility Agreements

<sup>3</sup> Note: \$0.1m difference due to rounding in original documents