



20  
\$

The Kimberley Land Council, in the State of Western Australia, is the promoter of this petition, which contains signatures.

**PETITION IN RELATION TO THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE *ABORIGINAL HERITAGE ACT***

To the President and Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We the undersigned assert that the proposed amendments to the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA)* (**the Act**) are discriminatory and would detrimentally affect Aboriginal heritage. The Act should protect and preserve cultural heritage for Aboriginal people. Instead, the proposed amendments would deny Aboriginal people any meaningful involvement in heritage protection and give supreme decision-making power to a government bureaucracy. Traditional Owners of the Kimberley have not been properly consulted about the proposed amendments and do not support them.

Your petitioners therefore respectfully request the Legislative Council to:

- investigate whether the protections afforded to Aboriginal heritage in Western Australia are at the same level as provided in other States and Territories, and/or consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other international standards;
- propose a consultation framework for the development of a complete replacement for the Act;
- review the extent of consultation with Aboriginal people, and report on what steps were taken by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (**DAA**) to ensure that Traditional Owners had meaningful opportunities to understand and give feedback on the proposed amendments, including a report on the level of support for the proposed amendments from Traditional Owners;
- review the proposed changes and report on whether Aboriginal involvement in the administration of the Act will be strengthened or weakened by the proposed amendments; and
- investigate whether DAA has:
  - a. removed records from the Register of Aboriginal sites, on what basis it has done so, and what consultation there was with affected Traditional Owners before removal;
  - b. provided information about site registration or site removal to development proponents; and whether it has provided an equal level of information to affected Traditional Owners;
  - c. changed its interpretation of section 5 of the Act, and if so, the basis for its changed view.

And your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray.

NAME	ADDRESS	SIGNATURE