

**Treaties, Agreements and Other Constructive Arrangements between Indigenous peoples and States**

*Submission to the Expert Mechanism on the rights of Indigenous peoples*

**Castan Centre for Human Rights Law**

Prepared by:

Scott Walker, Researcher

Andrea Olivares Jones, Policy Manager

Dr Katie O’Bryan, Academic

Associate Professor Melissa Castan, Academic Director

**January 2022**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Background |

The [Castan Centre for Human Rights Law](https://www.monash.edu/law/research/centres/castancentre) is a world-renowned academic research centre within the Faculty of Law at Monash University in Australia. We advocate for the respect and promotion of human rights to allow all people to flourish in freedom and dignity. We welcome the opportunity to provide a submission to the Expert Mechanism on the rights of Indigenous peoples on the above subject.

While we recognise that some progress towards treaties, agreements, constructive arrangements and joint problem-solving initiatives has been made to varying degrees in differing jurisdictions within Australia,[[1]](#footnote-1) this particular submission will focus on initiatives that have been advanced at a **national level**. It will further highlight progress in the state of **Victoria,** which is leading the country in the development of a treaty with First Nations[[2]](#footnote-2) peoples, as well as acknowledge the Noongar Settlement, a notable agreement in **Western Australia.**

|  |
| --- |
| 2. Types of Treaties, Agreements, Constructive Arrangements and Other Joint Problem-Solving Initiatives |

**2.1 Commonwealth**

1. *Constitutional Recognition*

Australia does not currently have any treaties with its Indigenous peoples, nor does it recognise them in the Australian Constitution. Recognition of the self-determination of First Nations peoples is also not a stated policy goal of the Australian Government.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Notwithstanding, Australia is in the midst of a long and robust dialogue with First Nations peoples on the form and substance of constitutional recognition[[4]](#footnote-4) (as well as, to some degree, treaties, agreement-making and other reconciliation initiatives).[[5]](#footnote-5) First Nations leaders have emphasised that recognition in this context requires more than symbolic ‘acknowledgement’, but rather requires substantive structural reform.[[6]](#footnote-6) Indeed in 2017, following extensive dialogues[[7]](#footnote-7) between First Nations peoples facilitated by the Referendum Council, the Australian people were presented with the *Uluru Statement from the Heart* (**Uluru Statement**). This powerful document saw First Nations peoples ‘invite’ non-Indigenous Australians to ‘walk with [them] in a movement of the Australian people for a better future’. The Castan Centre strongly endorses the Uluru Statement and a constitutionally entrenched First Nations Voice as manifestations of Indigenous self-determination.

The central claims arising from the Uluru Statement are that of Voice, Treaty, Truth. The Uluru Statement prioritises establishing a *constitutionally* enshrined First Nations Voice to Parliament,[[8]](#footnote-8) as a necessary first step towards structural reform. The Voice is intended to ‘redistribute public power via the Constitution’ and create an ‘institutional relationship between governments and First Nations that will compel the state to listen to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in policy and decision-making’.[[9]](#footnote-9) The Voice would not have the same powers of a House of Parliament (i.e. the ability to initiate, pass or reject bills).[[10]](#footnote-10)

In 2019, the Australian Government announced the Indigenous Voice Co-design Process to consult and engage on the mechanism of a Voice.[[11]](#footnote-11) The Co-Design’s final model for the Voice, announced in December 2021,[[12]](#footnote-12) is a *legislated* one which consists of a National Voice, as well as Local and Regional Voices.[[13]](#footnote-13) Under this proposal, the Australian Parliament and Government ‘would be “obliged” to ask the National Voice for advice on a defined and limited number of proposed laws and policies that *overwhelmingly* affect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’.[[14]](#footnote-14) There are considerable barriers to effecting this reform (see Part 3).

1. *Native Title*

Another constructive arrangement under Australian law is native title, which sees the recognition of First Nations’ pre-existing rights and interests over land and waters.[[15]](#footnote-15) The case of *Mabo v Queensland* (No 2), and subsequent enactment of the *Native Title Act* (**NTA**)allowed for the transformation of First Nations peoples’ moral claims to land and waters, into legal rights.[[16]](#footnote-16) While the NTA covers all Australian states and territories,[[17]](#footnote-17) there are other legislative frameworks on First Nations peoples’ rights to land that vary between jurisdictions.[[18]](#footnote-18)

**2.2 Victoria**

1. *Treaty Process*

The State of Victoria is the first in the country to formally commence developing a treaty with Aboriginal Victorians and Traditional Owners.[[19]](#footnote-19) The treaty process is governed by the *Advancing the Treaty Process with Aboriginal Victorians Act 2018* (Vic) (**Advancing Treaty Act**), which requires an Aboriginal Representative Body to work in partnership with the State to ‘establish the entities, rules and resource base necessary to facilitate future treaty negotiations’.[[20]](#footnote-20) The treaty process in Victoria has three phases: (1) establishing an Aboriginal Representative Body; (2) developing a treaty framework; and (3) negotiating treaties.[[21]](#footnote-21)

The first phase saw the establishment in 2019 of the First Peoples’ Assembly of Victoria (**Assembly**) -a democratically elected representative body for First Nations people in the State.[[22]](#footnote-22) The treaty process is currently in phase 2,[[23]](#footnote-23) which involves collaboration between the Assembly and the State to develop a framework for the negotiation of treaties.[[24]](#footnote-24) The Treaty Negotiation Framework will determine whether there should be one or multiple treaties, the content of treaties, and who negotiates and is represented by the treaties.[[25]](#footnote-25) The framework must ensure negotiations cover key issues, including the recognition of historic wrongs, addressing ongoing injustices, supporting reconciliation, ‘promoting the fundamental human rights of Aboriginal peoples, including the right to self-determination’, and acknowledging the importance of culture to Aboriginal identity, among other objectives.[[26]](#footnote-26) The Assembly is also working to establish:[[27]](#footnote-27)an Elders’ Voice;[[28]](#footnote-28) a Self-determination Fund;[[29]](#footnote-29) and a Treaty Authority.[[30]](#footnote-30)

1. *Truth Commission*

Victoria has also established a truth telling commission, the Yoorrook Justice Commission.[[31]](#footnote-31) The role of the Commission is to ‘look into both past and ongoing injustices experienced by Traditional Owners and First Peoples in Victoria in all areas of life since colonisation,’ and includes [making] recommendations for healing, system reform and practical changes to laws, policy and education, as well as to matters to be included in future treaties.’[[32]](#footnote-32)

The Castan Centre strongly endorses the First Peoples’ Assembly of Victoria and the Yoorrook Justice Commission as manifestations of Indigenous self-determination.

**2.3 Western Australia**

1. *The Noongar Settlement*

A further agreement which has origins in native title is the ‘Noongar Settlement’, ‘the largest and “most comprehensive” agreement to settle Aboriginal interests in land in Australian history’.[[33]](#footnote-33) The agreement, which involves 30,000 Noongar people, and covers 200,000 km2 of land in the south west of Western Australia, resolves all native title claims to that area.[[34]](#footnote-34) It includes agreement on ‘rights, obligations and opportunities relating to land, resources, governance, finance and cultural heritage’.[[35]](#footnote-35) While constitutional and Indigenous rights scholars Harry Hobbs and George Williams contend that the Noongar Settlement constitutes Australia’s first treaty between First Nations and the State, [[36]](#footnote-36) it is important to note that the Noongar Settlement was ‘not conducted under an explicit treaty framework’.[[37]](#footnote-37)

|  |
| --- |
| 3. Barriers to, and Enabling Conditions Necessary to Promote, Constructive Dialogue on such Arrangements |

**3.1 Barriers to Establishing a Voice**

The immediate political response to the Uluru Statement was dismissive, particularly of the Voice reform. The then Prime Minister argued that such a reform was ‘[not] capable of winning acceptance in a [constitutional] referendum’, and would be ‘seen as a third chamber of Parliament’.[[38]](#footnote-38) The current Prime Minister,[[39]](#footnote-39) Deputy Prime Minister[[40]](#footnote-40) and Minister for Home Affairs[[41]](#footnote-41) have also made similar claims- although scholars have dismissed these claims as unfounded.[[42]](#footnote-42)

The Opposition, however, supports *constitutional* enshrinement,[[43]](#footnote-43) and considers the Government’s proposal to be inconsistent with the Uluru Statement.[[44]](#footnote-44) There has also been criticism of the co-design process,[[45]](#footnote-45) and there remains continued disagreement about how to best achieve constitutional recognition,[[46]](#footnote-46) and the nature of the Voice, with considerable public support for a constitutionally enshrined Voice.[[47]](#footnote-47) A constitutional Voice would ‘benefit from greater stability because its existence would be guaranteed’, and would also provide for the recognition sought by many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.[[48]](#footnote-48)

Despite early commitments by the Australian Government to engage in Indigenous Voice reform before the end of the 46th Parliament, no such legislation has been enacted to date, and there is no indication that such a Bill will be introduced before the conclusion of the current Parliament, with the General Election required by May 2022.[[49]](#footnote-49)

|  |
| --- |
| **4. Barriers to Implementation of Treaties, Agreements and Other Constructive Arrangements etc** |

**4.1 Truth Alone is Insufficient**

The Australian experience has shown that ‘[t]he idea that truth automatically will lead to justice is fraught’.[[50]](#footnote-50) Indeed, there have been many attempts at truth-telling in Australia on laws, policies, and practices impacting upon First Nations peoples, including the 1991 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, the 1997 Australian Human Rights Commission *Bringing Them Home* Report and the 2017 Royal Commission into the Protection and Detention of Children in the Northern Territory. None have led to systemic reform of law, policy, or practice. Accordingly, First Nations peoples have placed great emphasis on mechanisms for meaningful structural reform before more truth-telling initiatives.

The Victorian treaty and truth-telling process (see Part 2.2) provides an illustration of a mechanism which recognises the need for structural reform to recognise First People’s sovereignty and self-determination (i.e. First Peoples’ Assembly and treaty process) as well as the truth-telling exercise to be undertaken by the Yoorrook Justice Commission. The Commission’s design and process is informed by the self-determination of Victoria’s First Peoples which complements, but does not overshadow, the structural reform agenda.[[51]](#footnote-51)

**4.2 Barriers to Establishing Native Title**

The limitations inherent in the recognition of native title ‘have constrained Indigenous peoples’ ability to transform their moral interests into legally enforceable rights’.[[52]](#footnote-52)As Hobbs and Williams note, native title reflects the desire of governments to pursue what it considers to be practical mechanisms to the recognition of First Nations land rights, rather than any broader claim for self-determination and sovereignty beyond the process of colonisation.[[53]](#footnote-53) The Noongar Settlement can therefore be seen as an outlier and the real ability of native title agreements to deliver upon the sorts of claims First Nations people are making for self-determination can be questioned. Further, the native title process has been recognised as ‘highly resource intensive’ with costs borne ‘most acutely’ by First Nations people, such as ‘in the need for detailed evidence relating to connection [to the land] to be brought by [First Nations] claimants’.[[54]](#footnote-54)

|  |
| --- |
| 5. Mechanisms for Conflict Resolution |

**5.1 Victoria’s Treaty Process and National Native Title Tribunal**

Although no treaty process has been finalised as yet,[[55]](#footnote-55) Victoria’s Advancing Treaty Act sets out the treaty process and recognises a number of institutional and procedural mechanisms for delivery of a treaty with Victoria’s First Peoples. The Act requires that parties to ‘work together to establish the dispute resolution process by agreement’.[[56]](#footnote-56) The interim dispute resolution process—which also provides standards of conduct for negotiation discussions—was finalised in January 2021[[57]](#footnote-57) and signed in February 2021.[[58]](#footnote-58) The First Peoples’ Assembly has said that this process ‘will ensure our future negotiations are done in good faith, on an equal playing field and honouring Aboriginal ways of doing business’.[[59]](#footnote-59) The Treaty Negotiation Framework and Treaty Authority (once established) will formalise and decide upon final dispute resolution mechanisms.[[60]](#footnote-60)

We also briefly note that the National Native Title Tribunal has functions relating to conflict resolution involving native title matters (for example, mediation, inquires etc), as does the Federal Court of Australia. [[61]](#footnote-61)
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