

Response ID ANON-8EBD-41R8-J

Submitted to **Review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972**

Submitted on **2018-05-18 10:40:29**

About You

Are you submitting a response as an individual, or on behalf of your organisation?

Individual

Individual details

Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent?

No

What is your name?

Optional:

Do you give permission for your name to be published with your feedback?

No

Purpose of the Act

Question 1

Yes

If not, what changes should be made?:

Roles under the Act

Question 2

2 - who should be consulted?:

They should definitely be consulted AND on the committee! I also think there should be representatives for each of the identified Aboriginal cultural groups in the state. This ensures that each group has a go-to person for concerns and that the committee also has someone to liaise with. We need to recognise formally that Aboriginal culture in our state is made up of several groups and traditions and that the land they live on and heritage means something different for each of them.

Question 3

No opinion

How can the provision to appoint honorary wardens be improved?:

Please see above answer.

Question 4

No opinion

Role and functions - Minister:

No

Role and functions - Registrar:

No

Role and functions - Committee:

No

Role and functions - DPLH:

What is Protected?

Question 5

Yes

5. How can section 5 be improved?:

Question 6

Yes

6. How can section 6 / Part VI be improved?:

Question 7

Yes

Additional comments:

Question 8

Yes

8. what needs to be considered?:

The different cultural needs of each Aboriginal community and how they wish to deal with the remains. Their traditions are more important to interact with and uphold than the upkeep of a skeleton in a lab or museum.

Protection and Enforcement

Question 9

9. Activities that should require consent or authorisation:

Public use and access. There should DEFINITELY be a lot of red tape around use of these sites for any kind of industry.

Question 10

No opinion

10. Criteria to evaluate activities that may affect a site:

Question 11

11. What is an impact in relation to sacred sites?:

There is not difference in importance between tangible and intangible cultural heritage. Intangible heritage for Aboriginal communities has suffered just as much, if not more than, tangible heritage since European settlement. The assessment should be stringent and equal for each.

Question 12

12. consent / authorisation for proposals that will affect sites:

The committee combined with the local Aboriginal community.

Question 13

No opinion

No opinion

13. How s18 can be improved?:

Question 14

No opinion

14. provisions for long-term protection of sites:

Question 15

Yes

15. How can enforcement provisions be improved?:

Question 16

No

16. How can penalties be improved?:

The fines and imprisonment times need to be higher to indicate how serious a crime it is. There are massive corporations that wouldn't even suffer for their first offence done.

Site Assessment and Registration

Question 17

No opinion

17. Why shouldn't a defence be provided?:

Question 18

Yes

18. What should the criteria be?:

Question 19

No opinion

19. Steps to report place or object:

No opinion

19. Steps to nominate a place or object:

No opinion

19. Steps to assess a place or object:

No opinion

19. Steps to enter a place or object on the Register:

No opinion

19. Steps to amend a place or object on Register:

No opinion

19. Steps to remove place or object from Register:

Other Parts of the Act

Question 20

No opinion

20. What's missing from the Act?:

Provision for ongoing education and outreach regarding the importance of these sites to bring awareness into communities across the state. This should be done in close council with Aboriginal communities.

Question 21

No opinion

21. Sections to be removed from Act?:

Any other comments

Any other comments: