

Response ID ANON-8EBD-41CZ-5

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

Submitted on **2018-06-01 11:34:02**

About You

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

Organisation

Organisation details

What is the name of your organisation?

Organisation Name:

Shire of Meekatharra

Name of submitting officer and position.

Submitting officer and position:

Roy McClymont, CEO

Do you have authorisation to make a submission on behalf of your organisation?

Yes

In which field is your business?

Government / Local Government

If "other" please specify your field of business:

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?:

Consult directly with the most appropriate aboriginal people on heritage matters.

Question 3

No opinion

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

Question 4

No opinion

Role and functions - Minister:

No opinion

Role and functions - Registrar:

No opinion

Role and functions - Committee:

No opinion

Role and functions - DPLH:

What is Protected?

Question 5

No opinion

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?:

Protection and Enforcement

Question 9

No opinion

9. Activities that should require consent or authorisation:

Question 10

No opinion

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

Question 11

No opinion

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

Question 12

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

DAA or other independent body

Question 13

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

Yes

16. How can penalties be improved?:

Site Assessment and Registration

Question 17

No

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

Minimises/removes the possibility of accidental damage or impact to the site

Question 18

No opinion

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

20. What's missing from the Act?:

The operation of the act is increasingly becoming a means of raising money and profits. Heritage is becoming a secondary less important facet. This lowers community respect of aboriginal people and their advisers. Perhaps penalties for any person who quotes or charges unreasonable fees for heritage surveys and services ... ?

But a difficult one to enact and enforce and process ...

What else can be done? As time passes and the old people move on this will become more prevalent.

Question 21

No opinion

21. Sections to be removed from Act?:

Any other comments

Any other comments:

Some aboriginal groups through their lawyers and heritage adviser are becoming unreasonable in terms of what they require for heritage surveys. What can we do about this.